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# Accreditation Standard 1.0 — Program Mission and Goals

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 1.0.1: The program submits its mission statement and explains how it is consistent with the profession’s purpose and values. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative provides the program’s mission statement. |

**Program’s Mission Statement:**

Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the program’s mission statement is consistent with the profession’s purpose (defined on pg. 5 of the EPAS) and values (listed in EP 1.0). |

**Profession’s Purpose:**

*“The purpose of the social work profession is to promote human and community well-being. Guided by a person-in-environment framework, a global perspective, respect for human diversity, and knowledge based on scientific inquiry, the purpose of social work is actualized through its quest for social and economic justice, the prevention of conditions that limit human rights, the elimination of poverty, and the enhancement of the quality of life for all persons, locally and globally.” (pg. 5, 2015 EPAS)*

**Profession’s Values:**

*“Service, social justice, the dignity and worth of the person, the importance of human relationships, integrity, competence, human rights, and scientific inquiry are among the core values of social work. These values underpin the explicit and implicit curriculum and frame the profession’s commitment to respect for all people and the quest for social and economic justice.”* *(EP 1.0, 2015 EPAS)*

While brief, our mission encompasses each of the components of the profession’s purpose and value:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Components of the Profession’s**  **Purpose & Values** | **Components of the Program’s Mission Statement**  *Relevant portions of the mission presented in bold.* |
| Person-in-environment framework | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide **regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being**.   * Our students are primarily from the region with the intention to remain here in the future; this will be explored more fully below under “[Context](#Program_Context).” As such, our mission statement emphasizes regional responsiveness to address this unique person-in-environment context of the MSW Program. The counties we serve are diverse in relationship to their socioeconomic status, urban/rural divide, and racial and ethnic compositions. We address the changing demographics of our regional environment and work with students to identify strengths across these identities and elevate human and community well-being. |
| Global perspective | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world** by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being.   * While our program provides regional responsiveness, our mission also recognizes the changing global context, particularly in relationship to the promotion of social justice. Systems theory teaches of our interconnectedness, and as such, we work to help students see how the global context impacts our own backyards. |
| Respect for human diversity | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving** **world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being.**   * Our professional values of social justice, dignity and worth of the person, and integrity provide the foundation for respecting human diversity. Social justice requires our attention to challenging discrimination and oppression and knowing about diversity. Dignity and worth of the person requires attention to difference. Integrity requires us to act in a manner that attends to these values that emphasize knowledge about and respect for difference. * Recognizing that our world is changing requires ongoing education about diversity and continuous adaptation in the curriculum. * Engaging in strengths-based general practice helps ground us in the unique cultural and individual resources students and clients bring to social work. |
| Knowledge based on scientific inquiry | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, **competency-based**, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being.   * Our professional value of competence, which mandates continuous professional development, combined with Competency 4’s emphasis on using methods of scientific inquiry to develop and consume professional knowledge, are inherent in our mission statement. |
| Quest for social and economic justice | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being**.   * Clearly explicating the promotion of social justice was a high priority in development of our mission statement. Consequently, it is included in our statement on the values of the profession and additionally highlights our utilization of strengths-based generalist practice in promoting social justice to elevate human and community well-being. |
| Prevention of conditions that limit human rights | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world** by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that **elevates human and community well-being.**   * We cannot promote social justice without attending to conditions that limit human rights. As such, a curriculum that promotes social justice necessarily must address human rights, which are also implied across our professional values. * The elevation of human and community well-being is an extension of preventing limitations on human rights. |
| Elimination of poverty | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice** in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that **elevates human and community well-being**.   * The elimination of poverty is a key emphasis in our professional values and an inherent component of promoting social justice and elevating human and community well-being. |
| Enhancement of the quality of life for all persons, locally and globally | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide **regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world** by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that **elevates human and community well-being**.   * Our core value of service is dedicated to enhancing the quality of life across all system levels. * Our emphasis on regional responsiveness highlights our commitment to our local community and our promotion of social justice speaks to a broader enhancement that includes global considerations. |
| Valuing service | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that **elevates human and community well-being**.   * Our core value of service is dedicated to enhancing the quality of life across all system levels and our mission statement emphases this in striving to elevate human and community well-being. |
| Valuing social justice | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice** **in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being.**   * As noted above, explicating the promotion of social justice was a high priority in developing our mission statement. Consequently, it is included in our statement on the values of the profession and additionally highlights our utilization of strengths-based generalist practice in promoting social justice to elevate human and community well-being. |
| Valuing dignity and worth of the person | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world** by **engaging in strengths-based generalist practice** that **elevates human and community well-being**.   * The promotion of social justice is grounded in valuing the dignity and worth of the person as each requires attending to the unique needs of individuals and communities and advocating for their needs. * Strengths-based practice requires recognizing an individual’s capacity and strengths and using them as the basis of the helping process. Such recognition requires a valuing of a person’s dignity and worth. |
| Valuing importance of human relationships | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by **engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being**.   * Strengths-based generalist practice requires collaboration in the helping process, a feat only possible when valuing human relationships. |
| Valuing integrity | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, **competency-based**, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being.   * The behaviors encompassed in Competency 1 provide the foundation for integrity; without professionalism and ethics, we cannot have integrity. |
| Valuing competence | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, **competency-based**, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being.   * Taken as a whole, the nine practice competencies provide the foundation of the professional value of competence as their mastery provides a baseline from which to build. The value then builds upon this baseline with a call to engage in continuous professional development. |
| Valuing human rights | **Grounded in the values of the Profession,** the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being**.   * As noted above, we cannot promote social justice without attending to conditions that limit human rights. As such, a curriculum that promotes social justice necessarily must address human rights. Additionally, the elevation of human and community well-being is an extension of preventing limitations on human rights. |
| Valuing scientific inquiry | **Grounded in the values of the Profession,** the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, **competency-based, interdisciplinary programs** that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being.   * As noted above, our professional value of competence, which mandates continuous professional development, combined with Competency 4’s emphasis on using methods of scientific inquiry to develop and consume professional knowledge, are inherent in our mission statement. * As an interdisciplinary program, our students are exposed to multiple ways of understanding and explaining the natural world to provide a broad base from which to interpret behavior. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: The narrative should discuss any ways in which the program option mission differs from the on-campus program (if applicable). |

N/A: The program has only one program option.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 1.0.2:The program explains how its mission is consistent with the institutional mission and the program’s context across all program options. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the program’s mission is consistent with the institutional mission. |

**Institutional Mission:**

The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay is a multi-campus comprehensive university offering exemplary undergraduate, master’s and select doctoral programs and operating with a commitment to excellence in teaching, scholarship and research, and service to the community. The University provides a problem focused educational experience that promotes critical thinking and student success.

The culture and vision of the University reflect a deep commitment to diversity, inclusion, social justice, civic engagement, and educational opportunity at all levels. Our core values embrace community-based partnerships, collaborative faculty scholarship and innovation.

Our commitment to a university that promotes access, career success, cross-discipline collaboration, cultural enrichment, economic development, entrepreneurship, and environmental sustainability is demonstrated through a wide array of programs and certifications offered in four colleges: College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences; College of Science, Engineering and Technology (including the Richard Resch School of Engineering); College of Health, Education and Social Welfare; and the Austin E. Cofrin School of Business, leading to a range of degrees, including AAS, BA, BAS, BBA, BM, BS, BSN, BSW, MS, MSW, MSN, and Ed.D.​

**Explanation of Consistency of Program’s Mission with the Institutional Mission:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Components of the Institutional Mission** | **Components of the Program’s Mission Statement** |
| The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay is a multi-campus comprehensive university offering exemplary undergraduate, master’s and select doctoral programs and operating with a commitment to excellence in teaching, scholarship and research, and service to the community. | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay **provide regionally responsive**, **competency-based**, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by **engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being**.   * Our focus on regional responsiveness and elevating community well-being corresponds to the university’s mission to service to the community. * Facilitating student mastery of the practice competencies aligns with excellence in teaching. |
| The University provides a problem focused educational experience that promotes critical thinking and student success. | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, **competency-based, interdisciplinary programs** that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by **engaging in strengths-based generalist practice** that elevates human and community well-being.   * The MSW Program provides problem focused educational experiences through teaching to the mission of the profession to “enhance human well-being.” Teaching students to master the competencies provides them the tools to address such problems of daily-living using critical thinking skills. Critical thinking is “generally regarded as purposeful thinking, involves careful examination and evaluation of beliefs, assumptions, and actions to arrive at a well-reasoned decision,”[[1]](#footnote-2) and a necessary component of generalist practice. * Our engagement in strengths-based practice extends to our work with students, whereby we work from our students’ strengths to nurture their successes. |
| The culture and vision of the University reflect a deep commitment to diversity, inclusion, social justice, civic engagement, and educational opportunity at all levels. | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world** by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being.   * The university’s commitment to diversity and social justice resonates well with our program mission as well as the purpose and values of the profession. |
| Our core values embrace community-based partnerships, collaborative faculty scholarship and innovation. | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay **provide regionally responsive**, **competency-based**, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by **engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being**.   * The university’s commitment to collaborations and partnerships reflects our program’s regional responsiveness and emphasis on strengths-based practice. |
| Our commitment to a university that promotes access, career success, cross-discipline collaboration, cultural enrichment, economic development, entrepreneurship, and environmental sustainability is demonstrated through a wide array of programs and certifications offered in four colleges: College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences; College of Science, Engineering and Technology (including the Richard Resch School of Engineering); College of Health, Education and Social Welfare; and the Austin E. Cofrin School of Business, leading to a range of degrees, including AAS, BA, BAS, BBA, BM, BS, BSN, BSW, MS, MSW, MSN, and Ed.D.​ | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay **provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being**.   * Promoting access is a component of social justice. * Facilitating career success incorporates the utilization of strengths-based strategies. * Cross-discipline collaboration is incorporated into interdisciplinarity. * Cultural enrichment and economic development are explicitly connected to our professional value of social justice. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the program’s mission is consistent with the program’s context across all program options. |

**Program’s Context:**

*“Context encompasses the mission of the institution in which the program is located and the needs and opportunities associated with the setting and program options. Programs are further influenced by their practice communities, which are informed by their historical, political, economic, environmental, social, cultural, demographic, local,*

*regional, and global contexts and by the ways they elect to engage these factors. Additional factors include new knowledge, technology, and ideas that may have a bearing on contemporary and future social work education, practice, and research.” (EP 1.0, 2015 EPAS)*

Both the university and program missions emphasize a focus on the local community and commitment to community. It is because of the Social Work Program’s commitment to “provide regionally responsive…programs” in a “diverse and evolving world” that the Northeast Wisconsin Region provides the primary context for our Program. The MSW Program serves primarily the Northeast Wisconsin region, which is comprised of 18 counties commonly referred to as the “New North” region, identified as such by the non-profit New North development organization whose primary purpose is to foster collaboration between public and private leaders in Northeast Wisconsin. A partnership with the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point provides space on the Wausau campus thus increasing MSW programming to Central Wisconsin.

Most of the MSW students in our Program come from, and plan to remain in, Northeast Wisconsin after graduation. This phenomenon is not unique to social work, but rather the region. In fall of 2019, almost 70% of UWGB students originated from New North counties; Brown County accounted for over 27% of the student population.[[2]](#footnote-3) Additionally, almost 95% of graduates from the New North remain in Wisconsin after graduation.[[3]](#footnote-4) Therefore, the characteristics and needs of this region provide important contextual elements for understanding the background and attitudes of students, and the needs of clients and communities in which they will work. These factors, in turn, influence course content and field opportunities for the Program.

**Combination of Urban and Rural.** This Northeast and Central Wisconsin regions are comprised of a mix of urban and rural areas, though it is more heavily rural. On one extreme, it contains a major metropolitan community comprised of over 320,000[[4]](#footnote-5) residents; this includes our Program’s location in the city of Green Bay, the state’s third largest city. On the other, two small rural counties of less than 5,000 people each; one of which most of the county is the Menominee Indian Reservation. These population characteristics suggest our Program graduates must be prepared to evaluate and enhance service availability and delivery across a wide range of community sizes and circumstances, as the communities vary widely in the range and depth of services and available resources, demographic profile, ease of access to services, and the demands on worker effort and time to reach out to and serve clients, particularly in their homes.

**Racial and Ethnic Diversity.** In addition to variation by population size, communities served by our Program vary widely in the extent of racial and ethnic diversity. U.S. Census data demonstrates that Wisconsin is less racially and ethnically diverse than the United States with almost 81% non-Hispanic White individuals. While the racial/ethnic composition of all UWGB undergraduate students closely reflects the same proportions of the state, social work students tend to be more racially/ethnically diverse than the broader campus with 24% Black, Indigenous, and People of Color.

While the racial and ethnic demographics of the state are predominantly non-Hispanic White, the composition of the counties comprising the New North vary greatly. Four federally recognized tribes reside in the area, including the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin, Oneida Nation of Wisconsin, Forest County Potawatomi, and Stockbridge-Munsee Community Band of Mohican Indians. Students may be working in settings where most families are Native American (82% in Menominee County) or in settings where almost all (80%+) community members are Caucasian. Additionally, Latino, Hmong, Somali, and African American families reside throughout northeast Wisconsin.

In general, when comparing the portions of BIPOC and White residents, the counties of the New North tend to be less diverse than both the general United States and the state of Wisconsin; however, that is not true for all the counties. Our MSW Program therefore needs to prepare students to practice in very divergent communities in relationship to race and ethnicity.

**Socioeconomic Status.** Socioeconomic status, as indicated by median household income and poverty rate, varies throughout the New North region as well. In 2019,[[5]](#footnote-6) median household income in the U. S. was $62,843 and the poverty rate at 10.5%. Wisconsin closely paralleled these figures with a median household income of $61,747 and a poverty rate of 10.5%. Median household income for the region would suggest Northeast Wisconsin families are doing more poorly in their socioeconomic status than both the U.S. and Wisconsin averages, with 14 of the 18 counties reporting lower median household incomes than both the U.S. and Wisconsin averages. However, in the region, poverty rates may be better indicators of poor socioeconomic status as only 6 of the counties have poverty rates higher than both that of the general U.S. and state of Wisconsin. Taken together, these figures suggest that while incomes may be lower in the region, fewer families across the region are living in poverty. While overall this paints a positive picture of the region, some counties are really suffering socioeconomically. For example, Menominee County has an alarming poverty rate of 25.3% and its median household income is under $41,000. The MSW Program must therefore prepare students for practice in both economically devastated counties as well as counties that are thriving economically.

The widespread differences in population density, racial and ethnic makeup, and financial resources indicate some of the factors the Program evaluates within the context of our “regionally responsive” program in a “diverse and evolving world.” In turn, our Program prepares graduates who will engage in “strengths-based generalist practice that enhances human and community well-being” (see Program Mission). These factors are also addressed and evaluated in policy and practice courses where students are challenged to examine the ways these influence their efforts to strengthen human and community well-being, particularly in their field settings. The region’s demographic characteristics make clear the need for Program graduates to recognize the importance of diversity, to address oppression, and to advocate for vulnerable community members.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: The narrative should discuss any ways in which the program option mission differs from the on-campus program (if applicable). |

N/A: There is only one program option.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

**Explanation of Consistency of Program’s Mission with the Program’s Context for the [Location/Delivery Method] Program Option:**

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 1.0.3:The program identifies its goals and demonstrates how they are derived from the program’s mission. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative identifies the program’s goals. |

The Program’s mission, grounded in the NASW’s (2021) *Code of Ethics*, and embedded within the broader UW-Green Bay mission, provides the foundation for the primary goals to which the Program aspires. The Program’s core competencies, in turn, provide the curricular avenue through which – and in concert with our community providers and social work practitioners – we prepare knowledgeable, ethical, and competent entry-level baccalaureate social workers for practice in increasingly diverse regional, national, and global communities.

Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks, our MSW Program has 5 goals that reflect our mission and move us toward our vision (see [Standard 3.0: Diversity](#Standard_3_0)). Goals are identified in the compliance statement below.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates how the program’s goals are derived from the program’s mission |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program’s Goals** | **Components of the Program’s Mission** |
| 1. Curriculum: The program engages in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core. | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, **competency-based, interdisciplinary** programs **that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being**.   * This goal reflects the Program’s commitment to upholding the practice standards reflected in the Program competencies. Our Program strongly supports competency-based social work education as it provides a well-established framework upon which the knowledge, values, and skills necessary to professional practice can be implemented. Every aspect of our curriculum is tied to the Program competencies established by the CSWE in the Educational and Policy Accreditation Standards (EPAS). |
| 1. Community Partnerships: The program seeks, analyzes, and responds to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities. | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide **regionally responsive**, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being**.   * This goal articulates the Program’s recognition of the importance of the regional context in which it operates and its commitment to sustaining a collaborative relationship with community and social service agency partners. It reflects the Program’s recognition of the central importance of the broader community environment in which it is embedded and its recognition of the faculty’s responsibility for nurturing strong ties to this community. |
| 1. Interdisciplinarity: The program promotes critical thinking through acquiring and applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice. | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, **interdisciplinary programs** that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being.   * This goal reflects the broader mission of the University and recognizes the Program’s reliance on an interdisciplinary knowledge base, use of critical thinking skills, and use of research-reflective practice. An essential aspect of this decision-making process is reliance on thoroughly researched assessment and intervention approaches. Additionally, essential components of effective critical thinking are reliance on a broad interdisciplinary knowledge base, and use of evidence-based data drawn from fields of sociology, psychology, economics, human development, and the political sciences. Achieving this Program goal requires ongoing development of curriculum components that challenge students to use their interdisciplinary research-based knowledge in their work with clients and communities. |
| 1. Professional Development: The program seeks and develops professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action. | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world** by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that **elevates human and community well-being**.   * This goal encompasses the Program’s emphasis on continued self-assessment and professional growth, commitments embedded in the profession’s value base. The Program is committed to helping students understand and embrace these values and in the faculty embodying them as well. |
| 1. Recruitment & Persistence: The program actively recruits students, faculty, and staff into an inclusive and extraordinary environment with highly effective supports to ensure that all are able to successfully meet academic and professional goals. | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay **provide regionally responsive**, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world** by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that **elevates human and community well-being**.   * This goal reflects our belief that in order to be regionally responsive and promote social justice, we must work to recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who represent the region and see such strategies as instrumental in elevating human and community well-being. We pursue retention through intensive advising (for students) and mentoring (for faculty and staff) and also seek to integrate additional resources committed to facilitating success |
|  | |
| 1. Compliance Statement: The narrative should discuss goals for all program options (if different from one option to the other) and demonstrate how they are derived from the program’s mission. | |

N/A: There is only one program option.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

# Accreditation Standard M2.0 — Generalist Practice

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M2.0.1:The program explains how its mission and goals are consistent with generalist practice as defined in EP 2.0. |

**Generalist Practice Definition:**

*“Generalist practice is grounded in the liberal arts and the person-in-environment framework. To promote human and social well-being, generalist practitioners use a range of prevention and intervention methods in their practice with diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities based on scientific inquiry and best practices. The generalist practitioner identifies with the social work profession and applies ethical principles and critical thinking in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Generalist practitioners engage diversity in their practice and advocate for human rights and social and economic justice. They recognize, support, and build on the strengths and resiliency of all human beings. They engage in research-informed practice and are proactive in responding to the impact of context on professional practice.” (EP 2.0, 2015 EPAS)*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the program’s mission is consistent with generalist practice. |

**The Program Mission and Generalist Practice**

The mission of the UW-Green Bay Social Work Professional Programs, consisting of a BSW and MSW Program, begins with this preamble:

*The mission, vision, and goals of the UW-Green Bay Social Work Professional Programs reflect our holistic philosophy. They provide guidance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship for students, faculty, and staff.*

The first statement, highlighting a holistic philosophy, sets the stage for generalist practice upon which the MSW Program is grounded. Furthermore, the preamble suggests that all areas of the Program (teaching, service, and scholarship) and all stakeholders in the Program (students, faculty, and staff) are guided by the mission and goals of the Program. Connecting the mission to all aspects of the Program ensures that we remain focused on generalist practice and the principles of the social work profession in all initiatives.

NOTE: When developing the latest iteration of the mission statement, the faculty was cognizant of three guidelines: alignment with the University’s mission, alignment with the definition of generalist practice, and a statement that was inclusive but concise. To that end, the mission statement has two global phrases that are intended to encompass several specific thoughts. These phrases are 1) “grounded in the values of the profession” which refers to all the principles and standards put forth by the National Association of Social Work; and 2) “competency-based” which refers to the definitions of all nine competencies put forth by the Council on Social Work Education.

In the table below, column one lists each component of the generalist practice definition. Column two identifies (in bold) the specific component of the mission that aligns with the generalist practice definition component. The third column provides a narrative for each element discussing *how* the mission and definition components align.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component of the Generalist Practice Definition** | **Components of the Program’s Mission** | **How the Components Align** |
| Grounded in the liberal arts | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the **University of Wisconsin-Green Bay** provide regionally responsive, competency-based,**interdisciplinar**y programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being. | The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay is a comprehensive, regional liberal arts university. This component of the generalist practice definition is core to the history of the University and, as such, is an underpinning of the mission of the MSW Program. Further, a liberal arts education implies an emphasis on interdisciplinarity in order to prepare students with a broad, generalized knowledge and skill base that may be transferrable across employment settings. |
| Person-in-environment framework | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide **regionally responsive**, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in **strengths-based generalist practice** that elevates human and community well-being. | Our mission pulls in the language “generalist practice” to subsume all the frameworks that guide its definition, including person-in-environment. Furthermore, our commitment to be regionally responsive suggests an intentional focus on the impact of the environment in which our clients and practitioners live and practice. |
| Promote human and social well-being | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice** in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that **elevates human and community well-being.** | Our mission specifically addresses human and social well-being by highlighting those terms, or close variations. |
| Range of prevention and intervention methods | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, **competency-based,**interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in **strengths-based generalist practice** that elevates human and community well-being. | The phrase “competency-based” was intentionally chosen to ensure the elements of all nine competencies were highlighted in our mission. This includes competencies six, seven, eight, and nine that address the change process (e.g., prevention and intervention) from a strengths-perspective. |
| Practice with diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being.** | A hallmark of the MSW Program’s mission, and specifically mentioned, is its emphasis on diversity, inclusivity, and equity across all areas of practice from micro to macro. |
| Scientific inquiry and best practices | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, **competency-based, interdisciplinary programs** that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being. | The phrase “competency-based” was intentionally chosen to ensure the elements of all nine competencies were highlighted in our mission. This includes competencies four (research) and six, seven, eight, and nine (change process) as both speak to the need for scientific inquiry and use of evidence-based, best practices. Further, interdisciplinary suggests that best practice may be pulled from outside the traditional social work field. |
| Practitioner identifies with the social work profession | **Grounded in the values of the Profession,** the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by **engaging in strengths**-**based generalist practice** that elevates human and community well-being. | Our mission begins with the phrase “Grounded in the values of the Profession” to reinforce that the social work principles, standards, and overarching values are the cornerstone of the MSW Program. This implies that our graduates and future practitioners will and do identify with the profession.  Further, our mission pulls in the language “generalist practice” to subsume all the frameworks that guide social work, including a strengths-based perspective. |
| Applies ethical principles | **Grounded in the values of the Profession,**the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice i**n a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being. | Our mission begins with the phrase “Grounded in the values of the Profession” to reinforce that the social work principles, standards, and overarching values are the cornerstone of the MSW Program. We intentionally delineated “promote social justice” as it is a hallmark of our program in addition to that of the social work profession and requires application of ethical principles to ensure justice is met. |
| Critical thinking | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide **regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary** programs that promote social justice in a diverse and **evolving world** by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being. | While our mission does not specifically use the phrase “critical thinking”, students must possess this skill in order to demonstrate regional responsiveness, mastery of competencies, interdisciplinary perspectives, and assessment and interventions in an evolving world. Further, critical thinking is mentioned in competency one (demonstrate ethical and professional behavior), which is addressed in our mission. |
| Practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, **competency-based**, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by **engaging in strengths-based generalist practice** that elevates human and community well-being. | The phrase “competency-based” was intentionally chosen to ensure the elements of all nine competencies were highlighted in our mission. In this instance, we are referring to demonstrating competency at all practice levels (micro, mezzo, and macro).  We further included the phrase “generalist practice” to subsume all the frameworks that guide its definition. In this instance, it refers to practice across all system levels. |
| Engage diversity in practice | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide **regionally responsive**, **competency-based,** interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice **in a diverse and evolving world** by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being. | The phrase “competency-based” was intentionally chosen to ensure the elements of all nine competencies were highlighted in our mission, including competency two (diversity). In addition, the mission specifically addresses diversity as a dynamic process and points to the program’s emphasis on responding to the diverse regions of NE Wisconsin. |
| Advocate for human rights and social and economic justice | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, **competency-based**, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world** by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being. | The phrase “competency-based” was intentionally chosen to ensure the elements of all nine competencies were highlighted in our mission, including competency three and five (human rights and social justice, and social policy). In addition, the mission specifically addresses the promotion of social justice from a diverse perspective. |
| Recognize, support, and build on the strengths and resiliency of all human beings | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a **diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice** that elevates human and community well-being. | Our mission pulls in the language “generalist practice” to subsume all the frameworks that guide its definition, including a strengths-based approach and concepts of resiliency. It also includes the phrase “diverse and evolving world” to emphasis the importance of recognizing and supporting the strengths and resilience of different cultures and norms. |
| Engage in research-informed practice | **Grounded in the values of the Profession**, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, **competency-based,** interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being. | Our mission begins with  the phrase “Grounded in the values of the Profession” to reinforce that the social work principles, standards, and overarching values are the cornerstone of the MSW Program.  The phrase “competency-based” was intentionally chosen to ensure the elements of all nine competencies were highlighted in our mission. This includes competency four (research-informed practice). |
| Proactive in responding to the impact of context on professional practice | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide **regionally responsive**, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that **promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world** by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being. | The phrases “regionally responsive” and “evolving world” were intentionally chosen to emphasize the dynamic nature of social work and the importance of understanding context in practice and policy.  The preamble suggests the mission “*provides guidance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship for students, faculty, and staff.”* By including teaching and scholarship as part of the mission statement, a mindset of forward, proactive is promoted. |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the program’s goals are consistent with generalist practice. | | |

**The Program Goals and Generalist Practice**

The Preamble to the goals of the UW-Green Bay Social Work Professional Programs, consisting of a BSW and MSW Program, is as follows:

*Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks, our Programs have five goals that reflect our mission and move us toward our vision.*

This preamble reinforces two fundamental beliefs of the Social Work Professional Programs, both stemming from the definition of generalist practice. The first is the important and specific connection between the goals and the overarching mission. One is dependent on the other and both are used to guide new and existing initiatives, enrollment and retention efforts, and evaluation activities. The second area stressed in the preamble is our emphasis on anti-racism and anti-oppression. Now, more than ever, social work must take an active role in confronting these issues at the individual and system levels. This commitment is further highlighted and summarized in our program vision:

*Leaders in promoting social justice advocacy and equity for people across all identities.*

The Program’s goals fall under five categories:

* Curriculum
* Community Partnerships
* Interdisciplinarity
* Professional Development
* Recruitment and Persistence

In the table below, column one lists each component of the generalist practice definition. Column two identifies (in bold) the specific component of the MSW Program goals that aligns with the generalist practice definition component. The third column provides a narrative for each element discussing *how* the goals and definition components align.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component of the Generalist Practice Definition** | **Components of the Program’s Goals** | **How the Components Align** |
| Grounded in the liberal arts | Interdisciplinarity: The program promotes critical thinking through acquiring and **applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum**of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice. | A liberal arts education implies an emphasis on interdisciplinarity in order to prepare students with the diverse knowledge and skills needed for a range of practice settings. This is a core element of the MSW Program as well as the broader UWGB community. |
| Person-in-environment framework | Curriculum: The program engages in continuous improvement to provide a **dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum**, with excellence and diversity at its core.    Community Partnerships: The program**seeks, analyzes, and responds to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region** by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities. | The curriculum goal specifically mentions generalist-practice to ensure inclusion of the frameworks that lie within its definition, such as person-in-environment.  The MSW Program’s goal of community partnerships highlights its emphasis on a person-in-environment framework when analyzing and responding to community needs. |
| Promote human and social well-being | Preamble: Grounded in **anti-racism and anti-oppression**.  Professional Development: The program seeks and **d**evelops professional growth opportunities with an **emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action.**  Recruitment & Persistence: The program actively recruits students, faculty, and staff into an inclusive and extraordinary environment with highly effective**supports to ensure that all are able to successfully meet academic and professional goals.** | The preamble of the MSW Program goals is the first indicator of our emphasis on human and social well-being.  The goals of professional development, and recruitment and persistence are designed to ensure the program invites and maintains an equitable, diverse, and inclusive workforce and student body. This stance is intended to translate into future social workers who will do the same for themselves, their clients, and their employers. |
| Range of prevention and intervention methods | Curriculum: The program engages in **continuous improvement to** **provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum,** with excellence and diversity at its core.  Community Partnerships: The program seeks, analyzes, and **responds to the dynamic urban and rural needs**of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities. | The curriculum goal intentionally uses the phrases “continuous improvement” and “dynamic…generalist-practice” to reflect the importance of ongoing assessment and implementation of prevention and intervention methods.  The MSW Program’s goal of community partnerships highlights its emphasis on the ever-changing and differential needs of urban and rural communities; reinforcing the importance of responding with a range of prevention and intervention methods. |
| Practice with diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities | Curriculum: The program engages in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, **with excellence and diversity at its core.**  Community Partnerships: The program seeks, analyzes, and responds to the **dynamic urban and rural needs**of the region by **cultivating partnerships with diverse communities**. | The MSW Program goals of curriculum and community partnerships specifically address diversity as fundamental to the program’s efforts, across all systems levels. |
| Scientific inquiry and best practices | Curriculum: The program **engages in continuous improvement** to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum**,** with excellence and diversity at its core.  Interdisciplinarity: The program promotes critical thinking through acquiring and applying knowledge from **across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice.** | Inquiry is fundamental to professional social work practice and is embedded throughout the MSW curriculum and supporting pre-requisites.  As such, both the curriculum and interdisciplinarity goals specifically address this generalist practice component by speaking to “continuous improvement” and “evidence-based professional practice”. |
| Practitioner identifies with the social work profession | Curriculum: The program **engages in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum,** with excellence and diversity at its core.  Professional Development: The program seeks and **develops professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action.** | The curriculum goal specifically mentions generalist-practice to ensure inclusion of the frameworks that lie within its definition; in this case the values, principles, and standards of the profession.  The professional development goal is designed to ensure the program supports continual, life-long learning that aligns with the profession’s historical roots. |
| Applies ethical principles | Curriculum: The program engages in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, **professional**, **generalist-practice curriculum**, with **excellence** **and diversity** at its core.    Professional Development: The program seeks and develops professional growth opportunities with an **emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action.** | Similar to above, the curriculum goal specifically mentions generalist-practice to ensure inclusion of the frameworks that lie within its definition; in this case the values, principles, and ethical standards of the profession.  The professional development goal is designed to ensure the program supports continual, life-long learning that aligns with the profession’s emphasis on the application of ethical principles. |
| Critical thinking | Interdisciplinarity: The program **promotes critical thinking**through acquiring and applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice. | The goal of interdisciplinarity specifically addresses critical thinking by making the connection between a broad range of knowledge from diverse sources as a key element of professional practice. |
| Practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels | Curriculum: The program engages in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, **professional, generalist-practice curriculum**, with excellence and diversity at its core.  Community Partnerships: The program **seeks, analyzes, and responds to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region** by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities.  Professional Development: The program seeks and develops professional growth opportunities with an **emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action.** | The curriculum goal specifically mentions generalist-practice to ensure inclusion of the frameworks that lie within its definition; in this case, the need to be proficient across all system levels from micro to macro.  The goals of community partnerships and professional development reinforce the Program’s emphasis on mezzo and macro practice by addressing the community and broader society. |
| Engage diversity in practice | Curriculum: The program engages in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and **diversity at its core.**  Community Partnerships: The program seeks, analyzes, and responds to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by **cultivating partnerships** **with diverse communities.**  Interdisciplinarity: The program promotes critical thinking through acquiring and applying **knowledge from across a diverse spectrum** of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice. | The MSW Program has held diversity as one of its goals for many years. As such, it is explicitly named as fundamental in three of the five program goals: curriculum, community partnerships, and interdisciplinarity. |
| Advocate for human rights and social and economic justice | Preamble: **Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression** frameworks:  Professional Development: The program seeks and develops professional growth opportunities with an **emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action.** | This component of the generalist practice definition is a hallmark of the MSW Program, guiding all five goals (through the preamble) and specifically addressed as a focus for professional development activities. An example of this is the Program’s theme of social justice for its annual continuing education trainings for field instructors. |
| Recognize, support, and build on the strengths and resiliency of all human beings | Curriculum: The program engages in continuous improvement to provide a **dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core.**  Recruitment & Persistence: The program actively recruits students, faculty, and staff into an **inclusive and extraordinary environment with highly effective supports** to ensure that all are able to successfully meet academic and professional goals. | The curriculum goal specifically mentions generalist-practice to ensure inclusion of the frameworks that lie within its definition, such as the strengths-perspective, and empowerment and resiliency approaches.  The Program’s goal of recruitment and persistence places emphasis on inviting and maintaining students and faculty through that same approach. |
| Engage in research-informed practice | Curriculum: The program **engages in continuous improvement** to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core.  Interdisciplinarity: The program promotes critical thinking through **acquiring and applying knowledge** from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning **while developing evidence-based professional practice.** | The goals of curriculum and interdisciplinarity address research-informed practice through their respective references to “continuous improvement” and knowledge acquisition for “evidence-based professional practice.” This generalist practice component is exemplified through most, if not all, MSW courses at both generalist and specialized levels. |
| Proactive in responding to the impact of context on professional practice | Curriculum: The program **engages in continuous improvement** to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core.  Community Partnerships: The program seeks, analyzes, and **responds to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region** by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities.  Professional Development: The program **seeks and develops professional growth opportunities** with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action. | The impact of context on professional practice is evidenced in three of the five program goals. The curriculum goal focuses on “continuous improvement” inferring the need to adapt in response to societal changes.  Community partnerships uses the word “dynamic” to suggest an ever-changing context for our community partners.  Professional development stresses the ongoing need for professional growth in order to respond to changing context in practice. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: If program options have different missions and/or goals, discuss for each program option. |

The mission and goals for the program are consistent across both the BSW and MSW Programs. There is only one program option for the MSW Program.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M2.0.2:The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative provides a rationale for the program’s formal curriculum design for generalist practice across all program options. |

Most of our students enter the MSW program with the goal of “helping people” interpreted, by them, as direct micro practice (counseling, case management, etc.) Many are not aware of, comfortable with, or interested in the macro expectations of all social work practitioners. This trend, and the need for field practicum students to quickly demonstrate strengths-based interpersonal communications, partially informs our program’s curriculum. In their first semester, students learn the elements of generalist practice from a holistic perspective but with a stronger emphasis on direct, micro practice. When they are more fully embedded in the profession and have their direct practice interests peeked, students are more receptive to the macro focus of the second semester. Some, who professed otherwise, become more interested in macro practice from a social justice and advocacy standpoint.

Furthermore, when students learn the history and mission of the social work profession, they experience a convergence of their personal and professional values. Sometimes, this realization is affirming to the student; sometimes it is disruptive. Navigating that realization takes time. We feel it takes a minimum of two semesters in the generalist curriculum for students to reconcile how their personal and professional values will intersect to inform their future practice.

To that end, the curriculum for the MSW Program is strategically designed with a scaffolding model for students who enter the program without a background in social work. As such, it is very prescribed in that students must take courses in the order laid out in the table below. The only exception to this requirement is for part-time students. In the part-time curriculum, students take all core courses in their first year (indicated by the asterisks). They complete their Generalist field practicum and accompanying seminars in their second year.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Fall Semester of Generalist Curriculum** | | |
| Course | Course Description | Rationale |
| SW 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work\* | This course focuses on understanding the multi-level facets of the social work profession. The course addresses social work values, ethics, competencies, standards, and professional behaviors across practice settings. The role of teamwork and collaboration in practice is emphasized and reinforced through a variety of hands-on activities. This course provides a framework for students to develop and strengthen their professional identities as advanced practice social workers. | This course was created to introduce students to the important aspects of the social work profession.   * Guiding principles (mission, ethics, principles, values, state and federal statutes, etc.) * The diverse areas of practice * The CSWE educational competencies * Social policy and politics * Historical overview * Anti-racism and systemic racism   The course provides the foundation for the rest of the curriculum and is, subtly, designed to help students determine if social work is the right profession for them. Great emphasis is placed on personal and professional values throughout the entire course. |
| SW 702: Generalist Practice I\* | Generalist Social Work Practice I is the first of two graduate generalist courses in the MSW practice sequence. This course promotes competence in the application of the knowledge, skills and values necessary for a strength-based, person and family centered, culturally competent, empowerment approach to generalist practice. Building on the background of social policy, social justice and ethical practice, it emphasizes research-informed approaches and major theories, models, principles, and issues relevant to the change process and the preservation and strengthening of families within diverse populations. Generalist Practice I also focuses on developing a sophisticated understanding of how one’s values and experiences impact the social work process, ethical practice, and the development of the cross-culturally competent social work professional. | This course is considered a practice course in that it introduces students to direct practice models, approaches, and skills. The key elements of generalist practice (EP 2.0, 2015 EPAS) are woven throughout the course providing students with a solid understanding of generalist practice. In addition, students learn and practice fundamental interviewing skills in this course so they can apply them in their first field practicum. |
| 711: Foundations of Social Welfare\* | This course closely examines those factors that have historically shaped the development of social welfare initiatives in the United States. It reviews major theories related to social welfare change over time and how these ideas have persistently defined the debate over whose needs are met—and whose needs are not met—and the social mechanisms employed. Social welfare policy has historically centered on deciding the point at which individual responsibility becomes a collective responsibility and the form and shape that collective responsibility takes. Our focus is on understanding how social welfare efforts originated, how and why they changed over time, and how this impacts current and future social welfare policy. It emphasizes a critical approach to present social welfare institutions and highlights the role of social workers and the social work profession in humanizing these institutions and promoting social justice.  Students are then introduced to the processes of policy development and change, and how they can influence the development and direction of policy. Students will analyze contemporary social policies in the U.S., including Title IV-E policies which impact individuals, families, and children who are affected by the multiple life challenges including vulnerability, poverty, and oppression. Students will trace the impact of these policies on social work practice with individuals, groups, families, and children. | This course provides a deep dive into the history of the social work profession, particularly as it relates to social change and policy trends. This knowledge is critical to understanding social work beyond the micro level and prepares student for the macro content that follows in the second semester. |
| 712: Field I | The generalist field sequence (Field I and Field II) is designed to allow students direct generalist practice experience in an agency setting. Through a collaborative process led by the Field Coordinator, students are assigned to a specific field setting and supervised by an agency field educator. Over the course of the generalist field sequence, students are expected to have direct, “hands on” responsibility for performing typical agency social work functions that reflect generalist practice expectations.  Because a goal of field is to offer students opportunities to apply skills learned in the classroom to the real world of daily practice in human service settings, students must be concurrently or previously enrolled in the Generalist Practice course sequence and Field Seminar. By completion of the generalist field sequence, students will demonstrate capacity to perform at the generalist level practice situations. | Students cannot enroll in field courses unless they are concurrently enrolled in the core courses (in the case of full-time students) or completed them prior (in the case of part-time students.) This is to ensure they are supported with academic knowledge and skills in conjunction with their practice experiences. This sequencing also ensures students have been exposed to the comprehensive ethical principles and standards that guide social work practice.  Field I is introductory by design. Students are expected to be attentive, take initiative in their learning, seek opportunities to shadow other workers, conduct research to deepen their knowledge of the agency and its services, identify relevant social policies and service delivery funding sources. This background prepares students for Field II in which they are expected to take a more active role in the delivery of services. |
| 713: Seminar I | The seminar courses provide opportunities for immersion in professional social work practice issues and dialogue within a classroom seminar format. The seminars are held concurrently with the field practicums. The focus of the seminars is on the application and integration of social work knowledge, values, and skills to supervised social work practice in human service settings. | The seminar courses provide students with a supportive learning environment to process and navigate their practicum experiences with the academic knowledge and skills they acquire through the classroom.  The primary assignment in Seminar I is a presentation when each student shares, with their classmates, the mission, goals, and services of their field practicum site. This assignment exposes generalist students to the wide range of social work practice settings and populations. This is especially helpful for generalist students who have yet to determine their areas of interest. |
| **Spring Semester of Generalist Curriculum** | | |
| Course | Course Description | Rationale |
| SW 701: Contemporary Social Work Ethics\* | The NASW *Code of Ethics* forms the backbone of this course, which covers a variety of ethics and boundary issues for social workers, particularly ethical responsibilities to clients, development of cultural competence, and with emphasis on social justice issues. Self-reflection and self-care are considered within the context of ethical practice. The course examines these issues relative to diverse practice settings and for direct practice, supervisory, and administrative roles. Students incorporate an ethical decision-making model in the examination of ethical issues arising in practice with emphasis on the client interest (e.g. children and families) as primary. Because some students are in their field practicum concurrently with this class, there are also numerous opportunities to assist students in identifying and resolving ethical and boundary concerns as they arise. | While SW 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work provides an overview of the Code of Ethics, this course requires students to delve into each of the standards within the Code. We originally offered this course in the first semester of the program, but quickly realized many students needed more of a foundation before they were ready to engage in the provocative discussions this course content evokes. Thus, it is now offered in the second semester of the generalist curriculum when students have a stronger foundation of the profession. |
| 704: Generalist Practice II\* | Generalist Practice II specifically focuses on the use of various group methodologies to create planned change, intervention approaches for utilizing community strengths and creating community change and change efforts within organizations. Emphasis is placed on rural-based social work practice with larger size systems utilizing evidence-based practice models that espouse an appreciation for diverse populations from a strength- based, system-focused, capacity-building, and ecological perspective.  The course builds on the skills developed in Generalist Practice I. It provides students with the necessary skills to work effectively within human service agencies that serve diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities. Specifically, this course focusses on group methodologies that highlight the use of culturally competent practices when working with children and families, as well as the use of ethical intervention strategies that bring about change and maintain confidentiality for children, families and individuals. An emphasis is placed on methodologies that will preserve and strengthen families.  This course provides students with the necessary skills to work effectively with organizations and communities via the use of various group methodologies, which seek to create planned intervention and change by utilizing the strengths of the individuals in organizations, and the strengths of individuals, families and children within communities. Methodologies which highlight the use of culturally competent and ethical practices that are strength-based, system-focused, capacity-building, and ecological are utilized when working with individuals in organizations, and when working with individuals, families and children within communities. A natural outcome of organizational well-being and community well-being is family and child well-being. | In their second semester of the generalist curriculum, students move to an emphasis on macro practice. They are positioned to expand and apply the concepts they learned in the first semester to macro-level work. |
| 707: Human Behavior and the Social Environment\* | Students will engage in building theoretical frameworks for social work practice in both person-centered and family-centered models. Students will use their professional social work experience to enhance their integration of theories and models examining the complexity of person/environment functioning with respect to individuals, families, small groups, organizations, and communities. Using an ecologically based approach, the biological, culturally diverse, psychological and social influences of human choices, behavior and functioning will be examined. This approach will prepare the graduate student with a theoretical foundation for multi-level understanding of client systems. The focus of the course is to provide relational competence in family relationships, understand the principles of child growth and social, emotional, physical, and intellectual development; and engage in evidence-based, and culturally competent practice modalities. | It is purposeful that the course focusing on theory is taken in the second semester. Students are more connected to the profession and, through field experiences and/or case studies, have examples upon which to apply the concepts learned in this course. |
| 714: Field II | The Generalist field sequence (Field I and Field II) is designed to allow students direct generalist practice experience in an agency setting. Through a collaborative process led by the Field Coordinator, students are assigned to a specific field setting and supervised by an agency field educator. Over the course of the Generalist field sequence, students are expected to have direct, “hands on” responsibility for performing typical agency social work functions that reflect generalist practice expectations.  Because a goal of field is to offer students opportunities to apply skills learned in the classroom to the real world of daily practice in human service settings, students must be concurrently or previously enrolled in the Generalist Practice course sequence and Field Seminar. By completion of the field sequence, students will demonstrate capacity to perform at the generalist level practice situations. | Field II is designed to build upon Field I by helping students move from observer to doer. They are expected to take a more active role in the delivery of services. At the same time, students are to maintain proper boundaries in their role as generalist students, presenting themselves as learners. In this way, Field II includes an emphasis on student’s professional development and identity as future social workers. |
| 715: Seminar II | The Generalist seminar courses provide opportunities for immersion in professional social work practice issues and dialogue within a classroom seminar format. The seminars are held concurrently with the field practicums. The focus of the seminars is on the application and integration of social work knowledge, values, and skills to supervised social work practice in human service settings. | Seminar II provides students with a supportive learning environment to process and navigate their practicum experiences with the academic knowledge and skills they acquire through the classroom. By second semester, the “honeymoon” stage of the field practicums needs attention. Students still in the honeymoon stage may be so excited to be entering into field work that they need help identifying challenges within their agency’s systems. Students no longer in the honeymoon stage easily identify challenges and need help navigating the real or perceived disconnect between their classroom discussions and their practicum experiences.  The primary assignment in Seminar II is a case study in which students demonstrate their understanding of person-in-environment and the change process to a de-identified case from their field practicum. Similar to Seminar I, this primary assignment exposes students to various practice settings and services. It also allows students the opportunity to teach and learn from one another—an important skill for all social workers. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the program’s curriculum design for generalist practice is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom **and** field across all program options. |

**Integration Between Classroom and Field for Generalist Practice:**

As noted in the preceding table, students complete a two-semester field practicum as part of the generalist curriculum. Full-time students complete their field practicum concurrently with core courses; part-time students complete their field practicum after completing core courses. This design ensures that students are not placed in a field practicum without the foundational knowledge of the historical, theoretical, and ethical underpinnings of the social work profession.

Just as the curriculum is built on the nine competencies (illustrated in M2.0.3), so is the field practicum. Students speak to each competency in the learning plan for their field practicum by linking their planned activities to the practice behaviors. In the first semester of generalist field practicum, students are prepared to focus on observation and exploration. In the second semester, they are encouraged to take a more active role in agency practices at the micro, mezzo, and macro level.

Concurrently with their field practicum, all students (full-time and part-time) are enrolled in a Seminar course. Seminar is intended to help students integrate the knowledge and skills they are/have learned in the classroom with the knowledge and skills they are learning in their field practicum. Furthermore, instructors regularly and consistently incorporate values into the Seminar discussions to ensure students are able to connect this important dimension to practice. The combination of Seminar and Field provides the solid foundation upon which students connect their academic and practice experiences to develop their cognitive and affective processes.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M2.0.3:The program provides a matrix that illustrates how its generalist practice content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Programs that add additional generalist-level competencies must provide the competency descriptive paragraph and corresponding behaviors in a narrative preceding the matrix (if applicable). |

We have not added additional generalist-level competencies.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Program provides a matrix illustrating how the program’s generalist practice curriculum content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program across all program options. |

One process the MSW Program uses to ensure adequate and balanced coverage of the four dimensions of each competency is a curriculum map, providing a bird’s eye view of the curriculum flow. The following table is a map of the Generalist curriculum. The “O” indicates dimensions that are covered and assessed in the course; the “X” indicates dimensions that are measured for evaluation purposes through an embedded assessment assignment.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Generalist Courses** X=Embedded Assignment O=Addressed | | 700: Gateway | 701: Ethics | 702: Gen I | 704: Gen II | 707: HBSE | 711: Social Welfare | 712: Field I | 713: Sem I | 714: Field II | 715: Sem II |
| Competency One: Ethical and  Professional | Knowledge |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Values | X |  | O |  |  | O |  |  |  |  |
| Skills | O | X |  |  |  | O | O | O | O | O |
| Cog/Aff | O |  |  |  |  | O | O |  | X |  |
| Competency Two: Diversity | Knowledge |  | O | O |  | X | O |  |  |  |  |
| Values |  | O |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skills |  |  | X |  | O |  |  | O |  | O |
| Cog/Aff |  |  |  |  | O |  | O |  | X | O |
| Competency Three: Social Justice | Knowledge |  | X |  |  | O | X |  |  |  |  |
| Values |  | O |  | O |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Skills |  |  |  | O |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Cog/Aff |  |  |  |  |  | O | O |  | X |  |
| Competency Four: Research | Knowledge | X |  | O |  | O | X |  |  |  |  |
| Values | X |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skills |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cog/Aff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Competency Five: Policy | Knowledge | O |  |  | O |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Values |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Skills |  |  |  | O |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Cog/Aff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Competency Six: Engagement | Knowledge |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Values | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skills |  |  | X | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cog/Aff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Competency Seven: Assess | Knowledge |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Values | X |  |  |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skills |  |  | X | O | O |  |  | O |  | O |
| Cog/Aff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Competency Eight: Intervene | Knowledge |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Values | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skills |  |  | X | O |  |  |  |  |  | O |
| Cog/Aff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Competency Nine: Evaluate | Knowledge |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Values | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skills |  |  | X | O |  |  |  | O | O |  |
| Cog/Aff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |

The following matrix illustrates, in detail, how the nine required competencies are implemented throughout the Generalist Practice Curriculum.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Generalist Practice Curriculum Matrix** | | | | | |
| **Competency** | **Course Number and Title** | **Generalist Course Content** | **Dimension(s) (Knowledge, Values, Skills, Cognitive & Affective Processes)** | **Systems Level(s) (Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities)** | **Page Number in Volume 2 and/or Direct Link to Page of Syllabi** |
| **Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior** | SW 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | **Readings** NASW *Code of Ethics;*  Grobman (2012); MPSW 20 (2020);  Franz (2012); Segal & Smith (2017) Young (2015) **Activities** -Self-assessments aimed to help them identify their own values and career interests.  -Classroom discussions and a range of written assignments.  -Readings and worksheets  - Group presentation. **Assignments** Professional Engagement [S] Day in the Life Summary [S] Values & Assumptions Paper [V] Team Feedback [S] Self-Eval of Teamwork [C/A] | Values Skills Cognitive & Affective Processes |  | [**SW 700**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW700)**:**  Readings: pp. 5-7  Assessments: pp. 10-11  Activities Grid: pp. 11-13  [**SW 701**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW701)**:**  Readings: pp. 17-18  Assessments: pp. 23  Activities Grid: pp. 23-25  [**SW 702:**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW702)  Readings: p. 30  Assessments: p. 34  Activities Grid: pp. 35-37  [**SW 711**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW711)**:**  Readings: p. 69  Assessments: p. 73  Activities Grid: pp. 73-75  [**SW 712**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW712)**:**  Readings: p. 79  Assessments: p. 82  Activities Grid: p. 82  [**SW 713**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW713)**:**  Readings: p. 87  Assessments: pp. 91-92  Activities Grid: pp. 92-93  [**SW 714**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW714)**:**  Readings: p. 97  Assessments: p. 101  Activities Grid: p. 101  [**SW 715**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW715)**:**  Readings: p. 105  Assessments: p. 109  Activities Grid: pp. 109-110 |
| SW 701: Contemporary Social Work Ethics | **Readings** NASW *Code of Ethics.* Series of articles related to social work ethics to increase knowledge of dimensions. Readings on moral theory link social work ethics with the broader moral context.  **Activities** -Videos focusing on origin of morality and recent theoretical research are used to teach moral theory.  -Online lectures and discussion boards  -Applied case studies using an ethical decision-making model adapted from Congress (2000) enhance skill development  -Modules provide focused instruction on standards **Assignments**  Reading Annotations [S]  Online Conversations [S]  Final Ethics Paper [K & S] | Knowledge  Skills |  |
| SW 702: Generalist Practice I | **Readings** NASW *Code of Ethics* **Assignments** Professional Engagement [C/A], Applied Learning [V], Case-study [V] | Values  Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| SW 711: Foundations of Social Welfare | **Readings** UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights.  **Activities** -Disc 1: Module materials, NASW Policy and Social -Justice Briefs, students are to answer focused questions  -Discussion boards, student led & discussion facilitation  **Assignments**  Discussion 1 [K]] Discussions 2 & 4 [K], Discussion facilitation [S]; Essay Exam [V] | Knowledge  Values  Skills |  |
| SW 712: Field I  . | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments**  (1) Field logs [Skills & C/A] (2) Mid-term and end of semester professionalism surveys [C/A]  (3) Progress toward competencies end of semester evaluation C/A]  (4) Learning contract [S & C/A] | Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
|  | **Readings** NASW *Code of Ethics* **Activities** In-class discussions around ethics, boundaries, and professionalism. **Assignments** Classroom Discussions [S] Online Discussion (Discussion Post #3 & 4) [S] Learning Contract [S] | Skills |  |
| SW 714: Field II | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments**  (1) Field logs [Skills & C/A] (2) Mid-term and end of semester professionalism surveys [C/A]  (3) Progress toward competencies end of semester evaluation [C/A]  (4) Learning contract [S & C/A] | Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| SW 715: Seminar II | **Readings** NASW *Code of Ethics* **Activities** In-class discussions around ethics, boundaries, and professionalism. **Assignments** Classroom Discussions [S] Online Discussion [S] Learning Contract [S] | Skills |  |
| **Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice** | SW 701: Contemporary Social Work Ethics | **Readings**  Week 3: NASW Standards for Cultural Competence, Garan & Werkmesiter-Rozas, Hugman  **Activities** Week 3: Two Cultural Humility videos  **Assignments** Reflective Paper [K & V] | Knowledge Values |  | [**SW 701**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW701)**:**  Readings: pp. 17-18  Assessments: p. 23  Activities Grid: pp. 23-25  [**SW 702**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW702)**:**  Readings: p. 30  Assessments: p. 34  Activities Grid: pp. 35-37  [**SW 707**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW707)**:**  Readings: p. 53  Assessments: pp. 61  Activities Grid: pp. 62-64  [**SW 711**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW711)**:**  Readings: p. 69  Assessments: p. 73  Activities Grid: pp. 73-75  [**SW 712**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW712)**:**  Readings: pg. 79  Assessments: pg. 82  Activities Grid: p. 82  [**SW 713**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW713)**:**  Readings: p. 87  Assessments: pp. 91-92  Activities Grid: pp. 92-93  [**SW 714**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW714)**:**  Readings: p. 97  Assessments: p. 101  Activities Grid: p. 101  [**SW 715**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW715)**:**  Readings: p. 105  Assessments: p. 109  Activities Grid: pp. 109-110 |
| SW 702: Generalist Practice I | **Readings**  Miley, K.K., O’Melia, M. & DuBois, B. (2017). Generalist social work practice: An empowering approach  **Activities**  Class discussions **Assignments**  Applied Learning [K & S] | Knowledge  Skills |  |
| SW 707: Human Behavior and the Social Environment | **Readings** Shriver text, peer-reviewed journal articles, and other HBSE book chapters  **Activities** --Online lectures and class discussions on course readings  --Watch a movie entitled “Crash” related to oppression, discrimination, and intersectionality of class, race, ethnicity, family, and gender, age.  --Online group projects (understand concepts related to diversity across practice levels)  --Online group projects to watch a video entitled “A Class Divided”  --Online group projects (influences and shaping personal and professional values). **Assignments** Final Developmental Environmental Influences paper [V & C/A]  Movie Analysis Paper [K]  Participation & Group Projects [S]  Peer Evaluation [S]  Quiz [K] | Knowledge  Values  Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| SW 711: Foundations of Social Welfare  . | **Readings** Barusch Chapter 5 **Activities** View Wilkinson TED Talk and respond to assigned prompts **Assignments** Discussion 3 [K] | Knowledge |  |
| SW 712: Field I | **Readings** None **Activities** Individualized field activities as identified on the learning contract **Assignments** Field logs [C/A] | Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| SW 713: Seminar I | **Readings** NASW *Code of Ethics* **Activities** In-class discussions around diversity, inclusion, and the importance of cultural humility. **Assignments** Classroom Discussions [S] Online Discussion (Discussion Post #5) [S] Learning Contract [S] Agency presentation [S] | Skills |  |
| SW 714: Field II | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments**  (1) Field logs [S & C/A] (2) Mid-term and end of semester professionalism surveys [C/A]  (3) Progress toward competencies end of semester evaluation [C/A]  (4) Learning contract [S & C/A] | Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| SW 715: Seminar II | **Readings** NASW *Code of Ethics* **Activities** In-class discussions around diversity, inclusion, and the importance of cultural humility. **Assignments** Classroom Discussions [S] Online Discussion [S] Learning Contract [S] Case Presentation [C/A] | Skills  Cognitive-Affective |  |
| **Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice** | SW 701: Contemporary Social Work Ethics | **Readings**  Week 3: Beauchamp & Childress, Oliver  **Activities** Week 2 activities focus on linkage of moral theory, social justice & SW call to action.  Week 3 are approached with a lens toward social justice.  Week 6 -Students present self-selected social justice topics in-class/poster present.  **Assignments** Social Justice Project Infographic [V]  Social Justice Project Poster presentation [K] | Knowledge Values |  | [**SW 701**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW701)**:**  Readings: pp. 17-18  Assessments: p. 23  Activities Grid: pp. 23-25  [**SW 704**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW704)**:**  Readings: pp. 40-41  Assessments: p. 45  Activities Grid: pp. 46-48  [**SW 707**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW707)**:**  Readings: p. 53  Assessments: p. 61  Activities Grid: pp. 62-64  [**SW 711**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW711)**:**  Readings: p. 69  Assessments: p. 73  Activities Grid: pp. 73-75  [**SW 712**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW712)**:**  Readings: p. 79  Assessments: p. 82  Activities Grid: p. 82  [**SW 714:**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW714)  Readings: p. 97  Assessments: p. 101  Activities Grid: p. 101 |
| SW 704: Generalist Practice II | **Readings** Netting, Kettner, McMurty & Thomas (2017); Fauri, Wernet & Netting (2008) **Activities** -Virtual Discussion: Underground Advocates  -Discussions of course material  -Assessing the Problem  **Assignments**  Organizational Analysis [V] Case study postings [S] | Skills Values |  |
| SW 707: Human Behavior and the Social Environment | **Readings** Schriver (2017), peer-reviewed journal articles, and other HBSE book chapters **Activities**  --Lectures and class discussions on course readings  ----Movie “Crash”  --Online group project (“A Class Divided”)  –Online activities watching a video entitled “Social Capital in Bangladesh” **Assignments**  Final Developmental Environmental Influences Paper [K] | Knowledge |  |
| SW 711: Foundations of Social Welfare | **Readings** DiAngelo, R. (2018); Janssen, B. (2020)..  Barusch  **Activities** Quiz and reflection  Paper/video  Video lectures & Discussions **Assignments** Policy Exam [K& V],  Policy Analysis Paper/Video [K];  Discussion 2 & 3 [K &V],  Student led discussions [K & S] | Knowledge Values  Skills |  |
| SW 712: Field I | **Readings** None **Activities** Individualized field activities as identified on the learning contract **Assignments** Field logs [C/A] | Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| SW 714: Field II | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments**  (1) Field logs [S & C/A]  (2) Mid-term and end of semester professionalism surveys [C/A]  (3) Progress toward competencies end of semester evaluation [C/A]  (4) Learning contract [S & C/A] | Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| **Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice** | SW 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | **Readings** Current events for electoral candidates Social Work Speaks, 2018 Wisconsin State Statutes, 2020 **Activities** Values and Assumptions assignment  Group Project Presentations -Statutes  **Assignments** Values & Assumptions Paper [V] Group Project Presentation [K & V] | Knowledge Values |  | [**SW 700**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW700)**:**  Readings: pp. 5-7  Assessments: pp. 10-11  Activities Grid: pp. 11-13  [**SW 702**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW702)**:**  Readings: p. 30  Assessments: p. 34  Activities Grid: pp. 35-37  [**SW 707**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW707)**:**  Readings: p. 53  Assessments: p. 61  Activities Grid: pp. 62-64  [**SW 711**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW711)**:**  Readings: p. 69  Assessments: p. 73  Activities Grid: p. 73-75  [**SW 714**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW714)**:**  Readings: p. 97  Assessments: p. 101  Activities Grid: p. 101 |
| SW 702: Generalist Practice I | **Readings** Miley, K.K., O’Melia, M. & DuBois, B. (2017). Generalist social work practice: An empowering approach  **Assignments** Applied Learning [K, V, & S] | Knowledge Values  Skills |  |
| SW 707: Human Behavior and the Social Environment | **Readings** Student selected-peer-reviewed journal articles  **Activities** ----Lectures and class discussions  --Review literature and discussions **Assignments** Final Developmental Environmental Influences Paper [K] | Knowledge |  |
| SW 711: Foundations of Social Welfare | **Readings** Barusch, A. S. (2018).  **Activities** Creation of paper/ video of a social welfare policy and program.  Course Discussions Discussion facilitation by selected CH 6-14, students bring in additional content.  **Assignments** Policy Analysis Paper/Video [K & S];  Discussion Facilitation [S] | Knowledge Skills |  |
| SW 714: Field II | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments**  (1) Field logs [S & C/A] (2) Mid-term and end of semester professionalism surveys [C/A]  (3) Progress toward competencies end of semester evaluation [C/A] (4) Learning contract [S & C/A] | Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| **Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice** | SW 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | **Readings** Wisconsin State Statutes (2020) **Activities** examination of Wisconsin statutes.  **Assignments** Group Project Presentation [K] | Knowledge |  | [**SW 700**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW700)**:**  Readings: p. 5-7  Assessments: pp. 10-11  Activities Grid: pp. 11-13  [**SW 704**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW704)**:**  Readings: pp. 40-41  Assessments: p. 45  Activities Grid: pp. 46-48  [**SW 711**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW711)**:**  Readings: p. 69  Assessments: p. 73  Activities Grid: pp. 73-75  [**SW 714**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW714)**:**  Readings: p. 97  Assessments: p. 101  Activities Grid: p. 101 |
| SW 704: Generalist Practice II | **Readings** Netting et al CH 7 -10 Fauri, Wernet & Netting CH 11  **Activities** Virtual discussions Breakout Groups Discussion of course material  **Assignments**  Case study postings [S] Organizational Analysis paper [V] | Values Skills |  |
| SW 711: Foundations of Social Welfare | **Readings** Barusch, A. S. (2018).  **Activities** Lectures  paper/video  Exam:  **Assignments** Exam [K & V],  Policy Analysis Paper/Video [K & S]  Discussion 2, 4 [K, V, & C/A]  Student Led discussions [K &S] | Knowledge  Values  Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| SW 714: Field II | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments**  (1) Field logs [S & C/A] (2) Mid-term and end of semester professionalism surveys [C/A] (3) Progress toward competencies end of semester evaluation [C/A] (4) Learning contract [S & C/A] | Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Communities** | SW 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | **Readings** Ivey, D’Andrea, Ivey, & Simek-Morgan, (2001); Moncho (2013) **Activities** RESPECTFUL model instruction and discussion  **Assignments** Multi-Cultural Practice Paper [V] | Values | Individuals | [**SW 700**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW700)**:**  Readings: pp. 5-7  Assessments: pp. 10-11  Activities Grid: pp. 11-13  [**SW 702**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW702)**:**  Readings: p. 30  Assessment: p. 34  Activities Grid: pp. 35-37  [**SW 704**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW704)**:**  Readings: pp. 40-41  Assessments: p. 45  Activities Grid: pp. 46-48  [**SW 714**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW714)**:**  Readings: p. 97  Assessments: p. 101  Activities Grid: p. 101 |
| SW 702: Generalist Practice I | **Readings** Miley, K.K., O’Melia, M. & DuBois, B. (2017).  **Activities**  Role Plays (individuals)  Case studies (Families, Organizations & Communities)  **Assignments**  Case Studies I-IV [K&S]  Role-Play [S] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals  Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities. |
| SW 704: Generalist Practice II | **Readings** Netting, Kettner, et al. CH 5 & 6  Fauri, Wernet & Netting Ch 11  **Activities**  -Virtual discussion  -Breakout Groups Discussion of course material  **Assignments** Community Assessment [K] Case study posting [S] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 714: Field II  . | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments**  (1) Field logs [S & C/A] (2) Mid-term and end of semester professionalism surveys [C/A]  (3) Progress toward competencies end of semester evaluation [C/A] (4) Learning contract [S & C/A] | Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| **Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Communities** | SW 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | **Readings** Ivey, D’Andrea, Ivey, & Simek-Morgan (2001), Moncho (2013) **Activities** RESPECTFUL model and the change process—engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation. Discussion and instruction **Assignments** Multi-Cultural Practice Paper [V] | Values | Individuals | [**SW 700**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW700)**:**  Readings: pp. 5-7  Assessments: pp. 10-11  Activities Grid: pp. 11-13  **[SW 702](C:\\Users\\groes\\AppData\\Roaming\\Microsoft\\Word\\UWGB MSW Syllabi VOL II.docx" \l "SW702):**  Readings: p. 30  Assessments: p. 34  Activities Grid: pp. 35-37  [**SW 704**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW704)**:**  Readings: pp. 40-41  Assessments: p. 45  Activities Grid: pp. 46-48  [**SW 707**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW707)**:**  Readings: p. 53  Assessments: p. 61  Activities Grid: pp. 62-64  [**SW 713**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW713)**:**  Readings: p. 87  Assessments: pp. 91-92  Activities Grid: pp. 92-93  [**SW 714**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW714)**:**  Readings: p. 97  Assessments: p. 101  Activities Grid: p. 101  [**SW 715**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW715)**:**  Readings: p. 105  Assessments: p. 109  Activities Grid: pp. 109-110 |
| SW 702: Generalist Practice I | **Readings** Miley, K.K., O’Melia, M. & DuBois, B. (2017). Generalist social work practice: An empowering approach  Activities  Role Plays (Individuals)  Case Studies (all levels of practice) **Assignments** Case Studies I-IV [K &S]  Role-Play [S] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals.   Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities: |
| SW 704: Generalist Practice II  . | **Readings** Netting, Kettner, et al. CH 9 & 10  Fauri, Wernet & Netting Ch 9  **Activities** Virtual Discussion of building support for proposed change. Selecting strategies and tactics  Breakout Groups Discussion of course material  **Assignments**  Community Assessment [K] Case Study Postings [S] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 707: Human Behavior and the Social Environment | **Readings** Week 5 through 13 course required readings Schriver and other HBSE book chapters  **Activities** --Lectures and class discussions  -- Group projects. **Assignments** Final Developmental Environmental Influences Paper [V & S] | Values Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 713: Seminar I | **Readings** NASW Code of Ethics **Activities** This course includes in-class and on-line discussions **Assignments** Classroom Discussions [S] Online Discussions [S]  Learning Contract [S] Agency presentation [S] | Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 714: Field II  . | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments**  (1) Field logs [S & C/A] (2) Mid-term and end of semester professionalism surveys [C/A] (3) Progress toward competencies end of semester evaluation [C/A] (4) Learning contract [S & C/A] | Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 715: Seminar II | **Readings** NASW *Code of Ethics* **Activities** This course includes in-class and on-line discussions **Assignments** Classroom Discussions [S] Online Discussion (Discussion Post #5) [S] Learning Contract [S] Case presentation [S] | Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Communities** | SW 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | **Readings** Ivey, D’Andrea, Ivey, & Simek-Morgan, (2001); Moncho (2013) **Activities** RESPECTFUL model instruction and discussion.  **Assignments** Multi-Cultural Practice Paper [V] | Values | Individuals | [**SW 700**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW700)**:**  Readings: pp. 5-7  Assessments: pp. 10-11  Activities Grid: pp. 11-13  [**SW 702**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW702)**:**  Readings: p. 30  Assessments: p. 34  Activities Grid: pp. 35-37  [**SW 704**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW704)**:**  Readings: pp. 40-41  Assessments: p. 45  Activities Grid: pp. 46-48  [**SW 714**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW714)**:**  Readings: p. 97  Assessments: p. 101  Activities Grid: p. 101  [**SW 715**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW715)**:**  Readings: p. 105  Assessments: p. 109  Activities Grid: pp. 109-110 |
| SW 702: Generalist Practice I | **Readings** Miley, K.K., O’Melia, M. & DuBois, B. (2017).  Activities  Role Plays  Case Studies- focus across systems levels **Assignments** Case Studies I-IV [K & S]  Role-Play [S] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals.   Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities: |
| SW 704: Generalist Practice II | **Readings**  Netting, Kettner, et al. CH 11  Fauri, Wernet & Netting  Fauri, Wernet & Netting Ch 15  **Activities** Virtual discussion of planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating  Breakout Groups Discussion of course material **Assignments** Community Assessment [K] Case Study Postings [S] Breakout Groups Discussion of course material [K & S] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 714: Field II | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments**  (1) Field logs [S & C/A] (2) Mid-term and end of semester professionalism surveys [C/A]  (3) Progress toward competencies end of semester evaluation [C/A]  (4) Learning contract [S & C/A] | Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 715: Seminar II | **Readings** NASW Code of Ethics **Activities** This course includes in-class and on-line discussions **Assignments** Classroom Discussions [S] Online Discussion (Discussion Post #5) [S] Learning Contract [S] Case presentation [S] | Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| **Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Communities** | SW 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | **Readings** Ivey, D’Andrea, Ivey, & Simek-Morgan, (2001); Moncho (2013) **Activities** RESPECTFUL model..  **Assignments** Multi-Cultural Practice Paper [V] | Values | Individuals | [**SW 700:**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW700)  Readings: pp. 5-7  Assessments: pp. 10-11  Activities Grid: pp. 11-13  [**SW 702**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW702)**:**  Readings: p. 30  Assessments: p. 34  Activities Grid: pp. 35-37  [**SW 704**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW704)**:**  Readings: pp. 40-41  Assessments: p. 45  Activities Grid: pp. 46-48  [**SW 713**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW713)**:**  Readings: p. 87  Assessments: pp. 91-92  Activities Grid: pp. 92-93  [**SW 714**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW714)**:**  Readings: p. 97  Assessments: p. 101  Activities Grid: p. 101 |
| SW 702: Generalist Practice I | **Readings** Miley, K.K., O’Melia, M. & DuBois, B. (2017).  **Activities**  Role plays  Case Studies discussions (across all systems levels)  **Assignments** Case Studies I-IV [K & S],  Role-Play [S] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals.   Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities: |
| SW 704: Generalist Practice II  . | **Readings** Fauri, Wernet & Netting  **Activities** Virtual Group Discussions  **Assignments** Community Assessment [K & S] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 713: Seminar I | **Readings** NASW Code of Ethics **Activities** This course includes in-class and on-line discussions **Assignments** Classroom Discussions [S] Online Discussions [S] Learning Contract [S] Agency presentation [S] | Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 714: Field II  . | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments**  (1) Field logs [S & C/A] (2)Mid-term and end of semester professionalism surveys [C/A])  (3) Progress toward competencies end of semester evaluation [C/A]  (4) Learning contract [S & C/A] | Skills  Cognitive & Affective Processes | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

# Accreditation Standard M2.1 — Specialized Practice

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M2.1.1:The program identifies its area(s) of specialized practice (EP M2.1), and demonstrates how it builds on generalist practice. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative identifies the program’s area(s) of specialized practice across all program options. |

**Area of Specialized Practice #1: Advanced Generalist**

The MSW Program at UWGB has one area of specialized practice: advanced generalist. The advanced generalist specialization builds upon students’ generalist practice knowledge and skills through course and field work by increasing their:

* Knowledge base of **evidence-based prevention and intervention** methods;
* Consumption, implementation, and creation of **research**; and
* Understanding of the implications of **diversity in practice**.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates how the program’s areas of specialized practice build on generalist practice across all program options. |

A primary distinction of the advanced generalist specialization is its focus on application **across all system levels**. Advanced Generalist students are expected to move from observing and absorbing into doing and, in some instances, teaching. For example, beyond learning about **human rights and social and economic justice**, students in the specialized area of practice are expected to actively engage in social policy/social change efforts with legislators and community stakeholders. They are required to join community improvement efforts, such as coalition groups or task forces, and participate in activities that **improve the well-being of individuals and groups**. To the extent allowed by the agency, advanced generalist students are encouraged to research and present **evidence-based practices** or emerging trends and policies to the colleagues at their field practicum.

As developing professionals, **rooted in the ethical principles** of social work, advanced generalist MSW students are asked to critically assess social service delivery systems and present recommendations for improving access/removing barriers. Further, they are challenged to adopt a philosophy of moral courage when confronted with situations that oppose the values of the social work profession including recognizing and supporting the **strengths and resilience** of individuals, groups, and communities.

Within the advanced generalist specialization, students may choose to focus their practice in a particular area of emphasis, such as schools or mental health. This focus is considered an *individual* area of emphasis which means the students must be able to critically assess their own learning needs, across all systems, and tailor their course assignments to meet those needs. For example, students interested in school social work must focus their assessment and intervention assignments, social policy assignments, and research assignments all toward school social work. This self-directed learning prepares students for advanced generalist practice by demonstrating their ability to be **critical thinkers** at the **micro, mezzo, and macro** levels.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M2.1.2:The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for specialized practice demonstrating how the design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field. |

**Area of Specialized Practice #1: Advanced Generalist**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative provides a rationale for the program’s formal curriculum design for specialized practice across all program options. |

The advanced generalist curriculum is purposefully structured opposite the generalist curriculum in that it begins with a focus on macro practice. This intentional design reinforces the foundation of social work practice--social justice, inclusivity, and advocacy--from the very start of the specialized curriculum. This aligns closely with the Program’s mission, vision, and goals by preparing specialized students to be actively engaged in macro practice.

That said, most students must also be adequately prepared for micro practice when they begin their specialized field practicums in the fall. Thus, the specialized curriculum intersperses practice courses (such as electives and SOC WORK 721: Advanced Practice: Multi-Level Family Systems) throughout the curriculum, starting in summer and ending in spring. This mixed strategy is not only pedagogically sound, it is very appealing to students. The curriculum design keeps students engaged and helps them meet their professional goals.

To that end, the curriculum for the specialized year of the MSW Program is very prescribed in that students must take courses in the order laid out in the table below. The only exception to this requirement is for part-time students. In the part-time curriculum, students take all core courses in their first year (indicated by the asterisks). They complete their Specialized field practicum and accompanying seminars in their second year.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Summer Semester of Specialized Curriculum** | | |
| Course | Course Description | Rationale |
| 728: Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice\* | The course is designed to provide students with the tools needed to critically analyze social welfare policy and programs, to begin to carry out leadership roles in positively impacting social problems, policies and programs in the student’s area of emphasis. Emphasis in the course includes both organizational and political change, and advocacy on behalf of oppressed and vulnerable client groups. A range of social policy issues/problems and their impact on client systems will be examined in major fields of social work including health care, corrections, juvenile justice, child welfare, and services to older adults and their families. Frameworks for policy analysis in regard to social welfare policies and services are presented with respect to diversity, multi-culturalism, and social change. | Understanding the implications of social policy on service delivery is a critical skill for social workers to possess. This course builds upon students’ previous knowledge of the social policy arena and challenges them to take a leadership role in organizing and advocating for social change in the area of practice that most interests them. |
| Electives\* | Range of options | Summer electives are taken alongside 728: Advanced Policy to prepare students for their field practicum and future practice. |
| **Fall Semester of Specialized Curriculum** | | |
| Course | Course Description | Rationale |
| 716: Field III | In the specialized field sequence (Field III and Field IV), students are assigned to a specific field setting where they are supervised by an agency field instructor for the duration of their practicum. Students have direct “hands on” responsibility for performing typical agency social work functions, across all levels from micro to mezzo to macro. Students are assigned to positions commensurate with those given to MSW practitioners who are beginning their work at the agency.  The purpose of these courses is to provide students with opportunities to obtain and enrich their skills as social workers under the guidance of qualified master’s level social workers, referred to as agency field instructors, who are employed in those settings. A primary goal is to offer students opportunities to apply knowledge, values, and skillslearned in the classroom to the real world of daily practice in human service settings. Another primary goal is to offer students the opportunity to demonstrate their capacity to perform in advanced level practice situations and to demonstrate leadership skills within the agency and larger community.  Depending on the nature of their placement, students may have the opportunity to review and use assessment tools to develop client case plans, recognize protective and risk factors, and examine the role of family relationships using trauma-informed and culturally competent practice. Research into evidenced-based practice is encouraged to enhance communication, engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation skills; and aid in understanding relevant topics such as: substance abuse, domestic violence, mental health, separation, grief and loss, child abuse and neglect, child development, older adults, family systems, and micro-to-macro practice. | Field III is the first field practicum of the specialized curriculum. Students begin the semester by creating a learning plan that encompasses the specialized practice behaviors for the nine competencies. They are expected to individualize the learning plan to their specific interests, practice, and population; and identify concrete activities to accomplish their plan.  As advanced practice generalists, students are expected to enter Field III with a balance between professional humility and independence in that they view themselves as learners but also contributors. There is a strong emphasis on professionalism in this semester as students develop their advanced practice social work identities. |
| 717: Seminar III | The Seminar course addresses crosscutting issues in the social work profession, offers students the opportunity to raise issues of practice, and encourages students to integrate learning across the curriculum as they carry out professional responsibilities. Through course dialogue and assignments, students will have the opportunity to discuss assessment tools, recognize protective and risk factors, and examine the role of family relationships using trauma-informed and culturally competent concepts. They will further share information about evidenced-based practices that may inform communication, engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation skills; and aid in understanding relevant topics such as: substance abuse, domestic violence, mental health, separation, grief and loss, child abuse and neglect, child development, older adults, family systems, and micro-to-macro practice. Seminar provides students with the opportunity to develop and enhance their capacity to act as leaders in the field. | Seminar III provides students with a supportive learning environment to process and navigate their practicum experiences with the academic knowledge and skills they acquire through the classroom.  Seminar III helps students understand the definitions of the nine specialized competencies and how they differ from the generalist definitions. As a means to prepare leaders, discussions are often student-generated and student-led.  The primary assignment in Seminar III is presentation of a case study that focuses on values and the change process. As part of the presentation, students must engage the class in a discussion that mimics a “staffing” in which their peers help find solutions for a micro or macro challenge in the case. |
| 720: Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy\* | Ethical and proficient social work practice requires that program graduates be able to practice without discrimination and with respect, knowledge, and skills related to clients’ age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation. This course contributes to the development of such proficiency for specialized level MSW students. The course focuses on a broad range of oppressed groups and relevant intervention strategies and approaches adapted to meet the needs of such groups. Additionally, it examines the role, function, and effects of oppression in society as it relates to social justice and strategies for effecting change. | This course is a hallmark of the specialized curriculum. It encompasses micro, mezzo, macro systems and incorporates theory, policy, values, ethics, and interventions from a broad-reaching global perspective.  The course is strategically taken early in the specialized curriculum to ensure students have a strong foundation in the critical elements of diversity, inclusivity, and equity before or while beginning their specialized field practicum. It is offered in the fall (versus summer) to allow students the full fourteen-week semester to grapple with some of the unsettling content and discussions that this course may provoke. Like many courses in the MSW Program, this course puts great emphasis on the role of personal and professional values in understanding and responding to issues of diversity. |
| 721: Advanced Practice: Multi-Level Family Systems\* | This practice course is required for all students in the MSW Specialized program. It incorporates theory, techniques, skills and knowledge for working with family-related issues and family-centered practices. Content emphasizes an ecological systems framework that views the family within the context of relationships, community and societal environments, in consideration of the microsystem, mezzo-, exo-, macro- and chrono- systems in which families function. Particular attention is given to working with vulnerable families and families at-risk of poor life outcomes (e.g. substance abuse, domestic violence, mental health, separation, grief and loss, child abuse and neglect). Empowerment, resiliency, building protective factors, and strength-based perspectives are employed, with an emphasis on understanding the dynamics of diversity amongst individuals (person-centered), families (family-centered), and society (ecological).  This course specifically targets understanding protective factors, resiliency, and the aspects of trauma in developing practice skills for work with individuals, children, and families. A focus on evidence-based practice to assist in case planning and sustain evidenced-based practice is at the core of this course. | The MSW Program believes an understanding of family-related issues and practices is a fundamental skill for all social workers, regardless of area of emphasis or interest. Thus, this course is taken in the fall semester so students can incorporate the learned knowledge and skills into their field practicum at the outset.  Similar to the summer semester, this practice course is paired with a macro-oriented course (SW 720: Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy) to provide students with a balance to their learning. |
| **Spring Semester of Specialized Curriculum** | | |
| Course | Course Description | Rationale |
| 718: Field IV | In the specialized field sequence (Field III and Field IV), students are assigned to a specific field setting where they are supervised by an agency field educator for the duration of their practicum. Students have direct “hands on” responsibility for performing typical agency social work functions, across all levels from micro to mezzo to macro. Students are assigned to positions commensurate with those given to MSW practitioners who are beginning their work at the agency.  The purpose of these courses is to provide students with opportunities to obtain and enrich their skills as social workers under the guidance of qualified master’s level social workers, referred to as agency field instructors, who are employed in those settings. A primary goal is to offer students opportunities to apply knowledge, values, and skillslearned in the classroom to the real world of daily practice in human service settings. Another primary goal is to offer students the opportunity to demonstrate their capacity to perform in advanced level practice situations and to demonstrate leadership skills within the agency and larger community.  Depending on the nature of their placement, students may have the opportunity to review and use assessment tools to develop client case plans, recognize protective and risk factors, and examine the role of family relationships using trauma-informed and culturally competent practice. Research into evidenced-based practice is encouraged to enhance communication, engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation skills; and aid in understanding relevant topics such as: substance abuse, domestic violence, mental health, separation, grief and loss, child abuse and neglect, child development, older adults, family systems, and micro-to-macro practice. | The final field practicum of the specialized curriculum, Field IV, is a significant turning point for most students. Their knowledge and skills have grown through coursework and field experiences, and they can articulate the intersection of the social work values across all systems levels.  As a result, the Field IV learning plan is edited to focus on those competencies and activities that need increased attention to achieve mastery. In addition, students are expected to increase their level of independence, self-directed learning, and active engagement within the agency. |
| 719: Capstone Seminar | The Seminar course addresses crosscutting issues in the social work profession, offers students the opportunity to raise issues of practice, and encourages students to integrate learning across the curriculum as they carry out professional responsibilities. Through course dialogue and assignments, students will have the opportunity to discuss assessment tools, recognize protective and risk factors, and examine the role of family relationships using trauma-informed and culturally competent concepts. They will further share information about evidenced-based practices that may inform communication, engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation skills; and aid in understanding relevant topics such as: substance abuse, domestic violence, mental health, separation, grief and loss, child abuse and neglect, child development, older adults, family systems, and micro-to-macro practice. The Seminar provides students with the opportunity to develop and enhance their capacity to act as leaders in the field.  As part of Seminar IV, students will complete their MSW Capstone Project, the Professional Poster and Symposium. | Seminar IV provides students with a supportive learning environment to process and navigate their practicum experiences with the academic knowledge and skills they acquire through the classroom.  Seminar IV places an emphasis on leadership and contributing to the social work profession. Students are encouraged to exchange knowledge gained in the field practicum with their classroom colleagues and knowledge gained in the classroom with field agency staff.  The primary assignment in Seminar IV is the Capstone Project in which students create a scholarly poster that reflects theory, evidence-based research, values, and practice. They present their posters in a public symposium, demonstrating their leadership and contribution to the knowledge of the social work profession. |
| 731: Research for Social Work Practice\* | This course is designed to provide students with social research skills and the knowledge necessary for understanding and utilizing research findings to inform practice and for carrying out research related to social work practice and social welfare issues. The course directly builds on knowledge obtained previously in undergraduate research course(s) and examines the application of research methods and principles to case and program level evaluations in an applied social work setting. It is intended to equip social work students with a necessary understanding of qualitative and quantitative methods and the critical thinking skills needed to provide leadership in research design, implementation and analysis based on social services at micro, mezzo or macro levels of practice. Students will successfully evaluate social work research in the field and carry out assessments of their own practice. | This research course is designed with an emphasis on applied research and program evaluation. The practical focus of the course is in direct response to our community partners whose greatest need is evaluation of service delivery and program outcomes.  This is the final core course taken by the specialized students. It is strategically offered when students’ knowledge and skills are further developed and they are more prepared for the intensity of a research course. Furthermore, the course is taken in the spring semester when students are working on their Capstone Project. Taking the research course at the same time as the Capstone Project helps students strengthen their investigative and analytical skills in one specific area of social work that interests them. |
| Electives\* | Range of options | Final electives are taken in the spring semester to further prepare students for their future practice as advanced generalist social workers. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the program’s curriculum design for specialized practice is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom **and** field across all program options. |

**Integration Between Classroom & Field for Advanced Generalist**

As noted in the preceding table, and similar to the Generalist curriculum, students complete a two-semester field practicum as part of the Specialized-Advanced Generalist curriculum. Full-time students complete their field practicum concurrently with core courses; part-time students complete their field practicum after completing core courses. This design ensures that students have the knowledge and skills necessary for advanced-level micro, mezzo, and macro practice while completing their specialized field practicum.

Just as the curriculum is built on the nine competencies (illustrated in M2.0.3), so is the field practicum. Students speak to each competency in the learning plan for their field practicum by linking their planned activities to the specialized practice behaviors, making them specific to their unique area of emphasis. In the first half of the first semester of the specialized field practicum, students are instructed to be present with professional humility by focusing on observation and exploration. By mid-semester and for the entire second semester, specialized students are expected to take an active, self-directed role within the agency demonstrating their ability to be independent, critical thinkers at an advanced level of practice.

Concurrently with their field practicum, all students (full-time and part-time) are enrolled in a Seminar course. Seminar is intended to help students integrate the advanced knowledge and skills they are/have learned in the classroom with the knowledge and skills they are learning in their specialized field practicum. Furthermore, instructors regularly and consistently incorporate values into the Seminar discussions to ensure students are able to connect this important dimension to their specialized practice. The intentional sequencing and combination of Seminar and Field provides the platform upon which students connect academic and practice experiences to demonstrate mastery of their cognitive and affective processes.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M2.1.3:The program describes how its area(s) of specialized practice extend and enhance the nine Social Work Competencies (and any additional competencies developed by the program) to prepare students for practice in the area(s) of specialization. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how each of the program’s areas of specialization extend and enhance each of the nine competencies (and any additional competencies developed by the program) to prepare students for practice in the area(s) of specialization across all program options. |

The UWGB MSW Program has one area of specialized practice: Advanced Generalist. The nine competencies for Advanced Generalist students have expectations similar to that of Generalist students in order to ensure well-rounded, adaptable practitioners for the rural regions the program serves. The primary difference between Generalist and Advanced Generalist is a focus on leadership and action. It is expected that Advanced Generalist students integrate their knowledge and skills in order to effectively make change at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. As expected of advanced practitioners, there is a special emphasis in the Specialized competencies on systems, social justice, equity, diversity, and their impact on micro practice. The specialized competencies are intended to prepare MSW students for leadership roles, both formal and informal, regardless of their eventual area of practice.

**Area of Specialized Practice #1: Advanced Generalist**

**Competency 1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior**

*Advanced generalist social workers have a broad knowledge base of the social work profession; its history, theories, principles, and ethical standards (including the ethical use of technology.) AG social workers understand how this collective knowledge informs all levels of service delivery from micro to mezzo to macro. AG social workers recognize the influence of personal values on professional decisions and actions and understand the importance of employing strategies to navigate that influence. AG social workers understand that managing ethical situations requires consultation and leadership. AG social workers are committed to regular and relevant continuing education, as both learners and teachers, to enhance their own knowledge and skills and that of the overall profession. AG social workers understand the intersection between direct practice, research, and policy; the role of social work; and the benefit of intra- and inter-disciplinary collaboration in each of these arenas.*

*AG social workers will:*

* Demonstrate ability to independently engage in activities that advance the core values of the social work profession.
* Contribute to the advancement of the profession by disseminating emerging knowledge obtained through professional development.
* Demonstrate moral courage (the ability to utilize critical thinking to recognize ethical dilemmas and develop appropriate action plans) in practice situations.
* Engage in professional development opportunities directed at challenging personal biases and enhancing professional values.
* Demonstrate ability to work effectively within and across coalition groups.

**Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice**

*Advanced generalist social workers understand diversity as a multi-dimensional concept that impacts all areas of service delivery. AG social workers understand the intersectionality of a broad range of identity statuses and the personal and societal values that overtly and covertly impact individuals and groups who share those identities. AG social workers recognize the need to approach their professional practice with cultural humility in order to best serve their clients and the communities with which they engage. AG social workers understand they hold a vital role in combatting personal, professional, and systemic racism and oppression across all levels from micro to mezzo to macro and how to utilize their positions to advance equity within these systems.*

*AG social workers will:*

* Demonstrate cultural humility when working cross-culturally in practice and professional settings.
* Utilize empowerment and strengths-based strategies appropriate to client’s identity status(es) and acculturation-level across the systematic change process.
* Critically assess the congruence of social work principles of diversity with the mission, goals, and organizational climate of social service delivery system(s).

**Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice**

*Advanced generalist social workers understand the role of social work is to advocate for all individuals and groups to ensure inclusivity, equity, and justice. AG social workers understand the connection between the profession’s mission and principles, and the advancement of human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice. Advanced generalist social workers understand that personal and societal values impact all aspects of service delivery. AG social workers understand their role as leaders in addressing these issues at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.*

*AG social workers will:*

* Analyze the congruence between social service delivery systems and social work values relative to social justice.
* Engage in macro-level advocacy on behalf of oppressed populations.

**Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice**

*Advanced generalist social workers understand that knowledge derives from broad, diverse, and multiple means. AG social workers understand that sound and ethical practice at micro, mezzo, and macro levels is based on evidence that is ethically collected and representative. AG social workers understand that evidence is gathered through scientific inquiry and culturally informed research. AG social workers understand that research findings must be analyzed for authenticity, applicability, and relevance before applying to practice. AG social workers understand their role in advancing the knowledge and skills of the profession by engaging in research-related activities.*

*AG social workers will:*

* Engage in critical consumption of research and practice literature.
* Investigate current Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) and introduce in professional settings.
* Evaluate service effectiveness and efficiency through synthesis of outcome data from multiple methods and sources.

**Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice**

*Advanced generalist social workers have depth of knowledge in policy formulation, analysis, implementation, and evaluation. AG social workers understand the interconnectedness between policy and practice. AG social workers understand that policy impacts access, equity, inclusivity, justice, and human rights across all aspects of service delivery. AG social workers recognize their leadership role in informing policy at the federal, state, local, and agency levels.*

*AG social workers will:*

* Critique social policy relevant to area of emphasis using a policy analysis model as a framework.
* Assess the micro to macro implications of social policy relevant to area of emphasis within the context of social work values and principles.
* Identify and assess the role of political influences on social service delivery systems in area of emphasis.

**Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities**

*Advanced generalist social workers recognize engagement as a critical first step in the change process. AG social workers understand the influence of many factors in establishing rapport with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. AG social workers acknowledge influences such as environment, culture, history, values, development, language/communication, and power differentials; and work to adapt their approach accordingly.*

*AG social workers will:*

* Identify factors across systems levels that impact the development of helping relationships in area of emphasis.
* Differentially apply engagement strategies in consideration of diverse client needs, characteristics, contexts, and changing practice dynamics.

**Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities**

*Advanced generalist social workers understand that assessment is a continual process that occurs at every step in the change process with individuals, families, groups, organizations, or communities. AG social workers understand that assessment can be a formal process, dictated by agency or practice setting, and an informal process that occurs at every interaction with the client system. AG social workers recognize the impact of personal, professional, and societal values on the assessment process and strive to mitigate that impact by utilizing strengths-based, client-centered assessment strategies.*

*AG social workers will:*

* Demonstrate ability to apply bio-psycho-social-spiritual-cultural assessments across systems levels grounded in strengths-based perspectives.
* Critique assessment methods in area of emphasis using a process of continual modification and application.

**Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities**

*Advanced generalist social workers understand evidence-based interventions for their specific area of practice, whether it is with individuals, families, groups, organizations, or communities. AG social workers recognize that client-centered interventions, based on empowerment principles, have the greatest outcomes at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels; and should be employed whenever possible.*

*AG social workers will:*

* Apply strategically chosen, critically evaluated interventions relevant to area of emphasis.
* Utilize empowerment principles to enhance the capacities of clients and social service delivery systems.

**Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities**

*Advanced generalist social workers understand that evaluation is a vital step in any level of social work practice—micro, mezzo, and macro. AG social workers understand that evaluative evidence is necessary to adequately and appropriately evaluate service delivery throughout the change process. AG social workers recognize that evaluation can be formal, using a scientific, research-based approach; and informal, using consultation and/or self-reflection to evaluate their interactions with the individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities with which they engage.*

*AG social workers will:*

* Evaluate effectiveness of intervention strategies, practice, and conscious use of self across systems levels.
* Demonstrate use of evaluation to inform the change process from micro to macro levels.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M2.1.4:For each area of specialized practice, the program provides a matrix that illustrates how its curriculum content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Program provides a matrix illustrating how the program’s specialized practice curriculum content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program across all program options. |

One process the MSW Program uses to ensure adequate and balanced coverage of the four dimensions of each competency is a curriculum map, providing a bird’s eye view of the curriculum flow. The following table is a map of the Specialized curriculum. The “O” indicates dimensions that are covered and assessed in the course; the “X” indicates dimensions that are measured for evaluation purposes through an embedded assessment assignment.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Specialized Courses** X=Embedded Assignment O=Addressed | | 716: Field III | 717: Sem III | 718: Field IV | 719: Sem IV | 720 Diversity | 721: Family | 728: Policy | 731: Research |
| Competency One: Ethical and Professional | Knowledge |  |  |  |  | O |  | X |  |
| Values |  | X |  | X | O | O |  | O |
| Skills | O | O | O | X | O |  | X | O |
| Cog/Aff | O |  | X |  |  | O |  |  |
| Competency Two: Diversity | Knowledge |  |  |  |  | X | O |  |  |
| Values |  | O |  | O | X |  | O |  |
| Skills |  | O |  | O | X | O |  |  |
| Cog/Aff | O |  | X |  |  | O |  |  |
| Competency Three: Social Justice | Knowledge |  |  |  |  | X | O | O |  |
| Values |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | O |
| Skills |  | O |  | O | O |  | X | O |
| Cog/Aff | O |  | X |  |  | O |  |  |
| Competency Four: Research | Knowledge |  |  |  |  | O |  |  | X |
| Values |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | O |
| Skills |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |
| Cog/Aff |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Competency Five: Policy | Knowledge |  |  |  |  |  | O | X | O |
| Values |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Cog/Aff |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Competency Six: Engagement | Knowledge |  |  |  |  | O | X |  |  |
| Values |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skills |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Cog/Aff |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Competency Seven: Assess | Knowledge |  |  |  |  |  | X |  | O |
| Values |  | X |  |  |  |  |  | O |
| Skills |  |  |  |  | O | X |  | O |
| Cog/Aff |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Competency Eight: Intervene | Knowledge |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Values |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skills |  |  |  |  | O | X |  |  |
| Cog/Aff |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Competency Nine: Evaluate | Knowledge |  |  |  |  | O | X |  |  |
| Values |  | X |  |  | O |  |  |  |
| Skills |  |  |  |  | O | X |  |  |
| Cog/Aff |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |

The following matrix illustrates, in detail, how the nine required competencies are implemented throughout the Specialized Curriculum.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of Specialized Practice #1: Advanced Generalist Curriculum Matrix** | | | | | |
| **Competency** | **Course Number and Title** | **Specialized Course Content** | **Dimensions (Knowledge, Values, Skills, Cognitive & Affective Processes)** | **Systems Level(s) (Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities)** | **Page Number in Volume 2 and/or Direct Link to Page of Syllabi** |
| **Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior** | SW 716: Field III  . | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Learning Contract [S] Professional Development Assessments [C/A] Field Activities Log [C/A]  Progress toward Mastery of Competencies [C/A] | Skills Cognitive & Affective |  | [**SW 716**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW716)**:**  Readings: pp. 115-116  Assessments: p. 121  Activities Grid: pp 121-122  [**SW 717**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW717)**:**  Readings: pp. 126-127  Assessments: p. 129  Activities Grid: pp. 129-130  [**SW 718**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW718)**:**  Readings: p. 135  Assessments: pp. 138-139  Activities Grid: p. 139  [**SW 719**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW719)**:**  Readings: pp. 143-144  Assessments: pp. 146-147  Activities Grid: p. 147  [**SW 720**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW720)**:**  Readings: p. 151  Assessments: pp. 156-157  Activities Grid: pg. 158-164  [**SW 721**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW721)**:**  Readings: pp. 170-173  Assessments: p. 180  Activities Grid: pp. 181-184  [**SW 728**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW728)**:**  Readings: p. 190  Assessments: p. 200  Activities Grid: pp. 200-203  [**SW 731**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW731)**:**  Readings: pp. 209-210  Assessments: p. 223  Activities Grid: pp. 223-226 |
| SW 717: Seminar III | **Readings** None **Activities** Classroom discussions focus on field activities, strengths and challenges, ethical dilemmas, and professionalism. Case presentation  **Assignments** Case Presentation [V & S] Classroom Based Discussions [S] | Values Skills |  |
| SW 718: Field IV | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Learning Contract [S & C/A] Professional Development Assessments [C/A] Field Activities Log [C/A] Progress toward Mastery of Competencies [C/A] | Skills Cognitive & Affective |  |
| SW 719: Capstone Seminar  . | **Readings** None **Activities** -Classroom discussions focus on field activities, strengths and challenges, ethical dilemmas, and professionalism.   -Student facilitated discussions  -The Capstone Poster is the major graduate project for the MSW students..  **Assignments** Classroom Based Discussions [S]  Student Facilitated Discussion [S] Capstone Poster and Symposium Presentation [V & S] | Values Skills |  |
| SW 720: Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy | **Readings** From Required Texts  Miller & Garran: CH. 1 & 2  Weaver: CH. 2  Grillo, T., & Wildman, S. M. (1997). **Activities** -Video: The Uncomfortable Truth: The History of Racism in America  -Discussion course material  -Breakout group activities **Assignments** Critical Reaction Journals Posting [K & V] Cultural Competence Self-Assessments [V] Canvas Participation Posts [K &S] | Knowledge Values Skills |  |
| SW 721: Advanced Practice: Multi-Level Family Systems | **Readings** Edwards, Chapter 1: Foundation Ideas (pp. 2-13)  Family work in different settings (pp. 18-24 only)  Four basic tools for family counseling (pp. 44-45)  **Activities** Class discussions focus on family interventions, with a particular focus on demonstrating ethical and professional behavior.  Small group student facilitated role plays.  Individual student reflective journaling following each role play. **Assignments** Professional Engagement [C/A]  Role Play & Reflexivity Journal [V] | Values Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| SW 728: Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy, and Practice | **Readings** Review Ameidi (2010) Slaight, (2020);  https://legis.wisconsin.gov/about/follow  **Activities** Review: How a Bill Becomes a Law  Lecture & Discussion of PPTX  Social Policy inventory  Prepare two questions and post on Canvas **Assignments** Film Question & A: Responses and Discussion Posts [S]  Policy Practice Paper [K & S] | Knowledge Skills |  |
| SW 731: Research for Social Work Practice  . | **Readings** Textbook and a series of peer-reviewed journal articles. **Activities** --Lectures and class discussions on course readings  --Watch videos addressing ethical issues related to human subject research  --Group projects applying ethical and professional values and skills to critically assess any violations of ethical principles in scientific research with human subjects.  --Present their research proposals in class.  **Assignments**  Participation [V & S] | Values Skills |  |
| **Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice** | SW 716: Field III | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Field Activities Log [C/A] | Cognitive & Affective |  | [**SW 716**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW716)**:**  Readings: pp. 115-116  Assessments: p. 121  Activities Grid: pp. 121-122  [**SW 717**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW717)**:**  Readings: pp. 126-127  Assessments: p. 129  Activities Grid: pp. 129-130  [**SW 718**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW718)**:**  Readings: p. 135  Assessments: pp. 138-139  Activities Grid: p. 139  [**SW 719**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW719)**:**  Readings: pp. 143-144  Assessments: p. 146-147  Activities Grid: p. 147  [**SW 720**](file:///C:\Users\groes\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW720)**:**  Readings: p. 151  Assessments: pp. 156-157  Activities Grid:  pp. 158-164  [**SW 721**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW721)**:**  Readings: pp. 170-173  Assessments: p. 180  Activities Grid: pp. 181-184  [**SW 728**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW728)**:**  Readings: p. 190  Assessments: p. 200  Activities Grid: pp. 200-203 |
| SW 717: Seminar III | **Readings** None **Activities** Classroom discussions focus on field activities with particular emphasis on the importance of understanding cultural difference. **Assignments** Classroom based discussions [V & S] | Values Skills |  |
| SW 718: Field IV | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Field Activities Log [C/A];  Progress toward mastery of competencies [C/A] | Cognitive & Affective |  |
| SW 719: Capstone Seminar  . | **Readings** None **Activities** Classroom discussions focus on field activities with particular emphasis on the importance of understanding cultural difference.   Student facilitated discussions **Assignments** Classroom Based Discussions [V & S]  Student Facilitated Discussion [V & S] | Values Skills |  |
| SW 720: Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy  . | **Readings** Marsiglia, F. F., & Kulis, S. (2015a).  Waters, M. In M. L. Anderson and P. H. Collins (Eds.).  Tervalon, M., & García, J. M. (1998)..  **Activities** Video Uncomfortable Truth: The History of Racism in America  Discussions of course material **Assignments** Cultural Competence Self-Assessments [V] Critical Reaction Journals Posting [K &V] Canvas Participation Response Posts [K & S]  Visit to Community Resource [S] Diversity In-Service & Readings and Presentation [K] | Knowledge Values Skills |  |
| SW 721: Advanced Practice: Multi-Level Family Systems | **Readings** Edwards, Chapter 1; Rasheed, Ch. 3:  Hecker & Murphy:  Boyd-Franklin & Hafer: Cultural, racial, and socioeconomic issues.  **Activities** -Class discussions/ePortfolio activities.  -Small group student facilitated role plays.  -Individual student reflective journaling. **Assignments** Role Play & Reflexivity Journal [K & S]  Professional Engagement [C/A] | Knowledge Skills Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| SW 728: Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy, and Practice  . | **Readings** Midgley & Livermore; CH 1-4  Haynes & Nicholson, CH 5   Van wormer, et al., CH 7  **Activities**  -Lecture and Discussion on readings  -Discuss Policy Focus  -Introduce Elevator Pitch (handout on Canvas; show in-class video)  -Creating a Policy Brief/Info-graphic  **Assignments** Advocacy Activity & Log [V] Film Question & Answers: Responses and Discussion Posts [V] | Values |  |
| **Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice** | SW 716: Field III | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Field Activities Log [C/A] | Cognitive & Affective |  | [**SW 716**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW716)**:**  Readings: pp. 115-116  Assessments: p. 121  Activities Grid: pp. 121-122  [**SW 717**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW717)**:**  Readings: pp. 126-127  Assessments: pp. 129  Activities Grid: pp. 129-130  [**SW 718**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW718)**:**  Readings: p. 135  Assessments: pp. 138-139  Activities Grid: p. 139  [**SW 719**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW719)**:**  Readings: pp. 143-144  Assessments pp. 146-147  Activities Grid: p. 147  [**SW 720**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW720)**:**  Readings: p. 151  Assessments: pp. 156-157  Activities Grid: pp. 158-164  [**SW 721**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW721)**:**  Readings: pp. 170-173  Assessments: p. 180  Activities Grid: pp. 181-184  [**SW 728**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW728)**:**  Readings: p. 190  Assessments: p. 200  Activities Grid: pp. 200-203  [**SW 731**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW731)**:**  Readings: pp. 209-210  Assessments: p. 223  Activities Grid: pp. 223-226 |
| SW 717: Seminar III | **Readings** None **Activities** Classroom discussions focus on field activities with particular emphasis on individual and system influences on human rights and social justice. **Assignments** Classroom-based discussions [S] | Skills |  |
| SW 718: Field IV | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Field Activities Log ([C/A] Progress toward mastery of competencies [C/A] | Cognitive & Affective |  |
| SW 719: Capstone Seminar | **Readings** None **Activities** -Classroom discussions/field activities with emphasis on influences on human rights and social justice.  -Student facilitated discussions with the topic chosen by the students,  - Capstone poster requires identification and examination of the societal values that impact the student’s chosen topic. **Assignments** Classroom Based Discussions [S]  Student Facilitated Discussion [S]  Capstone Poster and Symposium Presentation [V] | Values Skills |  |
| SW 720: Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy | **Readings** Frye, M. (2004).  Marsiglia, F. F., & Kulis, S. (2015a).  **Activities** -Watch Race: The Power of an Illusion – all three episodes,  -Asynchronous Discussion and Responses  -Virtual Discussion of course material  -Virtual Breakout group discussions **Assignments** Canvas Participation Response Posts [K & S] Diversity In-Service & Readings and Presentation [K & S] | Knowledge Skills |  |
| SW 721: Advanced Practice: Multi-Level Family Systems | **Readings** Rasheed, Ch. 2:  **Activities** Class discussion with a particular emphasis on the intersection of individual mental/ physical health conditions with families and communities.  Group reflection paper.  **Assignments** Student Choice Topic Paper [K])  Family Group Presentation/ Paper [C/A] | Knowledge Cognitive & Affective Processes |  |
| SW 728: Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy, and Practice | **Readings** Van wormer, et al., CH 1,2, 5; Midgley & Livermore, CH 3 & 29 ; van Wormer, et al., (2012) Chapter 9, 10, 11  **Activities** -Film: Roger & Me; Inequality for All  -Lecture and Discussion (PPT)  **Assignments** Policy Practice Project [K & S]  Policy Brief [K & S] | Knowledge Skills |  |
| SW 731: Research for Social Work Practice  . | **Readings** Textbook and a series of peer-reviewed journal articles  **Activities**  --Lectures and class discussions on course readings  ----Group projects evaluating the design and process of social work research  --Present their research proposals in class.  **Assignments** Participation [V & S] | Values Skills |  |
| **Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice** | SW 718: Field IV  . | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Spring Learning Contract [C/A]  Progress toward Mastery of Competencies [C/A] | Cognitive & Affective |  | [**SW 718:**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW718)  Readings: p. 135  Assessments: pp. 138-139  Activities Grid: p. 139  [**SW 719**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW719)**:**  Readings: pp. 143-144  Assessments: pp. 146-147  Activities Grid: p. 147  [**SW 720**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW720)**:**  Readings: p. 151  Assessments: pp. 156-157  Activities Grid: pp. 158-164  [**SW 731**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW731)**:**  Readings: pp. 209-210  Assessments: p. 223  Activities Grid: pp. 223-226 |
| SW 719: Capstone Seminar | **Readings** Student-selected **Activities** The Capstone Poster: literature review and present the current evidence related to their topic; identify the theory that supports their stance, the societal values impacting their topic, and the practice implications. **Assignments** Capstone Poster and Symposium Presentation [V & S] | Values Skills |  |
| SW 720: Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy | **Readings** Boyd H. (2007). (pp. 8-20).  Negy C., & Eisenman, R. (2005  Hunter and Hickerson (2003b).  **Activities** Watch: It's Elementary Talking About Gay Issues in School  Discussions and responses  **Assignments** Diversity In-Service & Readings and Presentation [K] | Knowledge |  |
| SW 731: Research for Social Work Practice | **Readings** Students read the textbook and 11 peer-reviewed journal articles  Review literature on the area of their interest.  Discussion of program evaluation and design a logic model  **Activities** --Lectures and class discussions on course readings  --Group projects evaluating different research designs and methodology  --Present their research proposals in class.  **Assignments** Research Critique ([K]  Research Proposal [K & S]  Program Evaluation [S]  Participation [V & S] | Knowledge Values Skills |  |
| **Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice** | SW 718: Field IV  . | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Progress toward Mastery of Competencies ([C/A] | Cognitive & Affective |  | [**SW 718**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW718)**:**  Readings: p. 135  Assessments: pp. 138-139  Activities Grid: p. 139    [**SW 721**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW721)**:**  Readings: pp. 170-173  Assessments: p. 180  Activities Grid: pp. 181-184    [**SW 728**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW728)**:**  Readings: p. 190  Assessments: p. 200  Activities Grid: pp. 200-203    [**SW 731**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW731)**:**  Readings: pp. 209-210  Assessments: p. 223  Activities Grid: pp. 223-226 |
| SW 721: Advanced Practice: Multi-Level Family Systems | **Readings** None **Activities** Individual paper focused on the intervention process with one individual and family  **Assignments** Student Choice Topic Paper [K] | Knowledge |  |
| SW 728: Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy, and Practice  . | **Readings** Midgley & Livermore, Chapter 25 & 28; Higgins & Severson **Activities** Film: Race, the Power of an Illusion  Discussion Groups  **Assignments** Online Q & A Posts and Discussions [K & V] Elevator Speech video [K & S]  Policy Brief/Info-graphic [K &S] | Knowledge Values  Skills |  |
| SW 731: Research for Social Work Practice  . | **Readings** Textbook and 4 peer-reviewed journal articles  **Activities** --Lectures and class discussions on course readings and the research critique assignment  --Group projects evaluating the process of social work research that influences the social environment and social welfare policies **Assignments** Research Critique [K] | Knowledge |  |
| **Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Communities** | SW 717: Seminar III | **Readings** None **Activities** Case presentations and discussion. [Student selected] **Assignments** Case Presentation [V] | Values | Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities. | [**SW 717**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW717)**:**  Readings: pp. 126-127  Assessments: p. 129  Activities Grid: pp. 129-130  [**SW 718**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW718)**:**  Readings: p. 135  Assessments: pp. 138-139  Activities Grid: p. 139  [**SW 720**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW720)**:**  Readings: p. 151  Assessments: pp. 156-157  Activities Grid: pp. 158-164  [**SW 721**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW721)**:**  Readings: pp. 170-173  Assessments: p. 180  Activities Grid: pp. 181-184 |
| SW 718: Field IV | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Progress toward Mastery of Competencies [C/A] | Cognitive & Affective | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 720: Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy | **Readings** Al-Krenawi, A., & Graham, J. R. (2000). Hamdy, K. (n.d.). Kim, W. (2006). Xiong, Z. B., Tuicomepee, A., LaBlanc, L., & Rainey, J. (2006). Kaiser, T. L. (2003).  Garrett, M. T., & Pichette, E. F. (2000). Walls, M. L., Johnson, K. D., Whitbeck, L. B., & Hoyt, D., R (2006). Weaver, H. N. (2004). Wolf, P. R., & Rickard, J. A. (2003). Álvarez, M. (2004). Gelman, C. R. (2004). Gutiérrez, A. Y., & Ortega, R. (2000). Hancock (2006).  **Activities** Discussion and Responses of Course materials Breakout Small Group Discussions **Assignments** Diversity In-Service and Readings and Presentation [K] | Knowledge | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 721: Advanced Practice: Multi-Level Family Systems | **Readings** Edwards, CH 1  **Activities** Class discussions  Small group student facilitated role plays.  Individual student reflective journaling.  Individual paper focused on the intervention process with one individual and family, from engagement through termination. **Assignments** Role Play & Reflexivity Journal [S]  Student Choice Topic Paper [K] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| **Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Communities** | SW 717: Seminar III  . | **Readings** None **Activities** Case study (student selected/range of systems levels).  **Assignments** Case Presentation [V] | Values | Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities. | [**SW 717**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW717)**:**  Readings: pp. 126-127  Assessments: p. 129  Activities Grid: pp. 129-130  [**SW 718**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW718)**:**  Readings: p. 135  Assessments: pp. 138-139  Activities Grid: p. 139  [**SW 720**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW720)**:**  Readings: p. 151  Assessments: pp. 156-157  Activities Grid: pp. 158-164  [**SW 721**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW721)**:**  Readings: pp. 170-173  Assessments: p. 180  Activities Grid: pp. 181-184  [**SW 731**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW731)**:**  Readings: pp. 209-210  Assessments: p. 223  Activities Grid: pp. 223-226 |
| SW 718: Field IV | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Progress toward Mastery of Competencies (Cognitive & Affective) | Cognitive & Affective | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 720: Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy | **Readings** Al-Krenawi, A., & Graham, J. R. (2000).  Hamdy, K. (n.d.). Khaja, K., & Frederick, C. (2008). http://www.islamtomorrow.com/downloads/Islam\_Questioned.pdf  Weaver: Ch 8-9 ; Kim, W. (2006).  Xiong, Z. B., Tuicomepee, A., LaBlanc, L., & Rainey, J. (2006). Kaiser, T. L. (2003). Miller & Garran: Ch. 12  Weaver: Ch 5 - 7; Bent-Goodley (2004); Staples, B. (2004). Swigonski, M. E. (1996). Weaver: Ch 5  Garrett, M. T., & Pichette, E. F. (2000). Walls, M. L., Johnson, K. D., Whitbeck, L. B., & Hoyt, D., R (2006). Weaver, H. N. (2004). Wolf, P. R., & Rickard, J. A. (2003). Álvarez, M. (2004). Gelman, C. R. (2004).Gutiérrez, A. Y., & Ortega, R. (2000). Hancock (2006).  **Activities** Watch: I Am Not Your Negro (94 minutes) Discussion and Responses  Discussion Practice with Specific Oppressed NE Wisconsin Populations  Discussion of course materials  Breakout group discussions **Assignments** Visit to Community Resource [S] | Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 721: Advanced Practice: Multi-Level Family Systems | **Readings** Edwards, Chapter 1 Kilpatrick & Holland, Ch 5  Rasheed, Ch. 2  **Activities** Class discussions.  Small group student facilitated role plays.  Individual student reflective journaling.  Individual paper focused on the intervention process with one individual and family, from engagement through termination. **Assignments** Role Play & Reflexivity Journal [S]  Student Choice Topic Paper [K] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 731: Research for Social Work Practice  . | **Readings**.  Textbook Chapters 1, 2, 4, 13, Appendix A, B, C, and D.  Peer-reviewed journal articles include Jones and Warner (2011), Stanhope (2012), Adorno et al. (2013), Fournier et al (2007), Krane and Davies (2007), Polak et al. (2017), and Mogro-Wilson et al. (2017).  **Activities** -Lectures and class discussion, course readings and the research critique assignment  - Group projects  **Assignments** Research Critique [K & V]  Program Evaluation [S] | Knowledge Values Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| **Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Communities** | SW 717: Seminar III | **Readings** None **Activities** Case study presentation and discussion (Spans systems levels)  **Assignments** Case Presentation [V] | Values | Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities. | [**SW 717**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW717)**:**  Readings: pp. 126-127  Assessments: p. 129  Activities Grid: pp. 129-130  [**SW 718**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW718)**:**  Readings: p. 135  Assessments: pp. 138-139  Activities Grid: p. 139  [**SW 720**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW720)**:**  Readings: p. 151  Assessments: pp. 156-157  Activities Grid: pp. 158-164  [**SW 721**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW721)**:**  Readings: pp. 170-173  Assessments: p. 180  Activities Grid: pp. 181-184 |
| SW 718: Field IV | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Progress toward Mastery of Competencies [C/A] | Cognitive & Affective | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 720: Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy | **Readings** Miller & Garran Chs. 3-5  Weaver Ch 13  Miller & Garran; Chs. 8-11  Burkard, A. W., & Knox, S. (2004). Stampley, C. & Slaght, E. (2004). Mullaly, B. (2010). Ross, R. (2006/1992) Hunter, S., & Hickerson, J. C. (2003a).  **Activities** Discussions of course materials Breakout small group discussions **Assignments** Visit to Community Resource [S] | Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 721: Advanced Practice: Multi-Level Family Systems  . | **Readings** Rasheed, CH. 6, 8 & 10  Lindblad-Goldberg & Northey  Brown: Bowen Family systems and Grief  Edwards: Neglected relationships in family counseling  Van Hook, CH. 12  **Activities** Class discussions  Small group student facilitated role plays.  Individual student reflective journaling.  Individual paper focused on the intervention process with one individual and family, from engagement through termination. **Assignments** Role Play & Reflexivity Journal [S]  Student Choice Topic Paper [K] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| **Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Communities** | SW 717: Seminar III | **Readings** None **Activities** Case study presentation and discussions (across systems levels)  **Assignments** Case Presentation [V] | Values | Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities. | [**SW 717**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW717)**:**  Readings: pp. 126-127  Assessments: p. 129  Activities Grid: pp. 129-130  [**SW 718**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW718)**:**  Readings: p. 135  Assessments: pp. 138-139  Activities Grid: p. 139  [**SW 720**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW720)**:**  Readings: p. 151  Assessments: pp. 156-157  Activities Grid: pp. 158-164  [**SW 721**](UWGB%20MSW%20Syllabi%20VOL%20II.docx#SW721)**:**  Readings: pp. 170-173  Assessments: p. 180  Activities Grid: pp. 181-184 |
| SW 718: Field IV | **Readings** None **Activities** Defined by learning contract **Assignments** Progress toward Mastery of Competencies [C/A] | Cognitive & Affective | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 720: Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy  . | **Readings** Miller & Garran CH. 3-5  Weaver Ch 13  Burkard, A. W., & Knox, S. (2004). Stampley, C. & Slaght, E. (2004).  Corneau, S., & Stergiopoulos, (2012).  Hoefer, R. (2012).  **Activities** Discussion of course material **Assignments** Critical Reaction Journals Posting [V] Visit to Community Resource [S] Diversity In-Service & Readings and Presentation [K & S] | Knowledge Values Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |
| SW 721: Advanced Practice: Multi-Level Family Systems | **Readings** Edwards, Rasheed Ch 11, Brock, G. & Barnard, C  **Activities** Class discussions  Small group student facilitated role plays.  Individual student reflective journaling  Individual paper focused on the intervention process with one individual and family, from engagement through termination. **Assignments** Role Play & Reflexivity Journal [S]  Student Choice Topic Paper [K] | Knowledge Skills | Individuals Families Groups Organizations Communities |

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following way:

.

**Accreditation Standard 2.2 — Field Education**

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 2.2.1:The program explains how its field education program connects the theoretical and conceptual contributions of the classroom and field settings. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the program’s field education program connects the theoretical and conceptual contributions of classroom and field across all program options. |

Students in the MSW program complete a two-semester field practicum in both the Generalist and Specialized curriculum. The field practicum provides students the opportunity to apply their theoretical knowledge in a social service setting related to their area of interest. Students complete their coursework concurrently with, or prior to, the field practicum courses to ensure thy have a theoretical foundation for their experiences in field

**Examples of Connecting Theories Between Classroom and Field:**

**Generalist Year**

* SOC WORK 700 Gateway to the Profession of Social Work: This introductory course highlights case examples of social work in a multitude of settings, introduces students to the social work competencies, ethics, and legal guideposts, and emphasizes the role of social work in social justice and anti-racism efforts. Students apply theories to their understanding of social work practice with particular emphasis on multicultural approaches.
* SOC WORK 701 Contemporary Social Work Ethics: This practice course uses case examples and student discussion of experiences in reinforcing ethical practice. A final assignment in the course requires students to work through an ethical dilemma experienced in their practice, applying moral and ethical theories to the decision-making process.
* SOC WORK 702 Generalist Practice I: This course focuses on social with individuals and families and uses case studies and student examples from field to foster understanding of the link between social work practice methods and theories. Embedded within the course is a skills component whereby students demonstrate practice skills using case examples.
* SOC WORK 704 Generalist Practice II: This course emphasizes theories and practice from the macro perspective. In addition to applied case studies, students complete assessments of communities and organizations where they are completing their field practicum.
* SOC WORK 707 Human Behavior and the Social Environment: The basis of this course is introduction and analysis of the theories that underpin social work and how those theories apply to all systems levels from micro to macro. Students engage in a variety of activities that demonstrate their ability to make those connections.

While enrolled in Field I and Field II (SOC WORK 712 and 714), students are concurrently enrolled in Seminar I and II.

* SOC WORK 713 Seminar I (Fall) and SOC WORK 715 Seminar II (Spring): Field seminars, facilitated by Faculty Field Liaisons, encourage student processing of field activities within the group settings, driven by student contributions based on their experiences in field. Faculty Field Liaisons are social work faculty who teach across the social work curriculum and thus can ask facilitative questions to draw out common social work theories, including systems theory, person in environment theory, engagement theories, and motivational theory, among others.

**Specialized Year**

While enrolled in Field III and Field IV (SOC WORK 716 and 718), students are concurrently enrolled in seminar.

* SOC WORK 717 Seminar III (Fall) and SOC WORK 719 Capstone Seminar (Spring): Specialized Seminars are facilitated by social work faculty (Faculty Field Liaisons) who teach across the curriculum. In fall, students present a case study that requires an understanding of systems theory as it relates to a micro, mezzo, or macro case from their field practicum. In spring, students complete their capstone project which includes identification of at least one theory, supported by research, as it applies to their chosen topic.
* SOC WORK 720 Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy: Course assists students in applying effective service delivery strategies to diverse groups in practice. Course uses student discussions to apply theoretical perspectives to practice situations. In addition, students visit a community resource and must be able to articulate the impact on diverse groups. Students prepare an in-service which is publicly shared at the field agency setting.
* SOC WORK 721 Advanced Practice: Multi-Level Family Systems: This course requires students to demonstrate skill in the various therapy approaches. Prior to implementation of the approaches, students review theoretical underpinnings so can effectively implement the intervention.
* SOC WORK 731 Research for Social Work Practice: The primary assignment in this course is a research proposal related to students’ field placement or area of emphasis, and supported in the literature by theory. Combining this assignment with the field practicum helps students see the link between research and practice, and the importance of that interface to support evidence-based practice and evaluation.

**Examples of Connecting Concepts Between Classroom and Field:**

Each course has identified competencies associated with the learning objectives of the course. In alignment with adult learning concepts, whenever possible, students are encouraged to link concepts to practice experience.

**Generalist Curriculum**

* SOC WORK 700 Gateway to the Profession of Social Work: Concepts covered in the course include multicultural services and teamwork and collaboration. Concept of professionalism and application to social work regulation/credentialing is discussed. Students complete a critical analysis paper which require reflection on concepts from student perspectives. Students also research WI statutes that apply to their intended practice area.
* SOC WORK 701 Contemporary Social Work Ethics: Ethical theories are applied using case studies and student discussions of the concepts. Students examine key concepts of self-determination, informed consent, and confidentiality outlining implications within various practice settings.
* SOC WORK 702 Generalist Practice I and 704 Generalist Practice II: These two courses focus on client-centered, strengths-based, empowering practice. Concepts are discussed related to variables in practice settings through case studies, student reflections, and the embedded assessment measures for the course.
* SOC WORK 707 Human Behavior and the Social Environment: Students complete a bio-psycho-social-spiritual-cultural assessment paper applied to themselves. Within the structure of the paper, they apply concepts covered in the course to their personal experiences and implications on future practice. Person-in-environment and understanding of multi-level systems is reinforced through student participation in discussions and a group project focused on applying theory to practice situations.
* SOC WORK 711 Foundations of Social Welfare: SOC WORK 711: Foundations of Social Welfare: This course introduces students to the historical roots of social work, social welfare, and social policy. Students are, then, challenged to examine their field experiences through this historical and social justice lens, as demonstrated in field logs and their learning plans.
* SOC WORK 713 Seminar I and 715 Seminar II: Generalist Seminar courses are specifically developed to help students integrate classroom concepts with the practice experiences they receive in field. Most discussions center around the nine competencies which provides assurance that students are able to identify linkages across all systems levels, from micro to macro

**Specialized Year Curriculum**

* SOC WORK 717 Seminar III (fall) and SOC WORK 719 Capstone Seminar (spring): Specialized Seminars are designed with the primary purpose of integrating content learned in the classroom with real experiences from the field practicum. Case studies in fall and the Capstone project in spring reinforce the interface between knowledge, values, and skills. Furthermore, in spring, specialized students work in small groups to present on a topic of interest that links content and practice.
* SOC WORK 720 Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy: Students take this course in the fall after completing SOC WORK 728 Advanced Policy, Leadership, Advocacy, and Practice. This course builds on concepts learned in SOC WORK 728 with intensive attention to diversity and difference. Students prepare an in-service around a non-dominant population with a specific need, with an emphasis on assessment and intervention.
* SOC WORK 728: Intentionally situated before students take other specialized year social work courses, this course teaches advocacy skills and reinforces social worker leadership in development of inclusive policy. Students are then expected to integrate this learning into their learning plans for Field III and Field IV.
* SOC WORK 731 Research for Social Work Practice: Taken their second semester of specialized year, course requires students to apply the logic model to their field practicums in an effort to evaluate agency services. Furthermore, the research proposal for this course requires a full understanding of research ethics, focusing on protection of human subjects, as it applies to their agency clientele.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M2.2.2:The program explains how its field education program provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities and illustrates how this is accomplished in field settings. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the field education program provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities across all program options. |

**Explanation of how program ensures students have generalist opportunities to practice with each systems level (individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities) in their field settings:**

Several programmatic mechanisms are in place to recruit and develop MSW field practicum sites that afford opportunities for students to practice within the range (individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities) of system levels.

**Field site recruitment**

The Social Work Professional Programs MSW Field Coordinator works to recruit, review and approve field sites for generalist field opportunities. Annually, field sites are queried for interest in offering a field practicum for students and are asked to provide a description of the opportunity. In recruitment and approval of field practicum sites, the MSW Field Coordinator outlines the competency-based learning the field experience is based upon and for a site to be approved, it must be able to provide adequate MSW practice opportunities for students in the areas of all nine competency areas and across all systems levels.

The BSW and MSW Field Coordinators have developed a “Field Site Fact Sheet” that is shared with prospective agencies to offer guidance on field site qualifications and outlines the importance of opportunities for practice across the range of system levels. The Field Site Fact Sheet states,

“UWGB Social work students complete their field placements from September-mid May, completing activities towards the accomplishment of social work competencies. There are nine competencies, which focus on direct practice skills, ethical practice and awareness of oppression, leadership skills and program evaluation and policy. A wide variety of practice settings make wonderful internships, including child welfare agencies, nonprofits, aging & disability resource centers, agencies that work with diverse populations, advocacy organizations, hospitals, residential facilities, shelters, youth programs, and more.”

**Field site orientation**

Prior to the start of field practicum in the Fall semester, the MSW Field Coordinator hosts a required Field Orientation event for all students and Agency Field Instructors. In addition to providing logistical details of field practicum, an emphasis of this event is to provide education and guidance on the nine social work competencies and the integration of learning centered on each competency spanning the range of system levels during the field practicum experience. Direct education of the nine social work competencies is provided along with small group discussion (facilitated by the Faculty Field Liaisons teaching field and seminar) regarding learning opportunities and activities that have been successful in supporting student growth and development of competency in each of the social work competencies.

**Learning Contract**

At the start of a field practicum, the student, Agency Field Instructor and the Faculty Field Liaison collaborate to develop a Learning Contract. This Learning Contract (see [Generalist Learning Contract](#Field_Learning_Contract) for copy of the Generalist MSW learning contract) clearly outlines the nine social work competencies, and students are instructed to purposefully identify a variety of tasks, activities and/or learning opportunities in the field practicum setting that will allow them to develop and demonstrate mastery of each social work competency across the range of system levels ensuring tasks that include individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. A meeting between the student, Agency Field Instructor and the Faculty Field Liaison is held early in the semester to review the Learning Contract, provide feedback, and generate additional tasks or learning activities as needed. During the learning plan meeting, the Faculty Field Liaison will ask questions and offer suggestions to ensure that generalist practice opportunities are available at all systems levels, probing the Agency Field Instructor for further ideas at the agency, and encouraging the student to think critically and creatively about their experience.

**Field Logs & Site Visits**

While the Generalist MSW Learning Contract serves as a guide throughout the semester for the student to manage their tasks and activities, students routinely submit Field Logs documenting activities accomplished in field practicum and in relation to the competencies. Progress toward meeting the outcomes identified in the plan are monitored by the student and the Faculty Field Liaison throughout the semester via field seminar discussions and review and discussion of student field logs.

Progress towards meeting the outcomes identified in the plan is evaluated at the end of the Fall semester of the field practicum. Students receive a grade in each of the nine competencies, providing formative feedback midway through the field experience. Should there be components overlooked in the first semester and/or if it has proven to be difficult to provide opportunities for learning in any of the competency areas, additional plans are created for the Spring semester. This is accomplished by arranging opportunities for development of competence in other program agencies, or communities. These opportunities are then be included in the student’s Spring semester learning plan.

Careful recruitment of field settings, along with attention to early development of the learning plan help limit ensure students have generalist practice opportunities at all systems levels in the field.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative illustrates how these generalist practice opportunities are accomplished in field settings across all program options. |

MSW students are placed in a variety of field practice settings. While student interest and learning goals guide a field placement referral, careful review and consideration is given by the MSW Field Coordinator in curating a list of potential field agencies that can provide a robust range of opportunities for field practicum activities that fall within the nine social work competencies and across the range (individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities) of system levels. The table below highlights a range of learning activities across system levels that students commonly participate in as part of field practicum.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Systems Level** | **Examples of Tasks, Roles, and/or Opportunities to Practice with Each Systems Level in Field Settings** |
| Individuals | Individual case management, one-on-one client meetings, participating in home visits, conducting intake assessments, providing client education and/or skills training; facilitating satisfaction evaluations during transitions and endings. |
| Families | Conducting home visits, engaging with parents and families, offering education and skills training, meeting with formal and informal support systems, facilitating parenting skills classes, supervising visits between children and parents in child welfare settings, discussing care plans, engaging with clients, conducting intake assessments with families, engaging during family events |
| Groups | Planning and facilitating support or education groups or workshops in a range of topic areas (socioemotional learning, parenting, budgeting, resume/ job preparedness, etc); working with youth or adults in group mental health or group home settings; assessing programmatic needs of groups, evaluation of group facilitation by debriefing with co-facilitators and/or conducting surveys or post-tests. |
| Organizations | Attending client staffing, participating in team/staff meetings, interviewing staff in various departments to better understand the field agency, shadowing and participating in multiple departments through the year to gain stronger organizational perspective, attending board and/or organizational leadership meetings; developing agency resource binders, entering and analyzing program data, formulating and advocating for agency policy, developing resource guides for agencies, researching and developing staff training materials, seeking opportunities for grant funding. |
| Communities | Attending community coalition meetings; Touring partner agencies; Planning community awareness-raising events; Attending or hosting booths at various community fairs on health, housing, education, community resources, etc.; Attending County Board or City Council meetings; Planning and/or attending rallies and demonstrations on social justice issues such as immigration, LGBTQ+ rights, Black Lives Matter, etc.; Formulating and advocating for community policy |

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M2.2.3:The program explains how its field education program provides specialized practice opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies within an area of specialized practice and illustrates how this is accomplished in field settings. |

The Program offers Advanced Generalist as a specialized practice area. Students wishing to study an area of practice to greater depth may choose to select an area of emphasis. Specialized students complete their field practicum in agencies that correspond to their area of emphasis and offer opportunities for more advanced leadership-oriented opportunities.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative identifies how the program’s field education program provides specialized opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies within an area of specialized practice across all program options. |

**Area of Specialized Practice #1: Advanced Generalist**

Several programmatic mechanisms are in place to recruit and develop Specialized field practicum sites that afford opportunities for advanced skill development within the range of systems levels (individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities).

**Field site recruitment**

The Social Work Professional Programs MSW Field Coordinator works to recruit, review and approve field sites for advanced generalist field opportunities. Annually, field sites are queried for interest in offering a field practicum for students and are asked to provide a description of the opportunity. In recruitment and approval of field practicum sites, the MSW Field Coordinator outlines the competency-based learning the field experience and outlines differences between generalist and specialized year requirements. For a site to be approved, it must be able to provide adequate Advanced Generalist MSW practice opportunities for students in the areas of all nine competency areas, across all systems levels, and with more advanced expectations.

**Field site orientation**

Prior to the start of field practicum in the Fall semester, the MSW Field Coordinator hosts a required Field Orientation event for all students and Agency Field Instructors. In addition to providing logistical details of field practicum, an emphasis of this event is to provide education and guidance on the nine social work competencies, requirements for advanced behaviors, and the integration of learning centered on each competency spanning the range of system levels during the field practicum experience. Direct education of the nine social work competencies is provided along with small group discussion (facilitated by the Faculty Field Liaisons teaching field and seminar) regarding learning opportunities and activities that have been successful in supporting specialized student growth and development of competency in each of the social work competencies.

**Learning Contract**

At the start of a field practicum, the student, Agency Field Instructor and the Faculty Field Liaison collaborate to develop a Learning Contract. (See [Specialized Year Learning Contract](#Field_Learning_Contract_Specialized)). This Learning clearly outlines the nine social work competencies and behaviors expected to be demonstrated with mastery by the end of the placement experience. Students are instructed to purposefully identify a variety of tasks, activities and/or learning opportunities in the field practicum setting that will allow them to develop and demonstrate mastery of each social work competency across the range of system levels at an advanced level. Behaviors link to tasks that include individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. A meeting between the student, Agency Field Instructor and the Faculty Field Liaison is held early in the semester to review the Learning Contract, provide feedback, and generate additional tasks or learning activities as needed. During the learning plan meeting, the Faculty Field Liaison will ask questions and offer suggestions to ensure that advanced generalist practice opportunities are available at all systems levels.

**Field Logs & Site Meetings**

While the Specialized Year MSW Learning Contract serves as a guide throughout the semester for the student to manage their tasks and activities, students routinely submit Field Logs documenting activities accomplished in field practicum and relation to the competencies. Progress toward meeting the outcomes identified in the plan are monitored by the student and the Faculty Field Liaison throughout the semester via field seminar discussions and review and discussion of student field logs.

Progress towards meeting the outcomes identified in the plan is evaluated at the end of the Fall semester of the field practicum. Students receive a grade in each of the nine competencies, providing formative feedback midway through the field experience. Should there be components overlooked in the first semester and/or if it has proven to be difficult to provide opportunities for learning in any of the competency areas, additional plans are created for the Spring semester. This is accomplished by arranging opportunities for development of competence in other programs, agencies, or communities. These opportunities are then included in the student’s Spring semester learning plan.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative illustrates how these specialized practice opportunities are accomplished in field settings across all program options. |

**Area of Specialized Practice #1: Advanced Generalist**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Systems Level** | **Examples of Tasks, Roles, and/or Opportunities to Practice with Relevant Systems Level in Field Settings** |
| Individuals | Provision of therapy services within clinical placement settings. Case management and crisis services provision with minimal supervision. Complete assessments and service plan development. Managing independent 1:1 interventions and resource identification for those requesting service. Provision of mentoring and/or supervision for students, interns within a BSW program. |
| Families | Provision of couple and family therapy within clinical placement settings. Coordination and participation in family conferences, interdisciplinary teams. Leading staffing discussions related to family issues. Assessment of structural issues impacting families and intervening to remove barriers. |
| Groups | Development and facilitation of groups. Assessment of members for participation in treatment groups. Research on needs of particular groups and provision of outreach activities to specified populations. |
| Organizations | Assistance with grant writing and program development within organizational setting. Involvement in program evaluation activities. Working as a member of a leadership team or coalition to revise programs or increase access to under-served groups. Provision of training to team members. Researching topics for best practice intervention within the organization. |
| Communities | Working with coalition to address community needs such as homelessness service provision, food insecurity. Identifying community needs and gaps in services through comprehensive planning. Advocacy and other interventions on behalf of agency populations and unmet need. |

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 2.2.4: The program explains how students across all program options in its field education program demonstrate social work competencies through in-person contact with clients and constituencies. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how students across all program options in the program’s field education program demonstrate social work competencies through in-person contact with clients and constituencies. |

The MSW Program does not place students in field agency sites that utilize simulation, avatar, or other technology in lieu of in-person contact with clients and constituencies. To ensure that all students demonstrate social work competencies through in-person encounters during field education, both Generalist and Specialized curricula utilize the approach as outlined above in Accreditation Standard M2.2.2: the MSW Field Coordinator explains the direct-service expectation with the agency field instructor or agency contact person prior to student placement. Discussion of possible field practicum activities with in-person clients and constituencies are also reviewed. For an agency to be approved as a possible field practicum site, the agency must be able to provide adequate in-person contact with clients and constituencies. This criterion is further reviewed during Fall Field Orientation. Faculty Field Liaisons continue to monitor opportunities and realization of in-person contacts through development of the Learning Contract and over the course of the field practicum with review of field logs and discussion of in-person activities during site meetings.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 2.2.5:The program describes how its field education program provides a minimum of 400 hours of field education for baccalaureate programs and a minimum of 900 hours for master’s programs. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program’s field education program provides a minimum of 900 hours for master's programs across all program options. |

Prior to the onset of COVID-19, the MSW field committee reviewed its field hour requirements for both the Generalist and Specialized year. To ensure consistency and compliance, once the COVID exceptions have been discontinued field hours will mirror the CSWE minimum requirements; 400 hours for Generalist field practicum; 500 hours for the Specialized field practicum. This decision ensures students admitted with advanced standing will have completed 900 field hours by the end of their MSW program (minimum of 400 in their BSW field practicum, and 500 in our MSW field practicum.)

An adjustment to the minimum number of required field hours was made in for the 2021-22 academic year in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, approved by the UW-Green Bay Social Work faculty and is consistent with allowances made by CSWE in the Commission on Accreditation (COA) Statement from October 9, 2020. UWGB field requirements were 85% and 86% of the requisite hours respectively, which is slightly more than the 85% allowance outlined by the COA. For the 2021-22 academic year, Generalist MSW students are required to complete a minimum of 340 hours across two semesters of field education. Field I and Field II (SOC WORK 712 and 714) each require a minimum of 170 total field practicum hours. Specialized year MSW students are required to complete a minimum of 430 field hours across two semesters of field education. Field III and Field IV (SOC WORK 716 and 718) each require a minimum of 215 total field hours.

Details of the program requirements are outlined in the 2021-2022 MSW Student Handbook (page 59) and will be adjusted for the 2022-2023 handbook to reflect the 900-hour total. The section below is the language with the reduced hours for the 2021-2022 academic year. (See [Field Hours](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Field_Hours)).

|  |
| --- |
| ***Field Hours***  Students are required to complete eight credits of field in both the Generalist and Specialized curriculum, accumulating a required number of hours over the course of two semesters. The field internship begins in the fall semester and continues through spring. A schedule of the beginning and ending dates for field is provided to students at the time of orientation and in the field course syllabi   * Generalist year field hours to be completed for each semester of the 2021-22 academic year are 170, or 340 total hours for the year. (These hours are based on allowances made by CSWE due to COVID-19 challenges.) * Specialized year student field hours to be completed for each semester of the 2021-22 academic year are 215, or 430 total hours for the year. *(These hours are based on allowances made by CSWE due to COVID-19 challenges.)* |

Policy outlined below is maintained regardless of the COVID adjustments offered the 2021- 2022 academic year.

|  |
| --- |
| A minimum of half of the required hours must be completed by the end of the fall semester. Generalist students may accumulate and carry-over up to, but no more than, 20 hours in the fall semester which can be applied to the spring semester. Specialized students may accumulate and carry-over up to, but no more than, 40 hours in the fall semester which can be applied to the spring semester. This policy is to help students create a buffer for their final semester; it is not intended to allow students to finish field “early”. Field hours should be evenly spaced throughout the semesters.  The MSW Field courses carry a non-traditional schedule. They start at the beginning of the academic semester but end later than the traditional 14-week semester. This allows students the flexibility of being in field less hours per week for a longer period. Field is scheduled as follows:   * Field I and III begin the first week of the fall semester and end on the final day of the January Interim. * Field II and IV begin the first week of the spring semester and end the Friday before commencement. |

The MSW field education program ensures students complete the requisite number of minimum field hours with the following programmatic strategies:

* Presenting expectations of minimum field hour requirements in discussions with potential field agency sites and providing clearly outlining expectations to students in multiple communications (MSW Student Handbook, Field Orientation, Field course syllabi).
* The Faculty Field Liaison reviews the field practicum schedule and process for documentation of field hours in the Seminar course with the student and at the Learning Contract meeting.
* Faculty Field Liaison monitors accumulation of field hours through routine Field Activities Logs, field visits and communication with students.
* Students are not eligible to proceed to Spring semester field and seminar without successful completion of Fall field and seminar coursework.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 2.2.6:The program provides its criteria for admission into field education and explains how its field education program admits only those students who have met the program’s specified criteria. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative provides the program’s criteria for admission into field education across all program options. |

The criteria for admission to the MSW field education includes:

* Admission to the MSW Program.
* Successful enrollment and progression of academic course sequence
* Maintaining University and Program academic standards.
* Successful completion of the Field Placement Referral process, including timely submission of the MSW Field Application.
* Successful completion of Fall Field Orientation

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the program’s field education program admits only those students who have met the program's specified criteria across all program options. |

**Admission to the MSW Program**

Students applying for a Generalist or Specialized level field practicum placement have been admitted to the MSW program and have successfully met admission criteria for the MSW Program. (See [Standard 3.1.1](#Standard_M3_1_1))

**Successful Course Progression and Academic Standards**

Students who are successful in course progression (part-time students and Generalist students moving into Specialized year) and remain in good academic standing (progressing successfully in the course sequence and maintaining academic standards) are invited to begin the field placement referral process. Students enrolled full-time in the program must enroll in required concurrent coursework to begin a field practicum experience. Part-time students must have completed coursework prior to the field practicum.

**Academic Retention**

Students must meet academic retention criteria to enroll in the field sequence. Both the University Graduate Studies and the MSW Program require a 3.0 GPA for progression in the Program. If at some point, a student does not meet the Program's specified criteria to engage in field practicum, the student will be referred to the MSW Field Coordinator to discuss adjustment in their program completion.

**Field Placement Referral Process**

The MSW Field Coordinator facilitates the multiple steps of the student field placement process. In the spring semester preceding enrollment in field practicum, the MSW Field Coordinator initiates the student field placement referral process. Eligible students are invited to an online Canvas site that outlines the steps of the field placement referral process. Students are instructed to review the online materials, prepare and complete a field application, review a list of available field practicum agencies, and submit a field preferences form. Field applications are numbered as they are submitted and students are offered an agency referral using the concept of first come, first served combined with field preferences and agency availability.

Per the MSW Student Handbook (page 58):

|  |
| --- |
| The UWGB MSW Field Placement process provides students with direction and guidance, while honoring autonomy in securing their own field placements. The process is a shared responsibility between the student and the MSW Program. Keys to a successful placement on the student end include adherence to timelines, reading and responding to MSW Program communications, preparation and submission of professional materials (such as a resume), researching agency preferences, a strong sense of one’s readiness/fit with various areas of social work practice, and successful interviews |

**Fall Field Orientation.**

All MSW students entering field practicum are required to complete a field orientation. Students are notified of the field orientation responsibilities in advance and must complete the orientation activities by approximately ten days into the semester. Field Orientation has two components:

* Asynchronous online modules and activities addressing field roles and responsibilities, professionalism, competencies, safety, and self-care
* A live, virtual session with students and Agency Field Instructors, facilitated by the MSW Field Coordinator and MSW Faculty Field Liaisons

If a student does not complete the field orientation, the MSW Field Coordinator contacts the student and Faculty Field Liaison via email to notify the student that orientation tasks must be completed to begin field. The MSW Field Coordinator notifies the student, Faculty Field Instructor, and Field Agency that the student is not eligible to begin accruing field hours until the field orientation work is complete.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 2.2.7:The program describes how its field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for selecting field settings; placing and monitoring students; supporting student safety; and evaluating student learning and field setting effectiveness congruent with the social work competencies. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program’s field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for **selecting field settings** across all program options. |

**Policies for Selection of Field Agencies**

The MSW Student Handbook outlines the following policy regarding [approval of MSW Field Agencies](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Field_Agency_Approval)

|  |
| --- |
| **APPROVAL OF MSW FIELD AGENCIES**  The MSW program views agencies as extensions of the University and partners in the provision of learning activities for students. Placements are developed in a range of practice areas where it has been determined that the agency is able to adequately meet the student’s learning needs. Placements are evaluated against the Council on Social Work Education supervisory requirements as well as learning environment for students. Agencies under consideration for student placements are reviewed by the MSW Field Coordinator and subsequently approved by UW-Green Bay Social Work faculty.  Agencies interested in providing a field placement for a student may contact the MSW program at any time to discuss the possibility of student placement. In addition, the MSW Field Coordinator may solicit additional field sites that provide a range of practice opportunities to address the interests of students in the program.  The MSW Field Coordinator works with interested agencies to discuss the policies, procedures, and expectations when accepting a student for placement. Agencies are asked to outline activities and practice opportunities for student learning. The MSW Field Coordinator evaluates the opportunities for a student to develop Specialized practice behavior competency and presents a recommendation to the Social Work faculty for approval or disapproval.  Once it is determined that a placement site is appropriate for MSW level practice experience, the MSW Field Coordinator works with the Administrative Associate and UW-Green Bay Risk Manager to establish an Affiliation Agreement. The Affiliation Agreement and Program Memorandum outline the following expectations of field site agencies:   * Agreement to provide a qualified MSW Field Instructor with the appropriate credentials or work with the MSW Field Coordinator and Faculty Field Liaison in securing appropriate supervision and then allow for regular and ongoing supervision of the student. * The Agency’s qualified MSW Field Instructor (as detailed below) agrees to accept the responsibilities for field instruction including assisting in the development of the learning plan, ensuring opportunities for activities that meet the social work competency requirements and regularly scheduled academically oriented supervision. * Agency allows the Agency Field Instructor to have release time to attend field instruction workshops and other meetings at the University. * Agency agrees to provide students with the necessary activities and client opportunities, space and resources to function at the level of social work practice that will further the educational process according to the student’s emphasis. * Agency makes available to the student opportunities for participation in policy and program development, critical evaluation of services, and the opportunity for research within the agency. * Agency will include the student in staff meetings and trainings that pertain to the learning about the functioning of the agency, respect and support interdisciplinary practice. * Recognition of Affirmative Action guidelines in the selection of students for placement and attention to the diverse needs of clientele/consumers of services |

**Procedures for Selection of Field Settings**

The MSW Field Coordinator carries out the policy and procedures outlined above from the MSW Student Handbook. The Program receives suggestions for potential field agency placements from a variety of sources. An agency may express interest by contacting the MSW Field Coordinator, Social Work Faculty may recommend an agency based on community connections, and social work students sometimes suggest agencies with which they are familiar. In all cases, the MSW Field Coordinator contacts the agency, typically via telephone or email and shares the Field Placement Fact Sheet. Often, a meeting will be scheduled to further discuss UWGB Social Work field placement policies and process. During this dialogue, the MSW Field Coordinator assesses the prospective agency in regard to agency ability to provide an appropriate field experience based on Program criteria.

If it is determined the agency can provide a suitable field practicum experience and both the MSW Field Coordinator and the agency would like to proceed in creating a field placement, the MSW Field Coordinator asks the agency contact to complete the annual field practicum query (which confirms the pertinent details of the field placement opportunity). This agency information is provided to students for review and consideration of a possible placement referral.

**Criteria for Selecting Field Settings**

In communication with community partners about potential field practicum locations, the MSW Field Coordinator is evaluating the agency ability to meet the following criteria:

* The agency is able to adequately meet the student’s learning needs.
* Placements are evaluated against the Council on Social Work Education supervisory requirements including agreement to provide a qualified MSW Field Instructor with the appropriate credentials or work with the MSW Field Coordinator and Faculty Field Liaison in securing appropriate supervision.
* Agencies are asked to outline activities and practice opportunities for student learning opportunities to develop Specialized behavior competency and presents a summary of possible activities to be completed at the practicum.
* Agreement to provide a qualified MSW Field Instructor with the appropriate credentials or work with the MSW Field Coordinator and Faculty Field Liaison in securing appropriate supervision and then allow for regular and ongoing supervision of the student.
* The Agency’s qualified MSW Field Instructor agrees to accept the responsibilities for field instruction including assisting in the development of the learning plan, ensuring opportunities for activities that meet the social work competency requirements and regularly scheduled academically oriented supervision.
* Agency allows the Agency Field Instructor to have release time to attend field instruction workshops and other meetings at the University.
* Agency agrees to provide students with the necessary activities and client opportunities, space, and resources to function at the level of social work practice that will further the educational process according to the student’s emphasis.
* Agency makes available to the student opportunities for participation in policy and program development, critical evaluation of services, and the opportunity for research within the agency.
* Agency will include the student in staff meetings and trainings that pertain to the learning about the functioning of the agency, respect and support interdisciplinary practice.
* Recognition of Affirmative Action guidelines in the selection of students for placement and attention to the diverse needs of clientele/consumers of services.

If an agency requests or requires a formal Affiliation Agreement to be on file, the MSW Field Coordinator works with the UW-Green Bay Manager to complete the affiliation agreement process.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program’s field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for **placing students** across all program options. |

**Policies for Placing Students**

Students who are eligible for field are identified by the Program and MSW Field Coordinator then initiates the process for placing students. The policies for placing students are outlined on [pages 56-58](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Field_Placement_Process) of the *MSW Student Handbook* and are as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **Placement Process**    The UWGB MSW Field Placement process provides students with direction and guidance, while honoring autonomy in securing their own field placements. The process is a shared responsibility between the student and the MSW Program. Keys to a successful placement on the student end include adherence to timelines, reading and responding to MSW Program communications, preparation and submission of professional materials (such as a resume’), researching agency preferences, a strong sense of one’s readiness/fit with various areas of social work practice, and  successful interviews. The MSW Program’s responsibility is to build relationships with agencies who can and will provide experiences that meets students’ learning outcomes and complies with program requirements.  Students who are eligible to begin their field placements in the upcoming fall semester will receive information about the field placement procedures in early spring. The official process begins with an email that provides students with a link to “apply” to Field. Applications are numbered as they are submitted and students are offered placements using the concept of first come, first served. As such, it is important to submit the field application as soon as possible. In the meantime, the MSW Program compiles a listing of agencies who have agreed to accept a student for the upcoming academic year. In mid-March, this list is shared with students, and they are asked to rank order the agencies they are most interested in for their upcoming practicum. The  full process for field registration is managed through a special Canvas shell into which students are invited after submission of their field applications.  Students are strongly encouraged to contact faculty advisors to process their interests and options before making their field placement choices. While we encourage students to investigate various agencies through websites and other external marketing venues early in the process, they are NOT to make contact until after they are given specific referral information. This policy is to protect agencies from numerous student inquiries and to preserve the field process which is designed to provide equal opportunity to all.  After students follow all field registration steps and receive their referral and contact information from the MSW Field Coordinator, they initiate contact with the agency to arrange an interview. The interview is conducted to determine if the match is acceptable to both parties. Timely contacts and communications are crucial. Delays in communication can make the process of obtaining an appropriate placement more difficult. Because the demand for field placements can be quite high, students are encouraged to promptly submit their field applications, communicate with the MSW Field Coordinator or Advisors, and follow through with agency communications.  Field agencies are strongly encouraged to interview students before committing to a placement. In some instances, agencies have requested to interview several students for a single placement. This decision reinforces the highly competitive nature of some field placements, stressing the need for students to be professionally prepared for their interviews and move promptly through the process. If multiple field interviews have resulted in the failure to find an appropriate match, the student will be referred to the Faculty Advisor to discuss the situation. |

**Procedures for Placing Students**

In addition to the process outlined in the policy above, students are expected to complete field paperwork in a timely basis. The Student Handbook outlines these policies on page 58 as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| In addition to the field application, students must be timely in completing the remaining steps in the field placement process as indicated below. The Field Coordinator and/or agency may assign deadlines for each of these steps, when appropriate. Items that must be completed in a timely manner, once a field placement referral has been made, include but are not limited to:     * Contact the agency to schedule an interview * Maintain communication with MSW Program * Submit required paperwork prior to the first day of the semester   + Driver’s Authorization, Student Placement Confirmation Form, and other agency-specific requirement(s) (ie. Background check)     Failure to meet assigned deadlines may result in the student not completing the field placement until the following academic year. |

The field placement is considered finalized when the Student Placement and Agency Liability Coverage Confirmation Form is completed by the student and Agency Field Instructor. This document is the formal contract for the internship. When required by the Agency, an Affiliation Agreement is developed by the University’s Risk Manager and signatures obtained to activate the agreement.

**Criteria for Placing Students**

Based on the principles of adult learning, the MSW Program uses a self-directed approach to placing students in their graduate field practicums. When completing the field application process as outlined above, students identify the area of emphasis they wish to pursue. Field placement sites are identified according to emphasis and are offered to students on a first-come, first serve basis. The Program does have two areas where preference is granted to students in those emphases:

* Students applying for the Child Welfare Stipend must complete their field placements in a public or tribal child welfare serving agency.
* Students interested in School Social Work Certification or specialization must be placed in a K-12 school system and supervision must meet the requirements as outlined by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

The Program’s Child Welfare Coordinator and School Social Work Coordinator, respectively, serve as advisor and assist in the placement of students seeking these areas of emphasis.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program’s field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for **monitoring students** across all program options. |

**Policies for Monitoring Students**

Field Instructors, Faculty Field Liaisons, and Faculty Field Instructors all play a role in monitoring students in the field placement. The FFL, however, assumes primary responsibility for monitoring of student learning in field. The role of FFL is outlined in the MSW Student Handbook, [p. 13](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Faculty_Field_Liaison), and is as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **Role of Faculty Field Liaison**    The Faculty Field Liaison (FFL) is the instructor for field and seminar courses that are  concurrent with the student placement in the field agencies. This faculty person has academic responsibility for planning, monitoring, and evaluating student progress towards achievement of the program competencies, in collaboration with the student and the Agency Field Instructor.  Responsibilities include:     * Teaching the Field Seminars and encouraging and assisting students toward the integration of classroom knowledge with the fieldwork experiences. * Orienting students to the social work competencies and practice behaviors and assisting in the development of student learning contracts based on student learning needs. * Consulting with the students and Agency Field Instructors at the beginning of each semester to initiate the development of the Field Learning Contract and identifying appropriate tasks, activities and learning goals that will ensure that students achieve the program competencies. * Assigning course work related to the field seminar and monitoring the progress of students in their field activities. * Assessing student written work, providing feedback and assuming responsibility for assigning course grades reflecting student performance. * Conducting and coordinating evaluations of student performance at the end of each semester, in consultation with Agency Field Instructors. * Informing MSW Field Coordinator of any issues or situations which are likely to affect student placement status or program relationships with field agencies. * Collaborating with MSW Field Coordinator for agency field orientation and training activities. |

**Procedures for Monitoring Students**

All students in their field placements are monitored by their Faculty Field Liaison in accordance with the field and seminar courses. As part of the course instruction, students complete a learning plan and field logs are submitted for FFL review and feedback is provided. As noted in the policy above, the FFL works with the student and Field Instructor in the development of the learning plan and consults with the Field Instructor when evaluating student progress each semester.

As part of the course assignments, students reflect on the activities of field and apply them to the appropriate (Generalist or Specialized) competencies and behaviors. The FFL provides formative feedback throughout the semester, monitors hours completed, and works with the student if any problems arise in the field setting. If a field situation becomes exceptionally problematic and impacts student’s participation or the field agency dynamics are not conducive to student learning, the FFL consults with the Field Coordinator to determine the appropriate course of action.

**Criteria for Monitoring Students**

Students engaged in field practicum must meet both academic and non-academic retention standards as outlined in the *MSW Student Handbook* ([pp. 35 – 43](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Acad_Non_Ret)).

Students are expected to maintain a consistent work schedule with their agency and it is the responsibility of the student to contact the FFL, FFI if assigned, and Agency FI to discuss an alternative plan. Changing schedules and any absences from field are addressed in the MSW Student Handbook on pages 61-62.

|  |
| --- |
| **Changing Field Placement Schedule**    As future professionals, it is expected that students will discuss and maintain a consistent work schedule with their agency. The staff and faculty of the MSW program recognize there are times when unexpected situations may arise in a student’s personal or professional life necessitating changes to the student’s original field schedule. Should this occur, students must contact their Faculty Field Liaison and Agency Field Instructor to discuss an alternative plan. Depending on the situation, the Faculty Advisor and/or Field Coordinator may be involved in the decision to approve an alternative field schedule.    **Absences from Field**    Regular attendance in the field internship is expected of all students in the MSW program. Students are expected to notify their Agency Field Instructor, as early as possible, of any absence. Absences in excess of one week must be reported to the Faculty Field Liaison. Students should refer to the Extended Medical Leave policy (See Legitimate Absence Policies) for health-related absences, including pregnancy and childbirth. Missed hours, for whatever reason, must be made up by the end of each semester in order to complete the required number of field hours. |

Likewise, students are expected to adhere to ethical and legal guidelines within their field activities as outlined on page 63 of the MSW Student Handbook.

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Participation in Activities Which Interfere with Field/Class Work**    Students are expected to adhere to the standards of practice for social workers in Wisconsin during the field experience and should familiarize themselves with the NASW Code of Ethics and MPSW 20 of the Wisconsin State Statutes. Activities that interfere with field or class work can include aggression, threats, legal infractions, or ethical violations. If the ability to participate in field is limited by legal or ethical situations, termination of the field placement may occur. If termination occurs due to legal issues, the program reserves the right to withhold any future field arrangements until resolved. The guidelines established with the caregiver background check may  determine courses of action in any such situations. Students have the right to appeal any decisions and/or consequences set forth by the MSW program. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program’s field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for **supporting student safety** across all program options. |

**Policies for Supporting Student Safety**

Discussion of safety in field settings is addressed in the MSW Student Handbook, [page 65](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Safety) and is as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **Safety in the Field**    The Social Work Professional Programs takes student safety very seriously. Best practices to ensure safety are presented in orientation, advising, and field-related courses. The Program asks partnering agencies to address safety with their interns. In addition, students entering field placements are encouraged to become familiar with agency policy and procedures relative to safety in the field setting. Certain placements may require more extensive training beyond that which the students have had in their regular course work. In general, students and Agency Field Instructors should discuss practices regarding any safety issues that are particularly relevant to the population served, discuss safety regarding home visits, travel, and any health precautions that may be necessary for the setting. Students should use consultation and supervision opportunities to discuss any safety concerns**.** |

Students who are expected to drive while in the field setting complete University paperwork to guarantee liability coverage. Policy is outlines on page 66 of the MSW Student Handbook:

|  |
| --- |
| During the preliminary field placement interview, students are encouraged to discuss the use of a vehicle in their field duties with the Agency Field Instructor. Appropriate forms for driving in the field must be completed and approved for each academic year the student is in placement. Students can access the application on-line using the following link:  <http://www.uwgb.edu/risk-management/operation-of-vehicle-on-university-business/driver-authorization> . All paperwork needs to be submitted and approved before a student uses a personal vehicle in the field placement. The UW-Green Bay Risk Manager will notify students of approval to drive under University liability. All approved drivers should be aware of the following:   * Student’s personal automobile insurance is primary over State coverage; * Students transporting clients or conducting agency business must maintain personal automobile insurance with current State of Wisconsin limits as the minimum; current minimums are $100,000/300,000. * The State will only provide excess coverage to drivers when they are using their personal vehicles on official University business. Official University business means undertaking field tasks at the request or direction of field personnel, which is common social work practice. Driving to and from the field agency is not considered University business.   Students who choose not to complete the necessary form(s) related to use of a vehicle assume complete liability for any situation that results in the use of their automobile in the line of university-related duty. Students are asked to discuss this with their field agency supervisor at the onset of the field placement. The MSW program encourages students who do not complete this form to refrain from using their vehicles to transport clients or to conduct ANY other type of  ‘agency' business which involves the use of a vehicle in the field placement.  Note: It is illegal for a student in the state of Wisconsin who does not hold a valid driver’s license to operate a vehicle even if the student completes the necessary driving forms(s) described above. Any new traffic citations should be reported to the risk management office for re-evaluation of driving status. |

**Safety of personal information**

Policies within the MSW Student Handbook recognize field as FERPA protected and is outlined in the confidentiality policy (pp. 65-66).

|  |
| --- |
| **Confidentiality**    Any information regarding the student’s performance in field is to be kept confidential among the educational partners (Field Instructor, Faculty Field Liaison, MSW Field and Program Coordinators, and faculty) and is not to be released to those outside the agency or university without the written permission of the student. For further information see: [https://www.uwgb.edu/ferpa/](https://www.uwgb.edu/ferpa/%20%20)    Regarding student records, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act regulate access to individual student academic records. Under this law, students have the right of access to their files and must give written consent before any material in the student file can be released to anyone other than faculty. Please see the Policies section of this handbook for more detailed information. During the field placement process, submission of the field application authorizes the University to share information pertinent to the referral for placement with field agencies.  Regarding client records, students should have access to client files and other agency records only insofar as access is related to the established student learning objectives. While in the field agency, students must become familiar with and abide by the rules of confidentiality and associated privacy regulations per agency policy. The NASW Code of Ethics serves as an additional resource regarding confidentiality and privacy. |

Policies were also created to address use of personal cell phones in field (p. 67) as well as social media (p. 44). While the social media policy is not unique to field, the policy outlines the connection to boundaries and professional conduct by students, all of which are associated with personal safety.

|  |
| --- |
| **Use of Personal Cell Phones in Field**    Occasionally, social work students are asked to use their personal cell phones to conduct business for their field agency. This request may range from minimal use to significant use including, but not limited to, the following examples:   * Communications with other agencies or professionals * Scheduling appointments with clients * Providing clients with their personal cell phone number   It is the opinion of the Social Work Professional Programs that students should not, or be expected to, use their personal cell phones for agency business as it places them at risk for boundary crossings. Furthermore, there is no certainty of protection of privacy/confidentiality for the client or the student when personal cell phones are used for client contact. However, the Program also supports students' rights to make their own decisions regarding personal cell phone use providing they follow agency policies and professional codes of conduct.  Agencies are asked to apprise the social work field coordinators if personal cell phone use is a requirement for placement in their agency so students are aware of the expectation before placements are finalized.  If students are asked to use their personal cell phones for agency business, the agency should provide options that protect the students’ personal boundaries. This could include: blocked numbers, apps that allow for transfer numbers, generic voice mail messages, and reimbursement for data overages incurred as a result of agency use. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Social Media Policy**    Social media offers many opportunities to share information and dialogue with others. While there are many benefits of using social media venues, there can also be negative effects and consequences when basic behavioral and ethical guidelines are violated or ignored. As representatives of the social work profession, students in the MSW program are expected to engage in professional behavior when interacting on social media sites such as, but not limited to, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, MySpace, LinkedIn, or Flickr. Whether social networking interactions take place with classmates, colleagues, field agency personnel or others, students must interact in a courteous, respectful and professional manner in all online communications and postings. In so doing, students are advised to consider how their “online presence” reflects not only themselves as social work professionals, but the MSW program, the University, and the community agencies that host them in their field internship sites.  The MSW program expects students to adhere to the standards and ethics of the profession as outlined in the NASW Code of Ethics in all their social networking interactions. Areas of the Code of Ethics which commonly pose ethical challenges and to which students should pay careful attention, include confidentiality and privacy, informed consent, dual relationships, documentation, and conflict of interest. For example, sharing personal or confidential information about classmates, clients, or program faculty is inappropriate and in violation of the Code of Ethics. Accordingly, online relationships on social media sites with clients, faculty, or field practicum instructors may be inappropriate due to potential boundary concerns or conflicts  of interest that may emerge. Derogatory language in social work documentation is also inappropriate and in violation of the Code.  Students are encouraged to inquire about field agency policies on social media with their Agency Field Instructor, comply with these policies, and encourage agencies to develop such policies if none exist. They are encouraged to meet with their MSW Program Faculty Advisor or seek out another faculty member if they have questions about the appropriate use of social media.    The MSW program takes concerns about professional conduct by students on social media sites very seriously. If issues arise related to student behavior in the use of social media while in the MSW program, the program’s non-academic performance standards apply. For further reflection regarding challenges inherent in the use of social media and social work practice, please see Dr. Frederick Reamer’s article, “Eye on Ethics: Developing a Social Media Ethics Policy” at  <http://www.socialworktoday.com/news/eoe_070111.shtml>. |

**Procedures for Supporting Student Safety**

Safety in the field is discussed with students and agency field instructors during the fall orientation to field, including an emphasis that students and field instructors dialogue about safety considerations that may be specific to their practice setting. In addition, students are encouraged to present any concerns to agency field instructors as well as faculty field liaisons throughout the practicum. If issues of safety become a concern during the field practicum, faculty field instructors work directly with the field agency to discuss additional strategies for student safety.

In addition to practices which support student safety, students are covered by the University’s liability policy should it be needed.

|  |
| --- |
| **Liability Insurance**    Students are considered agents of the University when participating in field programs that are part of a credit course or required for degree completion. Therefore, the University of Wisconsin liability insurance protects students and their field agencies in the case of negligence or malpractice suits related to the MSW students’ fieldwork in the agency. The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay is currently protected for liability arising out of the negligent actions of its employees, agents and officers through the State Self-funded Liability Program administered by the Department of Administration under State Statutes 893.82 and 895.46. The State will indemnify University employees, officers, and agents against liability for damages arising out of  their activity while acting within the scope of their respective employment or agency. The insurance is in effect throughout each academic semester.  Additionally, National Association of Social Workers Assurance Services provides liability coverage against claims related to professional education for NASW members. Students may purchase this coverage for nominal costs if they are enrolled in a Council on Social Work Education accredited social work degree program and if they are members of NASW. Students interested in learning more about this insurance can contact the Assurance Services at (855) 385-2160 or through the website at: http://www.naswassurance.org/. |

**Criteria for Supporting Student Safety**

Student safety is reinforced through the Student Placement/Agency Liability Coverage Confirmation form and fall field orientation. Students are ineligible to begin field until the Student Placement/Agency Liability Coverage Confirmation forms are completed and submitted, and fall orientation is completed.

If student wellness is impeding progress in field, the Faculty Field Liaison and/or Field Instructor will work with the student and consult with the MSW Field Coordinator and the MSW Program Coordinator, as needed. Should challenges rise to the level of not meeting non-academic retention standards, resulting in a comprise of safety in the field, the student and/or Agency Request for Termination of Placement policies will be followed.

Finally, the MSW Program frequently encourages students to engage with campus resources including the Wellness Center, which provides counselling as well as the self-paced mental health resource SilverCloud. UW-Green Bay’s Dean of Students Office and Phoenix Cares program also provide supportive resources such as student advocacy, case management, childcare grants, and emergency grants to help students address financial challenges that may impact their studies, such as housing insecurity, food insecurity, transportation challenges, and other unexpected costs. Students can access any of these resources on the University website, and Faculty Field Liaisons are aware of these resources and refer students to them as appropriate.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program’s field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for **evaluating student learning** congruent with the social work competencies, including any additional competencies added by the program across all program options. |

**Policies for Evaluating Student Learning**

All students in the field setting complete a learning contract which is used for evaluation of student learning at completion of semester and placement. Policy as outlined in the MSW Student Handbook ([p.66)](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Learning_Contract) is outlined as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Agreement/Contract**    The parties involved in the field education process include the student, Agency Field Instructor or Faculty Field Instructor, Faculty Field Liaison, MSW Field Coordinator, and the Faculty Advisor.  The MSW program is responsible for providing agencies with the necessary information and training to foster the necessary structure and support for optimum student learning. The learning contract and field evaluation are used to document field hours and assess student learning in the field. The learning contract is developed at the beginning of the field placement, is redeveloped at the beginning of the spring semester, and should be reviewed periodically by the student to ensure that progress toward each competency is occurring. The field evaluation is completed at  the end of each semester by the student, Agency Field Instructor, and Faculty Field Liaison. The process for developing the learning contract and evaluating student progress in field is as follows:     * At the beginning of the placement, students work with their Agency Field Instructor to identify activities that will help them meet the nine competencies and corresponding behaviors. These activities, written as goals, are the basis for the learning contract. In the Specialized placement, learning goals should focus on the student’s area of emphasis, as applicable. * Early in the semester, the Faculty Field Liaison arranges a meeting with the student and Agency Field Instructor to review the goals and activities, making suggestions as appropriate. * Students should meet weekly with their Agency Field Instructor to discuss learning needs and progress toward the goals identified in the learning contract. * In the middle of each semester, the Faculty Field Liaison contacts the Agency Field Instructor for a mid-term progress report. This report is usually conducted electronically or via telephone but can occur in person if deemed necessary. * At the end of the first semester, the student and Agency Field Instructor evaluate the student’s progress toward mastery of the competencies. With input from the student and Agency Field Instructor, the Faculty Field Liaison records and maintains the official evaluation tool. * At the beginning of the spring semester, the student and Agency Field Instructor redevelop the learning contract to ensure the student is completing the necessary activities to master the nine competencies. * If a student receives less than satisfactory feedback from the Agency Field Instructor or Faculty Field Liaison, at any point during the placement, a practicum improvement plan will be developed and implemented. * At the end of the placement, a final on-site meeting is held during which the student demonstrates mastery of the competencies and provides proof that the contracted number of field hours were completed in order to successfully pass the field component of the curriculum. |

**Procedures for Evaluating Student Learning**

As noted in the policy listed above, a mid-term evaluation of progress, as well as an end-of-semester evaluation, occurs throughout the practicum. Input into the evaluation is gathered from the student, agency field instructor and faculty field instructor (if one is assigned). Completion of the evaluation and assignment of a grade is the responsibility of the faculty field liaison.

**Criteria for Evaluating Student Learning**

The student Learning Plan is the basis of evaluation of learning in the field setting. Students must demonstrate proficiency in the competencies as demonstrated by the behaviors upon completion of the field placement to pass their field course. Learning plan is located with the embedded assessment assignment rubrics. (See [Generalist Learning Plan](#Field_Learning_Contract) and [Specialized Learning Plan](#Field_Learning_Contract_Specialized))

In addition to the learning plan, students complete logs of their field experience and submit progress reports or self-assessments throughout the field practicum. These documents, along student contributions in Seminar discussions, help to inform the final evaluation of student learning.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program’s field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for **evaluating field-setting effectiveness** congruent with the social work competencies, including any additional competencies added by the program across all program options. |

**Policies for Evaluating Field Setting Effectiveness**

At the end of the academic year, students complete an evaluation of the field setting. Results are reviewed by the MSW Field Coordinator, Program’s Research and Evaluation Committee, and the social work faculty. Policy for evaluation of effectiveness is outlined in the Program Evaluation section of the MSW Student Handbook ([p. 70](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Program_Evaluation)).

|  |
| --- |
| **PROGRAM EVALUATION**    At the completion of the field placement, both students and Agency Field Instructors are asked to evaluate the field placement process. Just prior to the end of the field placement, surveys are electronically distributed to Agency Field Instructors and anonymously compiled by the MSW Field Coordinator. Identifying information is requested solely for purposes of tracking. Students follow a similar format. Results of the field evaluations are included in the annual program evaluation report and highly considered when adjusting the field process. |

**Procedures for Evaluating Field Setting Effectiveness**

Field setting effectiveness is monitored throughout the placement for each student. Students are encouraged to discuss any concerns about the placement with their faculty field instructor and steps are taken to remedy issues upon identification. Such issues can include areas where competency development is not being addressed, challenges with placement activities and/or agency-specific concerns.

As noted above student evaluation of their field experience is completed at the conclusion of the academic year.

In addition, the field committee meeting, consisting of MSW field coordinator and all faculty teaching field courses, meets a minimum of twice each year to discuss field settings. At that meeting, specific challenges are identified and considered prior to utilizing the placement in future years. The field committee also discusses unique qualities or skills that students might need to be successful in certain agencies; for example, ability to speak Spanish; high level of flexibility; ability to drive during field practicum hours, etc.

**Criteria for Evaluating Field Setting Effectiveness**

Field setting effectiveness is evaluated in accordance with the components identified in Standard 2.2.7 above. Of primary consideration are the agency’s ability to provide opportunities to meet the learning needs of students in the placement, the ability to effectively supervise students, and a demonstrated commitment to student learning.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 2.2.8:The program describes how its field education program maintains contact with field settings across all program options. The program explains how on-site contact or other methods are used to monitor student learning and field setting effectiveness. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program’s field education program maintains contact with field settings across all program options |

Contact with field settings occurs in differing capacities throughout the year. Annually in spring, a query for possibility of student placements occurs.

With placement of students, communication occurs through the MSW Field Coordinator for completion of a placement agreement, orientation to program expectations, and discussion of field agency needs and requirements.

During the practicum, the faculty instructors meet with the agency field instructors meet in-person, virtually, or by phone or via email with the agency field instructors at least twice in the semester. These instructors are available throughout the placement to discuss any concerns relative to student participation, skill development, or competency development.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how on-site contact or other methods are used to monitor student learning and field setting effectiveness across all program options. |

The initial meeting of faculty field instructors and agency field instructors revolves around development of the student learning plan. Evaluative meetings are held at the end of each semester and written feedback is solicited at mid-semester. As noted in the policy outlined on [page 66](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Learning_Contract) of the MSW Student Handbook, portions related to onsite contact include:

|  |
| --- |
| * Early in the semester, the Faculty Field Liaison arranges a meeting with the student and Agency Field Instructor to review the goals and activities, making suggestions as appropriate.      * In the middle of each semester, the Faculty Field Liaison contacts the Agency Field Instructor for a mid-term progress report. This report is usually conducted electronically or via telephone but can occur in person if deemed necessary. * At the end of the first semester, the student and Agency Field Instructor evaluate the student’s progress toward mastery of the competencies. With input from the student and Agency Field Instructor, the Faculty Field Liaison records and maintains the official evaluation tool. * At the beginning of the spring semester, the student and Agency Field Instructor redevelop the learning contract to ensure the student is completing the necessary activities to master the nine competencies. * If a student receives less than satisfactory feedback from the Agency Field Instructor or Faculty Field Liaison, at any point during the placement, a practicum improvement plan will be developed and implemented. * At the end of the placement, a final on-site meeting is held during which the student demonstrates mastery of the competencies and provides proof that the contracted number of field hours were completed in order to successfully pass the field component of the curriculum. |

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M2.2.9:The program describes how its field education program specifies the credentials and practice experience of its field instructors necessary to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program social work competencies. Field instructors for master’s students hold a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-master’s social work practice experience. For cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited social work degree or does not have the required experience, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program’s field education program specifies the credentials and practice experience of its field instructors necessary to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program social work competencies across all program options. |

Every effort is made to obtain supervision in the agency by an MSW practitioner with two years post-MSW practice experience. For those field sites providing learning opportunities beneficial to student learning but without the required credential, the Program ensures support for social work perspectives through the assignment of a Faculty Field Instructor (FFI). This FFI may be either the FFL or an additional faculty member, depending on the student situation.

Policy is outlined on [page 70](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Credentials) of the MSW Student Handbook:

|  |
| --- |
| Credentials   * The Council on Social Work Education requires that Agency Field Instructors must have an MSW degree from a Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) accredited program and at least two years of post MSW professional practice experience. * Field Instructors with less than two years post MSW practice experience will be offered consultation and support from the MSW Field Coordinator and MSW Faculty in their role as Agency Field Instructors.   Exceptions to the general standards for Agency Field Instructors are considered on a case-by-case basis. In making these exceptions, the following criteria are considered: highly experienced agency practitioners who understand the philosophical underpinnings of social work and the role(s) it has among the helping professions, agencies located in hard-to-reach regions, unique practice settings, and extenuating student circumstances. In situations where the Agency Field Instructor does not hold an approved MSW degree, a qualified faculty member or community practitioner with the required credentials will assume the role of Field Instructor to provide  instructional support and supervision to both the student, and when needed, the Agency Field Instructor. Students involved in placements without an MSW level Field Instructor can expect to have additional supervision discussions with the faculty or community member agreeing to accept responsibility as Field Instructor. The Agency Field Instructor who agrees to provide supervision of the MSW student must accept the responsibilities for field instruction as outlined in the Roles and Responsibilities of Agency Field Instructors discussed earlier in this section. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates that field instructors for master’s students across all program options hold a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-master’s social work degree practice experience in social work. |

During the field query process, the agency is asked to identify who will be the Agency Field Instructor as well as the credentials for that individual. As responses to the query are added to the database, the qualifications of the proposed supervisor are verified and documented. Prospective field instructors are expected to have an MSW and two years practice experience. When that is not the case, a faculty member provides supplementary support for social work competencies.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates that for cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited master’s social work degree or does not have the required experience, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective across all program options. |

Upon completion of the field placement process, FFI are provided with the names of students in their section who require supplementary supervision. FFI then develop a plan to ensure students are offered the additional reinforcement of social work perspective beyond that offered all students in the field/seminar course section.

Role of the Faculty Field Instructor is outlined in the *MSW Student Handbook* ([p. 14](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#FFI)).

|  |
| --- |
| **Role of Faculty Field Instructor**    When the field placement offers appropriate learning opportunities for students in a social work setting, but the agency lacks a qualified MSW-prepared staff member, a faculty member will assume the role of Faculty Field Instructor (FFI) and work with the student and the Faculty Field Liaison (FFL) to ensure that a social work perspective is presented during the field placement.    The Faculty Field Instructor will provide individual or group supervision above and beyond what other students receive from their Agency Field Instructor, via the following responsibilities:   * Review student learning contract, logs, and progress toward learning objectives throughout the practicum. * Provide additional support in the understanding of the social work competencies and development of the learning plan. * Consult with the student on a monthly basis, in real or virtual space (asynchronously or synchronously, to reinforce the understanding of social work practice principles and assist in the integration of these principles within the practice setting. * Communicate with the Faculty Field Liaison for any student situations that require additional attention as needed. * Provide input into the evaluation of student progress at the end of each semester. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the social work perspective is reinforced in such cases across all program options. |

During the 2021-2022 academic year, the process was revised in how supplemental supervision to students lacking a qualified AFI was provided. Prior to the revision, an additional faculty member was assigned to review student learning plan and field logs, communicated regularly with students, and provide input in the evaluation process. The Program found this process to create boundary challenges and confusion for students in terms of course requirements vs. additional support. Full faculty decided that for the 2022-2023 academic year and going forward, the Faculty Field Instructor responsibilities could be completed by the Faculty Field Liaison (instructor of the field and seminar course sequence). The FFL is responsible to provide additional support beyond that offered all students in the course. The nature of that extra support and how that is conducted is up to the discretion of the faculty member, based on student circumstances and need. In situations where it is determined that more support is needed, due to concerns of student need or agency complexities, an additional faculty member complete FFI responsibilities.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 2.2.10:The program describes how its field education program provides orientation, field instruction training, and continuing dialog with field education settings and field instructors. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program’s field education program provides orientation, field instruction training, and continuing dialog with field education settings and field instructors across all program options. |

**Orientation**

Orientation to field begins during the selection of field site process when agencies are provided the parameters for being a field site, including supervision requirements and suggested learning activities. At that time, information on the Program’s process and expectations is outlined. (See Standard 2.2.7(1)).

At the start of the fall semester, all Agency Field Instructors (AFI), Students and Faculty Field Liaisons (FFL) are invited to a joint orientation session. This orientation reviews competencies, learning agreements/contracts, structure, and responsibilities within the field placement. As part of the orientation, the site visit process is explained, and Agency Field Instructors are provided the opportunity to meet with Faculty teaching the field and seminar sequence who explain the process of field monitoring, academic requirements, and interface with the field setting.

**Field Instruction Training**

In addition to the orientation to field, when Faculty Field Liaisons conduct field meetings at the initiation of the field practicum, general requirements of field are reinforced and learning opportunities are specifically identified to develop competency for each behavior outlined in the learning plan.

In addition to training on the particulars of field supervision, field instructors are invited to attend a complimentary spring workshop on a relevant social work topic. Every other year the topic of workshops is social work ethics and boundaries. Alternatively, topics which highlight emerging issues and best practice in the field are offered.

**Continuing Dialogue with Field Settings and Field Instructors**

All students in field placements are concurrently enrolled in field seminar. Seminar/Field Faculty provide ongoing dialogue with field instructors, including the Program’s planned contacts (orientation, development of learning plan, mid-term assessment, and completion of the final field meetings of the semester).

In addition to student-specific communications, the MSW Field Coordinator regularly communicates with agencies about significant programmatic updates. The MSW Field Coordinator is available for consultation on any policy of the field program. As part of the Program’s assessment plan, at the completion of the academic year, the MSW Field Coordinator disseminates an anonymous survey to Agency Field Instructors allowing them an additional opportunity to present feedback on the field placement process and any recommendations for improvement.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 2.2.11:The program describes how its field education program develops policies regarding field placements in an organization in which the student is also employed. To ensure the role of student as learner, student assignments and field education supervision are not the same as those of the student’s employment. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the field education program develops policies regarding field placements in an organization in which the student is also employed across all program options. |

Student placement in their work settings is allowed, but not encouraged. Students are informed of the challenges inherent in worksite placements prior to taking any steps to finalize a Worksite Placement. The specific policy is outlined on [pages 61-62](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Workplace_Sites) of the *MSW Program Handbook*.

|  |
| --- |
| **Workplace Field Sites**    According to requirements of the Council on Social Work Education, field education is a learning opportunity and, as such, should provide activities and responsibilities that differ from employment. Students are strongly encouraged to consider field placements other than their employment settings. In the rare circumstances when a workplace field placement is approved, the agency must meet the same approval criteria established for all other agencies. In addition, there must be a compelling reason why the employment-based placement is the best option to meet the learning needs of the student. In accordance with the NASW Code of Ethics, potential  issues involving boundaries and conflicts of interest may occur when there is an ongoing (or previous) relationship with an employer. Students desiring a field placement at their work site must complete the Student Request and Agency Agreement for a Work Site Field Placement.  The MSW Field Coordinator must be involved in discussions related to concurrent field education in the agency of employment. For a concurrent placement to be approved, a written agreement must be developed which includes the following elements:   * The student in the same agency shall count field practicum hours within the student’s placement agency independently from any paid employment hours. * Assignments for field must differ from those associated with the paid work assignments. * Assignments for field must be educationally focused toward the learning needs of the student and the curricular objectives of the program, i.e. facilitate student accomplishment of program competencies. * Supervision must be provided by an MSW that is not concurrently providing supervision for the paid work and that Agency Field Instructor must be a member of the agency staff. * The agency should provide the required release time so that the student can accomplish course work and field instruction.   The appropriate agency personnel must complete and sign a Student Request and Agency Agreement for a Work Site Field Placement.  Occasionally, students are offered paid employment at their field agency before the end of their internship. The protocol for worksite placement applies to these situations and must be followed as described above. Additionally, students must follow the guidelines for completing their field practicum in that hours must be evenly spaced throughout the semester and cannot be ended early. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how assignments and field education supervision are not the same as those of the student’s employment across all program options. |

**Ensuring Separate Assignments from Employment**

In completion of the Worksite Field Placement paperwork, students and agencies outline existing work responsibilities and proposed learning to be attained during the field placement. The applicability of the proposal to competency development and mastery of expected behaviors is assessed by the MSW Field Coordinator prior to approval of the Worksite Placement.

At times, agencies wish to employ students prior to the completion of the field placement experience. If the request is made, the student must work with the agency to complete the Worksite Field Placement paperwork and the process as outlined in (1) above.

**Ensuring Separate Supervision from Employment:**

As noted in the policy, separate supervision between employment and student learning experience is expected. In the Worksite Placement application, agency supervisor(s) outline how this differentiation of supervision is expected to be completed. Signatures obtained on the form signify a contract for the placement criteria.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

# Accreditation Standard 3.0 — Diversity

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.0.1:The program describes the specific and continuous efforts it makes to provide a learning environment that models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the specific and continuous efforts the program makes to provide a learning environment that models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference across all program options. |

**Diversity in the Implicit Curriculum:**

*“The program’s expectation for diversity is reflected in its learning environment, which provides the context through which students learn about differences, to value and respect diversity, and develop a commitment to cultural humility. The dimensions of diversity are understood as the intersectionality of multiple factors including but not limited to age, class, color, culture, disability and ability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, marital status, political ideology, race, religion/spirituality, sex, sexual orientation, and tribal sovereign status. The learning environment consists of the program’s institutional setting; selection of field education settings and their clientele; composition of program advisory or field committees; educational and social resources; resource allocation; program leadership; speaker series, seminars, and special programs; support groups; research and other initiatives; and the demographic make-up of its faculty, staff, and student body.” (EP 3.0, 2015 EPAS)*

**Implicit Curriculum Efforts:**

In line with expectations for competence outlined in the National Association of Social Workers’[[6]](#footnote-7) *Code of Ethics*, Program faculty assume that development of respect for and understanding of diversity requires **on-going learning**, **critical self-examination**, **non-discriminatory actions**, and **advocacy efforts**. As a part of the larger University environment, the Social Work Program engages with the University’s initiatives. These four areas are embedded into discussion of the components of the learning environment, below.

***Program’s Institutional Setting***

The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay’s recognition of the importance of an understanding of diversity for students is indicated by its inclusion in the University’s mission statement: “The culture and vision of the University reflect a deep commitment to diversity, inclusion, social justice, civic engagement, and educational opportunity at all levels.” This commitment is reflected in five key, university-wide initiatives implemented since the last self-study, as well as the rich extracurricular offerings and community-wide resources and programs. Each is described below.

The first initiative is the development of the university’s **Inclusivity & Equity Certificate Program** (**on-going learning** and **advocacy efforts**), which launched in spring of 2014. The program is “designed to develop and recognize commitment to the UW-Green Bay Inclusive Excellence initiative…and consists of a combination of professional development, self-study and community service.”[[7]](#footnote-8) Since its inception, over 50 university faculty and staff have completed at least one of the two levels, including five Social Work faculty (Groessl, Rhee, Schanen-Materi, Trimberger, and Warren).

The second is the adoption of a campus **Civility and Inclusivity Statement**[[8]](#footnote-9) (**non-discriminatory actions**) in 2017. It states, in part:

As campus community members, we are responsible for our behaviors and are fully accountable for our actions. We must each take responsibility for our awareness of discrimination and its many forms (i.e., racism, sexism, ageism, xenophobia, transphobia, homophobia, etc.). The concept of campus civility and inclusiveness can be demonstrated in hallways, classrooms, student housing, and the workplace environment.

Next, UWGB adopted a **Land Acknowledgement** (**critical self-examination**) in 2018 to “acknowledge past, present, and future relationships with Indigenous communities across the state.”[[9]](#footnote-10) It reads:

We at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay acknowledge the First Nations people who are the original inhabitants of the region. The Ho-Chunk Nation and the Menominee Nation are the original First People of Wisconsin and both Nations have ancient historical and spiritual connections to the land that our institution now resides upon.  
  
Today, Wisconsin is home to 12 First Nations communities including the Oneida Nation of Wisconsin, Forest County Potawatomi, Ojibwe Nation communities, Stockbridge-Munsee Community Band of Mohican Indians, and the Brothertown Indian Nation.

We acknowledge the First Nations Peoples of Wisconsin.

The fourth initiative was the creation of the **Council for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI)** (**on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**) in fall of 2020. Charged with, “support[ing] a community devoted to diversity/inclusivity of thought and experience”[[10]](#footnote-11) it provides advice and recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for University Inclusivity & Student Affairs. The Council established four strategic goals/objectives for 2020-2023:[[11]](#footnote-12)

1. Increase and enhance the recruitment and retention of a diverse employee population at the UW-Green Bay.
2. Facilitate professional development on equity, diversity, and inclusion for staff and faculty.
3. Develop intentional programming, structured interactions with community partners, and curricular recommendations to support learning and growth around equity, diversity, and inclusion for current and future students.
4. Increase the enrollment of under-represented learners at UW-Green Bay.
5. Reduce equity gaps in retention of racially minoritized and low-income degree and non-degree seeking students through research-based, data driven initiatives.
6. Increase engagement with community members/groups in areas related to inclusivity and equity.

The work toward these ambitious goals is ongoing. To date, the university has not published any information on the progress or initial outcomes of the work.

The fifth initiative, the development of a team of**Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion (EDI) Consultants**,[[12]](#footnote-13) (**on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**) was implemented in fall of 2021 to “align our actions more closely with our stated mission by providing tangible resources and expertise specific to diversity, equity, and inclusion in our academic programs and colleges.” Each of the four colleges has an internal consultant, and the campus as a whole has four additional consultants who provide expertise in: culturally responsive/sustaining pedagogy, universal design, open education resources, and supporting equity in gateway and introductory courses. Consultants are available for individual meetings with instructors and provide educational development opportunities for the campus. The EDI Consultant for the College of Health, Education, and Social Welfare is social work faculty member Dr. Cary Waubanascum.

Further supporting the mission, the University provides a rich, inclusive environment for students and employees. Included are curricular efforts, institutional supports and resources, student organizations, and a wide range of special activities and celebrations with diversity as their focus. Offerings in each area are noted in Table 3.1, below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1:**  **Institutional Setting** | |
| **University Arena** | **University Efforts** |
| Curricular Efforts (**on-going learning**) | * Ed.D. in First Nations Studies * First Nations Studies Major/Minor * Women & Gender Studies Minor * Women’s and Gender Studies Emphasis in Democracy and Justice Studies (DJS) Major * World Cultures Emphasis in Humanities Major * Religious Studies and World Cultures Emphases in Humanities Minor * Global Studies Minor * International Business Minor * Majors in French, German, and Spanish & Latin American Studies * Certificate in LGBTQ+ Studies |
| Institutional Supports and Resources (**on-going learning, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**) | Student Services:   * Academic Success Coaches * BIPOC Rise * First Nations Student Success Coordinator * Gateways to Phoenix Success (GPS) Program * Office of International Education * Office of Multi-Ethnic Student Affairs (MESA)   + Peer Mentoring Program   + Jump Start Program for First-Year Students   + Authentic Me Program   + Monitored Academic Progress Program * Office of Student Accessibility Services (formerly Office of Disability Services) * Pride Center (LGBTQ+ Resource Center) * The Learning Center * Wellness Center (formerly Counselling and Health Center) * TRIO and Precollege Programs * Veteran’s Services   Employee Resources:   * Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL)   + Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Teaching Consultants * Employee Resource Groups: Ethnically Diverse Group of Employees (EDGE), Group for International Employee Support (GIES), Pride Center, Veterans and Woman’s Leadership Network Employee Resource Groups * Inclusivity & Equity Certificate Program   Student & Employee Resources   * Campus Cupboard & Clothes Closet * College of Health, Education, and Social Welfare’s listing of diversity resources[[13]](#footnote-14) * Diversity Task Force * Richard Mauthe Center for Faith, Spirituality, and Social Justice * Web listing of diversity events and entertainment[[14]](#footnote-15) * Wellness Committee   Specialty Centers   * Education Center for First Nations Studies * Center for Middle East Studies and Partnerships * Hmong Studies Center * Gerontology Center   Initiatives   * Phuture Phoenix Program |
| Student Organizations (**on-going learning, critical self-examination,** and **advocacy efforts**) | * Multicultural Clubs: Black Student Union, Multiracial Student Union, Muslim Student Association, Organización Latino Americana, Somali Student Union, South Asian Student Alliance Southeast Asian Student Union, Intertribal Student Council, Women of Color * Psi Theta Nu all gender inclusive sorority, Sexuality and Gender Alliance * Social Justice Club (formerly the Social Work Club) * Women in Engineering Club * Three International Clubs * Four Faith-Based Clubs * Numerous political and service clubs |
| Diversity-Themed Events & Celebrations (2019-2020[[15]](#footnote-16)) (**on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**) | * Black History Month events * Women’s History Month events * Day of Silence events * International Women’s Day luncheon and speakers * Safe Ally Trainings for Faculty, Staff, and Students * Kwanzaa Celebration * Soul Food Dinner * International Dinner * Cinco De Mayo-Spanish Tertulia (conversation table) * *And So We Walked Together: An Artist’s Journey Along the Trail of Tears*; live performances and community engagement programs with author DeLanna Studi * *Waking up white and finding myself in the story of race* Community Book Read with author Debby Irving * “Black in the Bay” panel discussion with Black professionals * Pride Center Open House * *Harriet* Film Screening and Discussion * “Diversity Discovery Free Day” educating students and their families about local diversity nonprofit and community organizations * “Makin’ Cake Performance & Cake Reception with Dasha Kelly,” a community conversation on culture, class, and race * SAFE Ally-Level 1 & Level II trainings * Intergenerational Series Parts 1 & 2, panel presentation with retired community members and small group discussions * *The Last Black Man in San Francisco* film screening and discussion * “(M)iyamoto is Black Enough”performance of poetry and musical compositions. * “Let’s Talk: Events with Comforting Coffee” Black History Month discussion. * Wisconsin Statewide Pre-Law Diversity Conference & Law Fair * Inclusive Excellence Certificate Program Level 2 (Advocate) * Inclusivity and Equity Foundations Training for Student Leaders * Additionally, a number of events scheduled for the second-half of the spring semester were canceled due to the COVID pandemic:   + All Campus Roundtable Campus Climate Discussion   + Dolores Huerta & Cesar Chavez Day of Service   + *Your Heart is the Size of Your Fist: A Doctor Reflects on Ten Years at a Refugee Clinic* common book read and discussion   + Annual Lavender Graduation   + Hosting of *Toward One Wisconsin* Conference |

***Selection of Field Education Settings and Their Clientele*** (**on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**)

MSW students are placed in a wide variety of practice settings. Guided by personal student learning goals, the MSW Field Coordinator strives to place students in both “traditional” social work settings as well as culturally specific, new and/or creative settings that may benefit from social work perspective, such as culturally specific agencies, grassroots organizations, criminal justice settings, and public health programs.

The MSW Program places students in a variety of culturally specific or culturally focused field agencies. Some examples include We All Rise African American Resource Center, Wise Women Gathering Place (serving primarily Native American children and families), Oskeh-Wapeqtah (the domestic violence program for the Menominee Indian Reservation), and the Howe Resource Center (serving a heavily Latinx population in Green Bay). Many students are placed within Green Bay and the city’s demographics naturally create highly racially diverse settings in many other agencies such as after school programs, shelters, and mental health programs. Some students prioritize working within their own communities and others may seek an opportunity to be immersed in a different culture, and these partnerships with culturally specific agencies and agencies serving diverse populations allow the MSW Program to offer such opportunities.

In addition to being exposed to racially diverse clients, the Program also places students in other diverse placements. For example, each year a number of students complete internships with the campus’ Pride Center and in Aging and Disability Resource Centers across the region.

In the past five years, several students have performed the majority of their internship in a language other than English, due to a match between their own language skills and the population being served by an agency. One student provided parent education in Spanish. Another led a Hmong support group for survivors of domestic violence. Other students have provided case management services in a variety of settings, in Spanish. Such students have shared thoughtful reflections about what it is like to provide social work services in their first language, noting the impact on intimacy and boundaries. The annual field query asks whether a language besides English is required to complete practicum duties, so that agencies may request this skill, and students may seek an agency where they will get to utilize this skill.

The MSW Program also seeks to place students in agencies where social workers may not typically be found, such as in criminal justice and public health settings. Students in criminal justice settings often reflect upon the challenge of feeling isolated in an interdisciplinary setting. However, observing a different paradigm often makes their social work perspective more tangible to them as they grow in confidence and their sense of professional identity. In public health settings, students often practice case management, community awareness-raising, and program development.

Ultimately, all students are exposed to different dimensions of diversity. The faculty embrace a holistic definition of diversity that includes race and ethnicity, as well as gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomics, mental and physical health, ability, age, and unique lived experiences. Faculty field liaisons facilitate conversation regarding dimensions of diversity likely to be encountered in the field setting during field meetings and encourage students to engage in thoughtful reflection during field seminar, logs, and self-assessments.

In any field agency, the MSW Field Coordinator takes steps, outlined in the field portion of this self-study (see [Faculty Field Instructors)](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#FFI), to ensure practice opportunities at all systems levels are available. If a social worker is not present on staff, the MSW Field Coordinator will work with the Social Work Program Chair to ensure a faculty field instructor is assigned to support student learning.

***Composition of Program Advisory Committee*** (**on-going learning, critical self-examination,** and **non-discriminatory actions**)

Until Fall of 2015, Social Work maintained separate Program Advisory Committees for the BSW and MSW Programs. The Committees were merged into one if Fall of 2015, which corresponded with the beginning of our solo MSW Program, based on the recommendation of Advisory Committee members.

At that same time, the Program presented an idea to the Committee about creating an external committee focused on assisting the Program with issues of diversity and inclusivity. Advisory Committee members asked that such a committee be integrated into the Program Advisory Committee as members thought that would provide a more wholistic perspective to the Program and beneficial insight to Advisory Committee members too.

In Spring of 2016, the Advisory Committee approved a new document outlining its function and composition to reflect a single Program Advisory Committee that will intentionally attend to issues of diversity and inclusivity (see “[Program Advisory Committee](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#PAC)” in *MSW Student Handbook*). The document included a new function for the Committee, “[to] provide input and consultation related to current trends regarding the manner in which the Programs promote inclusive excellence and its promotion within the profession of social work.” To attend to this function, the composition of the Committee is now required to include not only diverse practice backgrounds, but also, “Representation from tribal and other diverse community and/or social service agencies with emphasis given to practitioners and other experts serving members of diverse identities.” Two non-Social Workers were added to the Committee in 2016 to advance the Committees goal: (a) the Director of Diversity and Inclusion at the local technical college and (b) the Project Co-Coordinator for the Summit for Addressing Disproportionality. Table 3.2 lists current Advisory Committee Members and their affiliations.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.2: Program Advisory Committee Membership** | | |
| **Member** | **Organization** | **Term(s)** |
| Alisha Andrews\*  Member Rights Specialist | Lakeland Care, Inc. | 2017-2023 |
| Mohammed Bey  Director, Diversity & Inclusion | Northeast Wisconsin Technical College | 2016-2022 |
| Juliet Ebiere Cole  Project Co-Coordinator for the Summit for Addressing Disproportionality & Co-Facilitator for Beyond Diversity Training | Disproportionality Technical Assistance Network, a program of the WI Department of Public Instruction | 2016-2022 |
| Alebra Webster\*  Social Worker/On-Going Case Manager | Oneida Indian Child Welfare | 2016-2022 |
| Alisha Haase\*  Ongoing Manager | Rock County Human Services | 2017-2023 |
| Molly McGregor\*  Medical Home Outreach Coordinator | Children’s Health Alliance of WI | 2016-2022 |
| Lane Morein\*  Social Work Doctoral Student | ATTIC Correctional Facility;  Prior work with UWGB Pride Center | 2018-2024 |
| Andrea Pasqualucci\*  School Social Worker | Ashwaubenon School District | 2017-2023 |
| Erik Pritzl\*  Executive Director | Brown County Human Services | 2016-2022\*\* |
| Judy VanRyzin  Mental Health Supervisor | Outagamie Co. Health & Human Services | 2016-2022 |
| \* Indicates alumni of program | | |
| \*\*Accepted a new position effective January 1, 2022, and therefore resigned from Committee. | | |

***Educational and Social Resources***

While many areas discussed across standard 3.0.1 are also educational and social resources, five specific examples not highlighted elsewhere are included here: (a) revision of mission and goals, (b) *Student Handbook,* (c) development of Social Justice & Advocacy Initiative, (d) syllabi, and (e) the Program’s website.

**Program Mission and Goals** (**critical self-examination**)**.** The Program revised its mission and goals as a direct result of discussions that occurred within and following a 2.5 day “Understanding & Analyzing Systemic Racism” training it organized in May of 2017. While the training itself will be discussed below, under [Program Leadership](#Program_Leadership), the impact of this training is relevant here.

During the training, one exercise was to discuss program missions. Several faculty (Groessl, Sallmann, and Trimberger) sat with faculty from other units. One, the Chair of First Nations Studies, asked a simple yet provocative question: “You don’t have any goals for yourselves?” The question hit home and there was instant recognition that our mission and goals were framed completely about outcomes for others (e.g., students, the community).

Because of this discussion, a working group was convened during the 2017-2018 academic year to revise the Program’s mission and goals to include a focus on the development of ourselves as a faculty. Additionally, the Program had been becoming more visible in advancing professional development related to EDI and faculty discussions emphasized a desire to become leaders in the university. As such, revisions also focused on providing a more visible commitment to social justice advocacy. The working group also proposed the inclusion of both a prelude and vision statement. The former made explicit that goals also apply to faculty and staff; the latter provided commitment to the Program’s long-term objective of being a leader in advancing EDI work. The new mission, goals, and vision statement were approved in April of 2018 by the faculty. Table 3.3, below, contrasts the changes with the old statement, highlighting the stronger commitment to EDI and obligations of faculty and staff.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.3: Changes to Mission & Goals** | | |
| **Section** | **Old Statement** | **Current Statement** |
| Prelude | N/A | The mission, vision, and goals of the UW-Green Bay Social Work Professional Programs reflect our holistic philosophy. They provide guidance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship for students, faculty, and staff. |
| Mission | 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. | Grounded in the values of the Profession, the Social Work Professional Programs at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being. |
| Vision | N/A | Leaders in promoting social justice advocacy and equity for people across all identities. |
| Goals | Our BSW Program has 5 goals that reflect this mission, they are: | Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks, our Programs have 5 goals that reflect our mission and move us toward our vision. |
|  | ~~Social Justice. Advance the primary mission of the social work profession by addressing the needs and empowerment of vulnerable and oppressed populations.~~ | [This was eliminated as a separate goal as intent infused throughout the statement.] |
|  | Curriculum. Offer and continually strengthen an effective generalist practice curriculum that reflects the core values and purpose of the profession. | Curriculum: Engage in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core. |
|  | Community Partnerships. Support the community by analyzing and responding to the dynamic needs of this region. | Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities. |
|  | Interdisciplinarity. Promote critical thinking by requiring students to gain and use evidence-based knowledge from multiple perspectives to inform social work practice. | Interdisciplinarity: Promote critical thinking through acquiring and applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice. |
|  | Professional Development. Foster students’ abilities to assess and strengthen their ongoing professional growth, development, and competence. | Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action. |
|  | N/A | Recruitment & Persistence: Actively recruit students, faculty, and staff into an inclusive and extraordinary environment with highly effective supports to ensure that all are able to successfully meet academic and professional goals. |

***Student Handbook*** (**on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**). The *Handbook* provides information on the policies and procedures that guide the MSW Program (see [Volume III](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#MSW_Student_Handbook) of Self-Study). Areas particular to the diversity environment include Program expectations for non-academic retention, introduction to the campus’ Civility and Inclusivity Statement, and the myriad resources available to students related to identity (e.g., the Pride Center, MultiEthnic Student Affairs), ability (e.g., Student Accessibility Services, the Wellness Center), and success (e.g., The Learning Center, Writing Center).

**Social Justice & Advocacy Initiative** (**on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**)**.** Social Work launched its Social Justice & Advocacy Initiative, as a faculty committee, in Fall of 2018 as a way to systematically attend to diversity and inclusivity issues raised in faculty meetings, course evaluations, program evaluations, and conversations with students and employees.

A first project to emerge from the initiative was a systematic review of syllabi to examine where in the curriculum content on white privilege, institutional and systemic racism, racial prejudice, and biases are explicitly addressed. A subgroup examined syllabi and documented such topics in multi-media, readings, lecture topics, assignments, and classroom activities. Findings indicated such content is sprinkled across the curriculum, and that some courses attend to the material in more depth. When presenting the information to faculty, discussion revolved around how many of these topics are not explicitly noted in the syllabi but are included in the course and often raised in classroom discussions. Faculty were directed to make such content explicit in syllabi, when applicable, and a future discussion was to ensure. Once COVID-19 moved the program online, this project was postponed and will be relaunched in fall of 2022, particularly as we have had some turnover in the faculty.

Next, the initiative organized a full faculty training, as part of the regularly scheduled January 2019 retreat, on “Inclusive Leadership in the Social Work Classroom.” The training was paid for by the Program and provided a baseline from which the faculty could work together on advancing inclusivity initiatives.

A third outcome of the initiative was the suggestion of integrating anti-racism training into the annual student orientation for incoming students. The idea was supported by faculty, but its implementation was postponed due to COVID-19 and the need to move the orientation fully online.

The next two areas discussed also grew out of the work of the initiative.

**Social Work Syllabi** (**critical self-examination** and **non-discriminatory actions**)**.** As noted above, the university adopted a Civility and Inclusivity Statement in 2017 and a Land Acknowledgement in 2018. Social Work voted to include both statements on all syllabi starting in Spring of 2019. The Land Acknowledgement appears at the top of each syllabus as a reminder of the history of colonization that underlies our collective history. The Civility and Inclusivity statement is included as it frames the expectation that our classrooms will promote inclusivity and respect for diversity and will not tolerate discrimination.

**Program Website** (**on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**)**.** In the Summer of 2020, in the wake of the murders of George Floyd, Ahmaud Arbery, and Breanna Taylor, and growth of the Black Lives Matter movement, Social Work updated the homepage of its website to reflect its commitment to “educate ourselves, provide resources, and develop initiatives to further [social justice] efforts.”[[16]](#footnote-17) The site now begins with an endorsement of CSWE’s Center for Diversity and Social & Economic Justice’s call for freedom from oppression and commitment to creating social change. The site also provides a link to a compilation of anti-racism resources that are accessible to the public.

***Resource Allocation***

The Program’s small amount of discretionary funds are allocated to enhance the diversity environment of the Program through three mechanisms: (a) selection of electives offered to the university, (b) funding for professional development opportunities, and (c) creation of a Social Justice Summit.

**Elective Offerings** (**on-going learning**)**.** Despite the small size of the faculty, the Program’s commitment to teaching about diversity is reflected in the Chair’s decision to continue offering elective social work courses with diversity-related emphases outside the required social work curriculum. In addition to the required course for all MSW students (SOC WORK 72): Diversity, Social Justice & Society), an elective offering will be available as of the 2022-2023 academic year, SOC WORK 655: First Nations Futures and Decolonizing Social Work.

**Professional Development** (**on-going learning** and **non-discriminatory actions**)**.** Each spring the Program funds a 4-hour continuing education workshop for our Field Instructors; most of the faculty attend the workshops as well. Beginning in 2014 we began using this workshop to focus on issues of diversity and inclusivity, and by 2018, the Program made a commitment to making that the primary focus of all the annual workshops. Topics since our last self-study include:

* Spring 2014: Advanced Ethics and Boundaries: Religion, Spirituality, and Ethics
* Spring 2015: Knowing Your Lens: A Cultural Competence Training
* Spring 2016: Moral Courage in the Workplace
* Spring 2017: Developing Leaders: Empowering Human Services Practitioners
* Spring 2018: Ethics & Boundaries: Trauma Informed Practice for Supervisors
* Spring 2019: Understanding First Nations
* Spring 2020: Ethics & Boundaries: Being Inclusive of LGBTQ+
* Spring 2021: Desperate Journeys: Asylum Seekers, Refugees and Immigrants

Additionally, the Program offered funding to all faculty for the following diversity-themed professional development opportunities:

* University of Wisconsin Madison’s Sandra Rosenbaum School of Social Work’s annual “Social Workers Confronting Racial Injustice” Conference.
* SWHELPER and CSWE’s Anti-Racism Virtual Summit, March 16-18, 2021, virtual. The Program bought a block of 100 admissions and allowed students and all faculty to register.

In addition to professional development paid for by the Program, faculty also prioritized spending considerable time on free opportunities, such as:

* UW-Madison Diversity Forum, “The Pandemic Effect: Exposing Racism & Inequities” with keynote Robin DiAngelo, October 27-28, 2020, virtual.
* SpeakOut Summer Institute, July 13-17, 2020, a virtual institute on “building equity and social justice education to create inclusive learning environments on campus and online.”[[17]](#footnote-18)
* Brave Conversations Facilitator Master Class, December 3, 2020, virtual.

**Social Justice Summit** (**on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**)**.** The current Social Work Chair (Dr. Groessl) proposed the creation of an annual Social Justice Summit in 2018. The goals are two-fold: (a) provide training and discussion opportunities on diversity initiatives within the community and (b) increase the visibility of the Program’s diversity and inclusivity offerings. She convened a subgroup of the Social Justice & Advocacy Initiative to explore the possibility and develop an implementation plan. The Summit, originally scheduled to premiere in Summer of 2021, was postponed due to COVID-19. It will be offered in June of 2022, organized and implemented by Social Work faculty with the Program providing the majority of the funds for the conference.

This summer’s premiere event is themed, “From Inclusion to Equity.” It features keynote speaker Dr. Denise O’Neil Green, an internationally known EDI leader. Smaller breakout sessions focus on service needs for typically minoritized populations particularly relevant to the Northeast Wisconsin region.

***Program Leadership***

The investment in addressing diversity concerns among social work faculty at UW-Green Bay is widely recognized within the University and Social Work is considered a leader in this area. Leadership is exemplified in: (a) faculty/program initiatives, (b) university service, and (c) community involvement.

**Social Work Faculty/Program Initiatives** (**on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**)**.**  Social Work organized several campus-wide diversity-related programs since its last reaffirmation of accreditation, many of these open to community members:

* Critical Cultural Competency, 7-hour workshop, June 15, 2015. Dr. Sallmann secured $11,000 from the Provost’s office to provide the speaker fee to representatives of Crossroads Antiracism Organizing & Training and lunch and refreshments for the training. Held on the campus and open to all employees, the workshop description read:

This workshop is designed to help participants create the spaces to be self-reflective about our cultural shaping as individuals and institutions, understand the power dynamics in society that impact us, develop the skills to interrupt old patterns and inequitable practices that limit access and exclude some people from our institutions, build trust and clear communication and begin to understand how to make decisions based on multiple perspectives where all people can be heard and represented.

* Symposium on the Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Populations (Ruffalo Noel Levitz), April 25-26, 2017, Chicago, IL. Dr. Sallmann secured $5,200 to send a team to the conference.
* Understanding & Analyzing Systemic Racism, 2.5-day training, May 22-24, 2017. Dr. Sallmann organized training on behalf of the College of Heath, Education, and Social Welfare, which provided all the funding for speakers, meals, and refreshments. The workshop description read:

A 2.5-day intensive workshop to build a common definition of racism and explore the historic development of institutional racism in the US. The workshop will examine ongoing realities of racism including the identity-shaping power racism has on People of Color and White people; explore racism’s individual, institutional and cultural manifestations; and consider the link between racism and other forms of oppression. A strategic methodology to dismantle racism will be introduced, focusing specifically on applying principles of organizing and social/cultural change.

* Racial Battle Fatigue Webinar Co-Facilitation, September 22, 2017 (Sallmann and Dean of Students Eric Arneson) and October 17, 2017 (Sallmann and Dean Susan Gallagher-Lepak).
* Antiracist Pedagogy, 14-hour training across three workshops, January 9 & 11, 2018. Dr. Sallmann organized training on behalf of the College of Heath, Education, and Social Welfare, which provided all the funding for speakers, meals, and refreshments.
  + Workshop I (5.5 hours):  The Complexity of Racism & Antiracist Practices in the American Academy
  + Workshop II (1.5 hours): Setting the Stage
  + Workshop III (7 hours):  Using Equity to Guide Curriculum and Antiracist Pedagogy. This session will explore a core set of principles related to equity and unpacks the ways antiracist behavior intersects with curriculum and pedagogy. Participants will practice developing inclusive strategies as well as action steps for sustaining their personal and professional development.
* 31st Annual National Conference on Race & Ethnicity, May 28-30, 2018, New Orleans, LA. Drs. Akakpo and Sallmann received competitive funding to attend conference with a group from UW-Green Bay and returned to participate in meetings to apply information learned to the campus environment.
* *Your Heart is the Size of Your Fist* by Martina Scholtens, common book read, small group discussion, and town hall. Sponsored by the College of Heath, Education, and Social Welfare and co-facilitated by Drs. Groessl and Trimberger, events were to be held March 25, 31, and April 3 of 2020 but postponed and offered in a revised modality September 8-17, 2020 due to COVID-19.[[18]](#footnote-19)

**University Service** (**on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**)**.** Social work faculty have been asked to participate with various University institutions committed to diversity and inclusivity through serving on committees, developing programs, and facilitating discussions. Such activities include:

* Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity (EDI) Consultant for College of Health, Education, and Social Welfare (Dr. Waubanascum)
* Member, International Education and Global Studies Minor (Dr. Akakpo)
* Executive Committee member for Gerontology Center (Dr. Rhee)
* Member, Center for Middle East Studies (Dr. Sallmann)
* Member, Inaugural Executive Committee for Ed.D. in First Nations Studies (Dr. Sallmann)
* Chair and Executive Committee member, LGBTQ+ Certificate Development Committee (Dr. Sallmann)
* Executive Committee Member, Women’s & Gender Studies Faculty) Dr. Sallmann)
* Pride Center Executive Committee (Dr. Sallmann)
* Innovation in Aging Planning Committee (Rhee)
* Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity Workgroup #2 (Dr. Sallmann)
* Search Committee Member, First Nations Education Assistant Professor (Dr. Sallmann)
* Search Committee Member, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Climate (Dr. Sallmann)
* Equity-Minded Institutional Change Teaching & Learning Community (Schanen-Materi)

Additional evidence of Program leadership with regard to diversity lies in the community’s recognition of the value of faculty participation in community-based diversity concerns. Over the past several years faculty members have served on various committees and initiatives dedicated to advancing diversity and equity in the community. Some examples include (full listings of recent involvements can be found in the [Faculty Data sheets](#Faculty_Data)):

* Brown County Annual Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Celebration Committee (Akakpo & Sallmann)
* Provision of Continuing Education & Community Engagement workshops on EDI content (Groessl & Lee Yang)
* Us2 Behavioral Health Board of Directors (Groessl)
* Provision of Trainings for Adult Protective Services (Groessl)
* Founder of Us2 Behavioral Health (Lee Yang)
* NEW Hmong Providers Board of Directors (Lee Yang)
* Advisory Committee Member, Curative Connections (Rhee)
* Wise Women Gather Place Board of Directors (Schanen-Materi)
* Board of Directors, Hospital Sisters Health System (Schneider)
* Board of Directors, Freedom House Ministries (Schneider)
* Oral Health Partnership Board of Directors (Trimberger)
* Board Member, Behavioral Health Training Partnership (Trimberger)
* Ecumenical Partnership for Housing (Warren)
* Co-development of training modules for the Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Studies (Waubanascum)
* Publications Committee Member for Indigenous Wellness Research Institute (Waubanascum)
* Research Consultant for the Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare (Waubanascum)
* Advisory Council for University of Wisconsin-Madison Native American Center for Health Professions (Waubanascum)

***Research and Other Initiatives***

Three projects not covered elsewhere include the development of a research project, utilization of program evaluation questions addressing the Program’s climate, and having been awarded a distance education grant. Full listings of recent scholarly work and other initiatives can be found in the [Faculty Data sheets](#Faculty_Data).

First, under the direction of Dr. Rhee, several faculty members (Akakpo, Groessl, Lawrence, Sallmann, Schanen-Materi, Trimberger, and Waubanascum) are in the process of submitting a research and funding proposal for the **Social Work Kaleidoscope Project** (**on-going learning** and **advocacy efforts**)**.** The project will collect expressive writing and/or semi-structured interviews of racially or ethnically minoritized adults on their thoughts and feelings about stressful/traumatic events related to social issues. The outcome will be an edited book to be used in Social Work classes at UW-Green Bay and potentially offered to a wider audience.

Second, in the end-of-year **program evaluation** (**critical self-examination** and **non-discriminatory actions**) survey, students are asked three questions to provide insight into the diversity climate of each cohort. The items are:

1. The Social Work Program’s curriculum and expectations are culturally appropriate.
2. My instructors respect my identity status(es) (e.g., race, gender identity, sexual orientation, etc.).
3. My peers respect my identity status(es) (e.g., race, gender identity, sexual orientation, etc.).

The outcomes of these items are presented in Accreditation Standard 4.0.5 under the heading “[Curriculum & Climate Assessment](#Curr_Clim_Assess).”

Finally, several faculty (Groessl, Lee Yang, Rhee, Sallmann, Schanen-Materi, Trimberger, and Warren) were collaboratively awarded a **distance education grant** (**on-going learning** and **critical self-examination**) from the university. While the goal of the grant is to increase instructor effectiveness in utilizing such modalities, recipients strive to integrate EDI into such offerings. As such, funding for recipients to attend the 2020 Social Work Distance Education Conference (virtually) were included in the proposal as its topic was “Removing Barriers and Expanding Borders Through Social Work Distance Education.” Per its website, the conference “[seeks] to explore how the 2020 pandemic and ethical responsibility of deconstructing racism impacts all aspects of social work distance learning within the context of the [theme].”[[19]](#footnote-20)

***Demographic Composition of Faculty, Staff, and Student Body***

The Program is committed to the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and students. Currently, the permanent faculty make-up reflects gender diversity (8.3% male), racial diversity (33.3% Faculty of Color), and diversity with regard to age.

The make-up of the student body also reflects this diversity and, except with regard to gender, the social work student body reflects greater diversity than is found in the general student body or the region, as depicted in Table 3.4, below. Historically, the Social Work Program has always had greater percentage of Students of Color than the University or northeast Wisconsin, and a greater portion of students over age 25 than the University. The trend related to racial/ethnic diversity is maintained; however, as Table 3.4 demonstrates, the Program now has fewer non-traditional age students than the broader university. Although the Program continues to attend to the need to actively recruit diverse students, much work needs to be done as the Program has historically attracted very few students from African American and/or Latino backgrounds and continues to struggle with recruiting male students of any race to the Program.

**Table 3.4: Fall 2019 Student Demographics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Female** | **Male** | **Non-Traditional Age[[20]](#footnote-21)** | **Person of Color** | **Non-Hisp. White Only** | **Population** |
| 83.9% | 16.1% | 67.9% | 10.7% | 89.3% | MSW Program[[21]](#footnote-22) |
| 60.5% | 39.5% | 25.0% | 19.8% | 80.2% | UWGB Graduates[[22]](#footnote-23) |
|  |  |  | 19.7% | 80.3% | Brown Co.\* |
|  |  |  | 19.3% | 80.9% | Wisconsin |

Each year, student demographics for incoming students are presented to the [Program’s Advisory Committee](#Advisory_Committee) and include a discussion of means of attracting those who are under-represented (**critical self-examination**). After enhancing our Advisory Committee with diversity experts, one such discussion revolved around recognizing that implicit bias may have an impact on our application review process. The Committee suggested utilizing an anonymous review of applicants whereby all identifying information (e.g., name, age, race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, etc.) is removed before being viewed by reviewers. The suggestion was made in the fall of 2017 and implemented in the spring of 2018 application review. While this review process has not significantly changed the demographics of incoming students, the Program continues to analyze admissions data and explore opportunities for enhancing the diversity of our students.

To increase diversity, faculty members participate in an array of University efforts to attract a broader spectrum of students to the campus and to social work. These efforts include Campus Preview Days (which provides high school students from the region and the Milwaukee area an opportunity to visit the campus) and GB Orientation for new first-year students on the campus. Additionally, faculty developed relationships with advisors on the Green Bay campus of the College of the Menominee Nation to encourage tribal students to consider a social work career.

In summary, UW-Green Bay and the Social Work faculty seek to model affirmation and respect for diversity across teaching, scholarship, and service to the university and community. All of the activities and initiatives above emphasize the continuous and varied efforts to initiate, participate in, energize, and enjoy a wide range of diversity opportunities. This diverse “mosaic” creates an implicit curriculum that is rich and wide-ranging in content and respectful in approach and indicates the Social Work faculty’s commitment to **on-going learning**, **critical self-examination**, **non-discriminatory actions**, and **advocacy efforts** with regard to diversity and social justice issues. Even more importantly, this environment reflects the challenges we offer our students to be lifelong learners with regard to these issues.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.0.2:The program explains how these efforts provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how these efforts provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment across all program options. |

**Implicit Curriculum Efforts (listed in AS 3.0.1) Impact on the Learning Environment:**

As noted above, Program faculty assume that development of respect for and understanding of diversity require **on-going learning**, **critical self-examination**, **non-discriminatory actions**, and **advocacy efforts,** and see the need to begin with the faculty as critical to providing a supportive and inclusive learning environment.As such, considerable time and resources are spent on professional development activities among the faculty. In this way, faculty members model a commitment to lifelong learning while building their capacity to serve and engage students regardless of identity and ability. In addition to modeling cultural humility and inclusivity, the impacts of specific efforts are explored below for each component of the learning environment.

***Impact of Program’s Institutional Setting***

The institutional setting contributes to the strength of the diversity environment as social work students function within this broader university system. The **Inclusivity & Equity Certificate Program** provides ongoing learning for faculty and staff and opportunities to engage in advocacy efforts across campus. The **Civility and Inclusivity Statement**provides clear direction for the entire campus community on expectations for behaviors with the goal of decreasing discrimination and harassment and creating more welcoming and inclusive environments. The **Land Acknowledgment** acknowledges the historic oppression experienced by the original inhabitants of the region and recognition that we are on occupied territory. The goals of the **Council for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI)** intend to facilitate the recruitment and retention of more diverse students and employees, increase instructor and staff competence in working with diverse identities, and reduce equity gaps. Finally, the **Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion (EDI) Consultants** provide concrete resources for instructors to enhance their abilities to create supportive and inclusive classrooms. Overall, these initiatives highlight positive actions the university has undertaken to develop a supportive and diverse environment through making visible the voices and experiences historically invisible on the campus and in curriculums.

Additionally, UW-Green Bay offers a range of majors and minors focused on specific dimensions of diversity and social work students have access to the classes that comprise those programs. The institutional supports and resources assist in the recruitment and retention of diverse students and employees and create a dynamic extracurricular environment. The university’s specialty centers boast collaborations between University personnel and community members, and Social Work faculty are members of the Advisory Councils of both the Center for Middle East Studies and Partnerships (Dr. Sallmann) and the Gerontology Center (Dr. Rhee). UWGB’s varied student organizations address issues of diversity and oppression through creating opportunities for active engagement with these issues, as do the multitude of diversity-themed events and celebrations.

All of these initiatives, resources, events, and supports create an atmosphere in which diversity is valued, discrimination is not tolerated, and understanding and advocacy are encouraged. Faculty routinely participate in and announce these events in class and encourage social work students to participate in them. Program faculty also offer extra credit in their courses for student attendance at some of these events to increase their exposure to difference and encourage lifelong learning.

***Impact of Selection of Field Education Settings***

The MSW Program is comprised of primarily white students and situated in a primarily white institution. The pool of field education settings is intentionally comprised to provide such students with experience working with persons who differ from them, and for many, such experiences may represent the first such extended immersion. Field education provides students with rich opportunities to experientially learn about other groups and identities and challenge ideologies some do not even know they have. For our students of color, LGBTQ+ students, and students of diverse abilities, the pool of placement sites provides opportunities to work in agencies serving their communities and among leaders who share their backgrounds, should they want such experiences.

***Impact of Composition of Program Advisory Committee***

Since the inception of the new Advisory Committee function, each meeting includes an agenda item requiring the Program to report back on its inclusivity/anti-racism efforts since the last meeting. Most have also included discussion topics reflecting issues of diversity and inclusion the Program would like feedback on. Examples include introducing the concept of cultural humility, exploring client vs. student demographics, the role of social work education in a politically polarizing climate, program evaluation feedback related to diversity climate, implicit bias in the application review process, inclusivity initiatives in program orientations, the use of singular “they” in APA citation style, and the impact of COVID-19 on service systems/clients/students. The concerns and suggestions of members are brought to the full faculty for further discussion. Overall, the new Advisory Committee structure has assisted in keeping EDI issues at the forefront of Programmatic discussions and resulted in concrete changes aimed at curbing implicit bias.

***Impact of Educational and Social Resources***

**Program Mission and Goals.** Revisions to the Program’s mission and goals, and inclusion of a vision statement have resulted in a philosophical shift in the Program and among the faculty. To keep EDI issues and social justice advocacy at the forefront of our Program, a standing item is included for every faculty meeting, providing an opportunity to continually explore the diversity environment of the Program and opportunities for enhancements. Additionally, the mission and goals are used in budgetary decisions resulting in the availability of discretionary funds for professional development opportunities in these areas. The Program has been fortunate to be able to avail many such opportunities to students as well as the broader community.

***Student Handbook.*** The *Handbook* provides transparent policies and procedures for behavior and retention in the major. As such it also seeks to extend a sense of belong to students regardless of their identities and abilities and outline expectations for respectful and inclusive behavior. For example, retention standards highlight the need to actualize social work values in behavior, including valuing diversity and recognizing the dignity and worth of all persons, and effectively manage their own biases. Additionally, it provides resources for personal and academic success, such as Student Accessibility Services, the Wellness Center, and the Pride Center. As a whole, the *Handbook* indicates the value the Program places on diverse identities and the supports available to facilitate success across learning preferences and educational backgrounds.

**Social Justice & Advocacy Initiative.** While new, this initiative shows promise for enhancing the diversity environment of the major. Based on its recommendations, the full faculty was trained in “Inclusive Leadership in the Social Work Classroom” to enhance the capacity of faculty to cultivate inclusive classrooms. The Initiative also began a systemic review of syllabi for EDI content to ensure comprehensive coverage and proposed the development of an anti-racism training for incoming majors. While both projects were postponed due to COVID-19, faculty established these as goals to begin in fall of 2022.

**Social Work Syllabi.** The prominent inclusion of the UW-Green Bay Land Acknowledgment at the top of all Social Work syllabi signals students to the value the Program places on this acknowledgement. No other unit on campus has taken this step as an entire faculty. Additionally, incorporating the campus’ Civility and Inclusivity Statement into all syllabi frames the expectation that our classrooms promote inclusivity and respect for diversity, and will not tolerate discrimination or harassment. Together, these statements are visual cues to the values of the Program and recognition of the need to attend both to historic oppression and current experiences.

**Program Website.** The Program’s website is considered part of the physical environment of the program, even if it is virtual. The homepage begins with a statement acknowledging systemic racism and oppression and noting the Program’s commitment to challenging social injustice and working for equity. The intention of the homepage is to signify the Program’s values and priorities, hopefully contributing to an inclusive environment.

***Impact of Resource Allocation***

**Elective Offerings.** Diversity and social justice related elective offerings provide on-going learning opportunities to students, as well as the instructors teaching them. As a small program, few electives are offered each year. Prioritizing these electives signifies our commitment to the topics and advancing social justice and inclusivity. They are also seen as gateway courses to the major, bringing in students committed to these issues who may not have selected the major if not for the elective.

**Professional Development Opportunities.** Access to and offering of EDI-related trainings provide on-going learning and opportunities for non-discriminatory actions for faculty and the professional community, enhancing the capacity of the region to be more inclusive.

**Social Justice Summit.** While this project is in the works for June of 2022, it is expected to provide on-going learning through professional presentations, critical self-examination through examination of our own learning needs, non-discriminatory actions through the educational trainings, and advocacy efforts as they are to be an emphasis of the presentations.

***Impact of Program Leadership***

The Program is proud of its **Social Work Faculty/Program Initiatives** and **University Service** related to EDI. These efforts create opportunities for on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions, and advocacy efforts for the Social Work faculty and university and wider community. Both areas increase the visibility of Social Work faculty, and the Program as a whole, as leaders in advancing equity and inclusion on campus and in the community, assisting the Program is living its mission.

***Impact of Research and Other Initiatives***

Projects such as the **Kaleidoscope Project** and the **Distance Education Grant** demonstrate the commitment of the faculty to increase opportunities to learn about identity statuses and abilities and how to better serve all students. Faculty invest considerable time in these projects, as well as professional development opportunities, because they deeply believe in the need to engage in lifelong learning and their obligations to work with students across all aspects of identity and ability.

***Impact of Demographic Composition of Faculty, Staff, and Students.***

Faculty diversity contributes positively to the implicit curriculum in two primary ways. First, more diverse voices assist the Program in challenging itself and reducing the likelihood of simply maintaining the status quo. Second, more diverse faculty should assist in the recruitment of more diverse students as they provide students the opportunity to see themselves reflected in the faculty. Anecdotally this appears to be the case. In a recent conversation with the Chair of First Nations Studies, she shared she has had conversations with First Nations students who indicate that they are now considering Social Work as a major as it now has a Native faculty member.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.0.3:The program describes specific plans to continually improve the learning environment to affirm and support persons with diverse identities. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes specific plans to continually improve the learning environment to affirm and support persons with diverse identities across all program options. |

**Implicit Curriculum Plans:**

The Program addresses ongoing review of the learning environment through student assessment of the Program, annual faculty and student review of assessment outcome data, and in work with the Advisory Committee. Each of these provide opportunities for continual improvement, and, in addition to continuing the efforts noted above, the Program prioritized specific plans for the following components of the learning environment.

***Educational and Social Resources***

**Social Work Syllabi.** As stated previously, the first project of the [Social Justice & Advocacy Initiative](#SJA_Initiative) was a systemic review of syllabi of required Social Work courses to examine where content on white privilege, institutional and systemic racism, racial prejudice, and biases are explicitly addressed. While findings were reported to faculty and discussed, COVID-19 combined with a number of personnel changes resulted in the postponement of the next stage of this project. It is anticipated that this project will resume in fall of 2022 and coincide with the Program’s implementation of the 2022 EPAS and its new guidelines on ADEI. Such a systemic review is expected to highlight gaps in our curriculum and provide opportunities for continuous improvement in addressing ADEI.

**Anti-Racism and Inclusivity Training.** The Program’s [Social Justice & Advocacy Initiative](#SJA_Initiative) recommended the inclusion of an anti-racism and inclusivity training as part of the orientation process for students accepted to the major. The goals of the training are to: (a) provide a common language for students to use in discussing oppression and dimensions of diversity and identity, (b) orient students to the Profession’s commitment to challenging oppression, and (3) train students in how to engage in brave conversations about ADEI content. Having such a training prior to the start of classes, rather than covering portions of such content across classes, is intended to provide a baseline understanding of these issues for students, allowing them to enter classrooms with a more uniform understanding of programmatic expectations and social work values.

***Resource Allocation***

**Social Justice Summit.** As noted above, the Program is organizing and hosting a [Social Justice Summit](#SJ_Summit) in June of 2021; the goal is for this to develop into an annual event sponsored by the Program. The idea for the Summit grew out of a desire of the faculty to strengthen its own understanding of and ability to provide leadership to the region on issues of anti-racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion (ADEI). The Summit will be open to students and practitioners, and highlight faculty efforts in these areas as well as community needs and innovations. Launching this as an annual event requires extensive commitment of time and resources from the Program and its faculty and demonstrates our commitment to continuous advancement of ADEI through **on-going learning, critical self-examination, non-discriminatory actions,** and **advocacy efforts**.

***Research and Other Initiatives***

**Kaleidoscope Project.** As noted above, a number of faculty committed to a two-year research project beginning in spring of 2022, the [Kaleidoscope Project](#Kaleidoscope). These faculty will be collecting and analyzing the stories of racially or ethnically minoritized adults on their thoughts and feelings about stressful/traumatic events, and ultimately writing a book for use in our social work courses (and possibly beyond). Faculty are therefore increasing their own knowledge in this area while contributing to the knowledge base of the profession.

**Distance Education Grant.** The entire focus of this [Distance Education Grant](#DE_Grant) is to develop faculty capacity to develop inclusive and accessible distance education courses and/or activities within our general education offerings in social work. The goal is to make these classes more accessible to a broader range of students and therefore increase the pool of potential social work applicants. A broader pool could also result in a more diverse pool, further diversifying the major.

***Program’s Institutional Setting***

**EDI Consultants.** The next plan revolves around the initiative of Dr. Waubanascum, and endorsed by the full faculty. As the [EDI Consultant](#EDI_Consultants) for the College of Health, Education, and Social Welfare, Dr. Waubanascum developed a proposal to:

*identify where colonialism exists in our social work program. [She] will conduct a qualitative study to examine Indigenous alums and current students’ experiences within the Social Work Professional Programs at UWGB. Along with [an] intern, [she] will either conduct focus groups and/or interviews with former and current students to understand their experiences with course curriculum (policy, practice, research), field placement experiences, and program environment as compared or contrasted to Indigenous worldviews and practices.*

The goal of this project is to work toward the decolonization of our MSW Program. As she writes in her proposal:

*Decolonization in social work education entails identifying where colonialism exists and contesting harmful Imperial frameworks and western hegemony. It is also an opportunity to revitalize Indigenous worldviews, knowledges, and ways of helping and integrating them into social work curriculum.[[23]](#footnote-24),[[24]](#footnote-25),[[25]](#footnote-26) The representation of Indigenous worldviews and knowledges in social work curriculum and faculty positively impacts the cultural and professional identify of social work students and is transformative for non-Indigenous students.[[26]](#footnote-27)*

The Program looks forward to the results of her work and finding ways to respond to challenges she identifies. It is anticipated that her project will evolve into concrete implications for assisting in the decolonization of our program, recruitment of Indigenous students, provision of a more inclusive curriculum, and greater advancement of social justice. Goals the Program is expected to embrace.

***Demographic Composition of Faculty, Staff, and Student Body***

As noted above, the Program engages in frequent conversations about the diversity of students in the major, particularly with the Program Advisory Committee. In addition to participating in recruit events, the Program anticipates the ability to utilize EAB Navigate (student success software) in the near future. to more effectively recruit a broader pool of applicants to the MSW program. EAB Navigate was broadly implemented in fall of 2021 to track student success, and soon will be available as a recruitment tool whereby programs can select students to target for information campaigns.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

# Accreditation Standard 3.1 — Student Development: Admissions; Advisement, Retention, and Termination; and Student Participation

**Admissions**

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M3.1.1:The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program. The criteria for admission to the master’s program must include an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association. Baccalaureate social work graduates entering master’s social work programs are not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative identifies the criteria the program uses for admission to the social work program across all program options. |

**Admission Criteria**

The UWGB MSW Program uses the following criteria to evaluate admission to the program. Points one and two are similar to the criteria for admission into the University. Points three through five are unique to the MSW Program.

1. An undergraduate degree from a regionally accredited university by the time classes start.

1. A 3.0 grade point average (GPA), measured on a 4.0 scale. GPA is based on the last 60 credits taken in bachelor’s degree studies or graduate level course work. Consistent with Graduate Studies policy, students from schools not using a grading system will be evaluated on an individual basis. Students who do not meet the 3.0 GPA requirement may be admitted on a provisional basis. Provisionally admitted students who receive at least a B grade in courses totaling nine credits of graduate work, after acceptance, will be fully admitted.

1. An academic background in the liberal arts with completion of a minimum of 12 credits in the social sciences. Examples include coursework within or across the following disciplines: psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics and political science.

1. A total of four prerequisite courses are required and include one course from each of the following areas: Biological Life Sciences, Lifespan Development, Statistics, and Research Methods. Students who have a BSW degree are considered to have met all four prerequisites.

1. International students must provide evidence of English proficiency.

**Application Materials**

The MSW Program application includes the following items, submitted electronically to the Office of Graduate Studies by the stated deadline (typically December 1)**.**

1. State UW-System E-application
2. Application Fee
3. MSW Admissions Questionnaire
4. Two references
5. Transcripts from all graduate and undergraduate institutions attended

Prospective students are informed of the admission criteria on the MSW Program website on the [Admissions](https://www.uwgb.edu/msw/admission/) page as well as in the MSW Student Handbook, [page 30-31](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Admissions_Procedures). All students must [first apply to the University](https://www.uwgb.edu/graduate/admissions/overview/) through Graduate Studies.

**Transfer Procedures**

Applicants may not simply transfer into the UWGB MSW Program from another MSW Program. They must follow the normal application process and meet program criteria. If accepted into the program, applicants may request to have certain courses, completed through another program, accepted as substitutes for the MSW Program. These decisions are made on an individual basis.

Policies regarding [credit transfer](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Credit_Transfer) are outlined in the MSW Student Handbook, page 30.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates the criteria for admission to the master’s program include an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association across all program options. |

Students without an undergraduate degree from a CSWE-accredited Bachelor of Social Work program through the Generalist Program, requiring a two-year (fill-time) plan or a four-year (part-time) course of study. The requirements for the [generalist curriculum](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#MSW_Greneralist_Curriculum) are identified in the MSW Student Handbook, pages 20-21.

[Option Two](UWGB%20MSW%20Self%20Study%20Volume%201%202023.docx#Option2) , sub-1, noted below, articulates the requirement for an accredited BSW degree to enter the program with Advanced Standing. Undergraduate degree program information for all students seeking admission with a BSW degree is verified as to accreditation status of the program. Students who enter with a degree earned from an international program must be identified as meeting criteria through the CSWE listing of accredited programs.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates that baccalaureate social work graduates entering master’s social work programs are not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs across all program options. |

**Advanced Standing**

The MSW Student Handbook outlines policies for Admission with [Advanced Standing](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Advanced_Standing_Policy).

The options noted below are explained in that policy.

Applicants with a BSW degree may be eligible to be admitted with advanced standing if they meet the criteria in one of the two options listed below. The purpose of option two is to ensure applicants are credited for their BSW degree but possess current knowledge of the trends in social work practice and policy through work experience and the continuing education requirements (30 hours every two years) of the Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services. This option ensures that students are not repeating previous achievements.

**Process for Ensuring Baccalaureate Social Work Graduates Do Not Repeat Previous Achievements**

As noted above, the transcripts and institutions where the student earned the degree is evaluated for all students requesting advanced standing. Only those whose degree program was accredited by the Council on Social Work Education when the degree was granted are eligible to enter with advanced standing.

Options outlined in the Student Handbook are as follows:

OPTION ONE:

BSW degree from a baccalaureate social work program accredited by the CSWE or those recognized by the International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Service. BSW degree must be obtained within seven years of the year of admission to the UW-Green Bay MSW program.

OPTION TWO:

Must meet all three of the following criteria: \*

1. BSW degree from a CSWE-accredited program,
2. Current Wisconsin Social Work certification (training certificate excluded), and
3. Post-BSW social work practice experience equivalent to three full-time years

(approximately 6,240 hours). Work experience must be obtained within 10 years of the year of admission to the MSW program.

The MSW [Admissions](https://www.uwgb.edu/msw/admission/) page of the website outlines these policies under “Advanced Standing”.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.1.2:The program describes the policies and procedures for evaluating applications and notifying applicants of the decision and any contingent conditions associated with admission. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the policies and procedures for **evaluating admission applications** across all program options. |

**Policies and Procedures for Evaluating Applications**

Applications to the MSW Program are evaluated by a committee of MSW faculty members. A minimum of two faculty members independently review each application, providing a numerical rating and overall recommendation for admission. When needed for clarity, a third or fourth faculty member will evaluate the application and the sum of the input will determine the applicant’s admission status. Applications are reviewed using the following rubric:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Social Work Commitment | Academic Readiness | GPA |
| \*The applicant demonstrates an ability to relate social work values and principles to their own professional work and volunteer history, and specifically articulates a connection between themselves and their future professional practice.  \*The applicant articulates specific career goals and rationale for obtaining the MSW degree.  \*The applicant articulates an understanding and commitment to social work ethical standards, diversity, vulnerable populations, and social justice.  \*References support admission of the student. | \*Essay is well organized, coherent, logical and responsive to the prompts; essay employs appropriate grammar and syntax; applicant demonstrates analytical and/or critical thinking skills.  \*References support admission of the student. | \*Based on last 60 credits.  GPA is counted at face value and administratively calculated into reviewer ratings. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the policies and procedures for **notifying applicants** of the admission decision across all program options. |

**Policies and Procedures for Notifying Applicants**

All applicants are notified of their admission status via email. Applicants who are offered admission receive a letter from the MSW Program, followed by an official acceptance letter from the Office of Graduate Studies. Applicants who are denied admission receive a letter from the Office of Graduate Studies, followed by an email from the MSW Program Coordinator inviting them to meet and discuss the decision. Applicants who are placed on a waitlist receive a letter from the Office of Graduate Studies explaining the waitlist process. As openings arise, the MSW Program contacts individuals on the waitlist via phone and email to offer admission.

The [Admissions Review Process and Notification](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Admissions_Notification) policy is located in the MSW Student Handbook, page 31-32. Since the application occurs through the Graduate Studies office, the Program works in concert with graduate studies relative to student notification. The Graduate Studies website outlines processes for students to monitor acceptance on the “[After You Apply](https://www.uwgb.edu/graduate/admissions/after-you-apply/)” page.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the policies and procedures for **notifying applicants of any contingent conditions** associated with admission across all program options. |

**Policies and Procedures for Contingent Admission**

Applicants admitted with any contingencies are notified of these conditions in their official acceptance letter from the Office of Graduate Studies. In conjunction with the MSW Program, the Office of Graduate Studies monitors the situation and informs applicants when contingencies have been met. If contingencies are not met by the stated deadline, the MSW Program works with individual applicants to determine a course of action. While contingencies are not common in the MSW Program, they can occur when there is an unavoidable delay of official transcripts or an applicant’s GPA is below the Graduate Studies requirement.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M3.1.3:The program describes the policies and procedures used for awarding advanced standing. The program indicates that advanced standing is awarded only to graduates holding degrees from baccalaureate social work programs accredited by CSWE, recognized through its International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Services, or covered under a memorandum of understanding with international social work accreditors. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the policies and procedures used for awarding advanced standing across all program options. |

Policy for admission with Advanced Standing is articulated in [Standard 3.1.1.(3)](UWGB%20MSW%20Self%20Study%20Volume%201%202023.docx#Advanced_Standing) above.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative indicates that advanced standing is awarded only to graduates holding degrees from baccalaureate social work programs accredited by CSWE, those recognized through its International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Services, or covered under a memorandum of understanding with international social work accreditors across all program options. |

**Policies and Procedures for Awarding Advanced Standing**

Applicants may be eligible to be admitted with advanced standing if they meet the criteria in one of the two options listed below. To confirm eligibility for advanced standing, the MSW Program reviews each applicant’s transcript for proof of degree and consults the CSWE listing of accredited programs to ensure accreditation existed at the time of the degree. Applicants qualifying for advanced standing under option two must also provide their Wisconsin provider number and submit a resume describing their work history. The MSW Program verifies all provider numbers through a search on the Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services website.

OPTION ONE:

BSW degree from a baccalaureate social work program accredited by the CSWE or those recognized by the International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Service. BSW degree must be obtained within seven years of the year of admission to the UW-Green Bay MSW program.

OPTION TWO:

Must meet all three of the following criteria: \*

1. BSW degree from a CSWE-accredited program,
2. Current Wisconsin Social Work certification (training certificate excluded), and
3. Post-BSW social work practice experience equivalent to three full-time years

(approximately 6,240 hours). Work experience must be obtained within 10 years of the year of admission to the MSW program.

As noted in Option One above, students who have recognized international degrees through CSWE are granted advanced standing. The Program evaluates all BSW degrees earned and works with students to determine advanced standing eligibility on a case-by-case basis when needed.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.1.4:The program describes its policies and procedures concerning the transfer of credits. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the program’s policies and procedures concerning the transfer of credits across all program options. |

**Policies and Procedures for Transfer of Credits**

All requests for transfer of credits are initiated by the student and flow through the MSW Program Coordinator. Field and practice courses must be completed at a CSWE-accredited MSW Program to be considered for transfer. Other courses, such as research, policy, or certain electives may be considered for transfer if, upon review of the syllabi by the MSW Program Coordinator and/or course instructor, they align with the Program’s curriculum. In reviewing courses for transfer credit, the MSW Program considers: social work perspective, graduate level study, content that satisfies the goals of the MSW curriculum/program, and student area of emphasis. Decisions about transfer credits are relayed by the MSW Coordinator to the student who completes the required UWGB steps to officially complete the transfer.

[Transfer credit policy](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Credit_Transfer) is articulated in the MSW Student Handbook (p. 30).

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.1.5:The program submits its written policy indicating that it does not grant social work course credit for life experience or previous work experience. The program documents how it informs applicants and other constituents of this policy. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative submits the program’s written policy indicating that it does not grant social work course credit for life experience or previous work experience across all program options. |

**Policy on Credit for Experience or Work**

In keeping with the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Accreditation Standards, the MSW program does not grant social work course credit for life experience or previous work experience regardless of the undergraduate degree attained.

This statement is outlined in the MSW Student Handbook, [page 33](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Credit_Life_Experience).

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative documents how the program informs applicants and other constituents of this policy across all program options. |

**Notification of Policy**

The policy on credit for life experience or previous work experience is documented in the student handbook and on the MSW Program website ([Admissions](https://www.uwgb.edu/msw/admission/) page). Prospective students are informed of this policy in advising sessions.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

**Advisement, Retention, and Termination**

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.1.6:The program describes its academic and professional advising policies and procedures. Professional advising is provided by social work program faculty, staff, or both. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the program’s academic **and** professional advising policies and procedures across all program options. |

**Academic Advising Policies and Procedures**

The MSW Program offers a range of advising options to prospective and current students. Academic advising begins with the first inquiry into the program and continues throughout the student’s time in the MSW Program. Initial academic advising may be provided by general UWGB admissions staff who, upon request, will refer a prospective student to the Office of Graduate Studies advisors, the Social Work Professional Programs Administrative Associate and/or the MSW Program Coordinator. Advising sessions may be handled via email, with a virtual or phone meeting, or in-person, depending on student preference. Academic advising, in the MSW Program, is primarily focused on the path to degree: admission process, curriculum and course offerings, registration, schedules and course formats, areas of specialization, credit completion, and graduation requirements. After admission into the MSW Program, requests for advising are typically generated by the student, who reaches out to request a meeting (in-person, virtual, or via email). Until February of 2021, the MSW Program employed an Academic Status Advisor to assist with academic advising. When the Office of Graduate Studies expanded its role in advising, it was determined that the position of Academic Status Advisor was no longer needed for the MSW Program. Academic advising is now provided by social work faculty assigned as advisor/mentors, Graduate Studies academic staff advisors (who monitor degree completion), and the MSW Program coordinator.

**Professional Advising Policies and Procedures**

The MSW Program places great emphasis on professional advising, from the time of inquiry through graduation. Professional advising with individual students can include career options, professional development suggestions, credentialing and licensing procedures, school-work-life balance concerns, and job search tips. For discussions of this nature, students typically request an advising meeting with the faculty member they feel can best address their questions. In addition, the MSW Program offers an optional, annual workshop for graduating students to help them prepare for the state and national exams required for credentialing in Wisconsin.

Professional advising also comes into play for students who may be experiencing academic and/or non-academic issues to the level that the students or their instructors are concerned. In these instances, the faculty advisor may initiate the request for a meeting with the student to discuss the situation and possible solutions.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative documents that professional advising is provided by social work program faculty, staff, or both across all program options. |

**University Nomenclature**

Th University revised its undergraduate advising model in fall 2021 to embed a “Professional Advisor” in each College, who completed academic advising, and to assign a “Faculty Mentor”, who performs professional advising responsibilities.

Graduate studies advisors perform some portions of academic advising and faculty the remainder. As such, to provide consistency in language across BSW and MSW Programs, the MSW Program has adopted “Faculty Mentor” to the faculty who perform both academic and professional advising responsibilities.

**Professional Advisor/Mentor**

Beginning with the 2022-2023 admission cycle, students may select their Advisor/Mentor from the faculty. Students are given a link to a survey where preferences can be identified based on practice expertise of faculty and connection to student area of interest. The role of the [Faculty Advisor/Mentor](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Faculty_Advisor_Mentors) is outlined in the MSW Student Handbook, p. 33. The Advisor/Mentor is then identified on the student’s SIS account.

Professional advising/mentoring is provided by selected faculty member, supported by the MSW Coordinator and Graduate Studies as needed. Additionally, students who are seeking assistance with resumes, interviewing tips, and other employment-related advising are encouraged to seek advice from staff in the UWGB Career Services department as that is their area of expertise.

Additional advising assistance can be found in the MSW Program Portal. As noted in the handbook (p. 34),

The site outlines information helpful to students and is the first resource to consult. Canvas site contains curriculum and course offerings, registration information, schedules and course formats, locations, and technology and web-based resources. Students are provided with a course curriculum guide for their respective cohort at the New Student Orientation and/or advising sessions.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.1.7:The program submits its policies and procedures for evaluating student’s academic and professional performance, including grievance policies and procedures. The program describes how it informs students of its criteria for evaluating their academic and professional performance and its policies and procedures for grievance. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative submits the program’s policies and procedures for evaluating student’s academic and professional performance, including grievance policies and procedures, across all program options. |

**Evaluating Student’s Academic Performance**

The MSW program adheres to the UW-Green Bay Graduate Studies policies regarding grades and academic standing as follows:

Good Standing

* A 3.0 or better end-of-term cumulative GPA results in continuing good standing.
* A 2.0 to 2.999 end-of-term cumulative GPA results in probation status.
* A 1.999 or less end-of-term cumulative GPA results in academic suspension status. The MSW Program Coordinator and/or faculty advisor reviews the student’s record up to that time and recommends for continued enrollment or for the suspension status to go into effect.

(Action on part-time students is withheld until at least nine credits are attempted at UW-Green Bay.)

Probation

* A 3.0 or better end-of-term cumulative GPA results in a return to good standing.
* A 2.999 or less end-of-term cumulative GPA may result in an academic suspension status at the end of any term after a cumulative total of 15 or more credits is attempted at UW-Green Bay. The student’s faculty advisor and/or MSW Program Coordinator reviews the student’s record up to that time and recommends for continued enrollment or for the academic suspension status to go into effect.

Furthermore, students must receive a “C” or “Pass” grade or better in all required MSW courses and course electives. Students receiving less than a “C” in any MSW course are required to work with the MSW Program to address the academic concern.

Students whose grades fall below these requirements will be formally notified of the unmet requirement and will be placed on academic retention in the program, consistent with Graduate Studies policy. The student will be directed to schedule a meeting with the MSW Program Coordinator and assigned Faculty Advisor to discuss options for addressing the academic concern and continuance in the program. Options for addressing the academic concern could include repeating the course, providing documentation of adequate understanding of the course content, or discontinuing in the Program. If a student receives less than a “C” in a social work course required for the MSW degree, the course must be repeated.

These policies are outlined in the MSW Student Handbook, pages [37-38](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Grades).

**Academic Performance Grievance**

Consistent with Graduate Studies policy, a student who is dissatisfied with a grade and wishes to appeal the course grade must first contact the instructor who issued the grade to discuss the concern. If, after contact with the instructor, the student remains dissatisfied, an appeal can be made to the MSW Program Coordinator who will, in turn, consult with the course instructor. Further appeals by the student may be made by contacting the Dean of the College of Health, Education, and Social Welfare who will then consult with the instructor and the Program Coordinator to determine the next course of action.

**Evaluating Student’s Professional Performance**

MSW students are expected to demonstrate the highest standard of performance and professional behavior in all aspects of their work in the MSW program. This includes the demonstration of maturity, emotional stability, the knowledge necessary to carry out the required work, and the personal integrity necessary to perform as a social work professional. Students are also obliged to demonstrate compliance with the standards of professional conduct, values, and roles embodied within the NASW Code of Ethics throughout their time in the MSW program and to uphold the policies and procedures of the University of Wisconsin System regarding academic misconduct.

In addition, the Social Work Professional Programs expects its students to abide by the UWGB Civility and Inclusivity Statement, which includes the following stance:

The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay (UWGB) is an institution of higher learning where the safety of its multifaceted community of people is expected and enforced. Campus activities, programs, classes, lectures, and everyday interactions are enriched by our inclusion of one another as we strive to learn from each other in an atmosphere of positive engagement and mutual respect.   
  
As campus community members, we are responsible for our behaviors and are fully accountable for our actions. We must each take responsibility for our awareness of discrimination and its many forms (i.e. racism, sexism, ageism, xenophobia, transphobia, homophobia, etc.). The concept of campus civility and inclusiveness can be demonstrated in hallways, classrooms, student housing, and the workplace environment.

When concerns about non-academic performance arise in the classroom, field agency, or other areas related to the MSW Program or campus community, the following steps are taken:

1. The concerns are brought to the attention of the student and the Faculty Advisor. Documentation regarding the concerns should include statements addressing the student’s strengths and challenges, description of the concerning behaviors or attitudes, instructional or supervisory interventions already provided along with the student’s responses to these interventions, and the student’s current level of functioning. Should the process require further action, the following steps may be taken:
2. The Faculty Advisor speaks with relevant individuals (e.g., additional instructors, Field Instructor, etc.) to determine whether the concerns are more extensive. If the concerns are not considered extensive, the process moves to step 3. If the concerns are considered serious, the process moves to step 5. In situations involving extremely serious concerns, the process moves immediately to step 7.
3. The faculty raising the concerns works with the student to develop a written plan to redress the concerns.
4. The faculty raising the concerns monitors the student’s compliance with the plan. A written summary should indicate successful completion of the plan, thus concluding the process. If the student has not successfully completed the plan, the process moves to step 5.
5. The faculty raising the concerns meets with the student and the Faculty Advisor; together, they develop a written plan to redress the concerns. If the concerns are shared by others (e.g., additional instructors, Field Instructor, etc.), they may also attend the meeting and participate in the planning. If appropriate, or if the concern is very serious, the MSW Program Coordinator may also attend the meeting. The student has the right to bring a support person to this meeting; the support person has a nonparticipating role in the meeting.
6. The Faculty Advisor monitors the student’s compliance with the plan. A written summary should indicate successful completion of the plan, thus concluding the process. If the student has not successfully completed the plan, the process moves to step 7.
7. For very serious or unresolved concerns, the student will be directed to schedule a meeting with the Faculty Advisor and the Program Coordinator to discuss the options for continuance in the program. The student has the right to bring a support person to this meeting; the support person has a non-participating role in the meeting.

See MSW Student Handbook, [Non-academic Performance Policy](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Non_Academic_Performance), for behaviors considered under this policy.

**Professional Performance Grievance**

Consistent with the UWGB Dean of Students policy, students who have grievances related to University faculty or staff should first address those complaints directly with the individual. If the student is not satisfied after talking with the individual, the grievance can then be brought to the MSW Program Coordinator and/or Chair of the Social Work Professional Programs, and, if resolution is not achieved there, the student may consult with the Dean of Students Office per University policy.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program informs students of the program’s criteria for evaluating their academic and professional performance and its policies and procedures for grievance across all program options. |

Policies and Procedures as outlined in Standard 3.1.7(1) above support student notification of criteria for performance.

**Informing Students of Academic Criteria and Grievance Processes**

The criteria for evaluating academic performance (3.0 or better end-of-term cumulative GPA and no lower than a C in any MSW course) is stated in the MSW student handbook and the UWGB Graduate Catalog. In addition, this information is shared with students during the initial orientation to the MSW Program.

The academic grievance process is described in the MSW student handbook, see [Grievances](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Grievances), and on the UWGB Graduate Catalog.

**Informing Students of Professional Performance Criteria and Grievance Processes**

The criteria for evaluating professional performance (adherence to MSW program policy, University policy, and the NASW Code of Ethics) is stated in the MSW student handbook and the UWGB Dean of Students website. In addition, this information is shared with students during the initial orientation to the MSW Program.

The academic grievance process is described in the MSW student handbook (see link above) and on the UWGB Dean of Students’ [Complaints and Grievances](https://www.uwgb.edu/dean-of-students/policies-procedures/students/#complaints-grievances) web page.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.1.8:The program submits its policies and procedures for terminating a student’s enrollment in the social work program for reasons of academic and professional performance. The program describes how it informs students of these policies and procedures. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative submits the program’s policies and procedures for terminating a student’s enrollment in the social work program for reasons of academic **and** professional performance across all program options. |

Policy for academic and non-academic [retention and program continuance](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Academic_Non_Retention) are outlined in the MSW Student Handbook.

**Termination Based on Academic Performance**

Students whose grades fall below academic requirements will be formally notified of the unmet requirement and will be placed on academic retention in the program, consistent with Graduate Studies policy. The student will be directed to schedule a meeting with the MSW Program Coordinator and assigned Faculty Advisor to discuss options for addressing the academic concern and continuance in the program. If the student does not follow-through with the meeting and/or does not achieve a 3.0 end-of-term cumulative GPA after attempting a cumulative total of 15 or more credits at UW-Green Bay, academic Suspension status goes into effect.

The MSW Program follows the Office of Graduate Studies procedures for academic Suspension, which are as follows:

At the time a student earns academic Suspension, a graduate committee identified by each program reviews the student’s record up to that time and recommends for Continued Enrollment or for academic Suspension status to take effect.  For thesis/dissertation-based programs, the review committee must consist of the student’s graduate committee plus the program chair.  In situations in which a student-specific graduate committee does not exist, then the program must form a committee consisting of the program chair, the student’s advisor, and a minimum of one additional member from the programs executive committee.  All committees must contain a minimum of three faculty.

If the committee feels the student cannot achieve success in the MSW Program, they will recommend upholding the academic Suspension status and the student will be terminated from the Program.

**Termination Based on Professional Performance**

In deciding on continuance options in the MSW Program, the faculty, in collaboration with the student, consider: (1) the likelihood that the student will meet the standard in question in a reasonable time period if a proposed solution is implemented; (2) the consequences for the student’s graduation trajectory if a decision on removal from the program is delayed; and (3) the seriousness and urgency of the problem in terms of its impact on the student, on present and future social work clients, on the profession, on the practicum agency, and on the MSW program and its students and staff. While the faculty is committed to helping students succeed in the program, the program’s ultimate responsibility is to the student’s future clients and to the professional and local communities within which the student might practice. The steps for continuance are:

1. The student, the Faculty Advisor, and MSW Program Coordinator develop a time limited plan to meet retention standard(s).
2. The student may be advised to step out of the MSW program or pursue the degree on a part-time basis while an underlying challenge or barrier to success is addressed or alleviated.
3. The student may be dismissed from the MSW program with the option of reapplying to the program at a later date.

If the student’s professional performance is egregious or none of the above steps are reasonable, the MSW Program will consult with the Dean of Students in terminating the student from the Program.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program informs students of these policies and procedures across all program options. |

**Informing Students of Academic Performance Termination Processes**

Students are informed of the [Continuance](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Continuance)/Termination process in the MSW Student Handbook and the UWGB Graduate Catalog (See “[Academic Standing](https://catalog.uwgb.edu/graduate/general-information/academic-rules-regulations/acad-standing/)”).

**Informing Students of Professional Performance Termination Processes**

Students are informed of the Continuance/Termination process in the MSW Student Handbook ( See [Academic and Nonacademic Retention](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Academic_Non_Retention)) and on the Dean of Students website as noted above.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

**Student Participation**

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.1.9:The program submits its policies and procedures specifying students’ rights and opportunities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the program’s policies and procedures specifying students’ rights and opportunities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs for each program option. |

**Students’ Rights to Participate in Academic and Student Affairs Policymaking**

Students in the MSW Program are made aware of the following [list of their rights](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Student_Rights) through the MSW student handbook:

1. Academic freedom, which includes the right within the academic program to examine, study, and write about controversial issues that relate to a program of study and to discuss or present these issues as they relate to course content and context;
2. Freedom from harassment or discrimination based on race, gender, ethnicity, age, marital status, sexual or affectional orientation, class, religion, disability, political affiliation or any other qualification or characteristic that could prove discriminatory;
3. Freedom from arbitrary or capricious evaluation and grading;
4. Due process when appealing or grieving a grade, disciplinary action, or negative student personnel decision;
5. A comprehensive syllabus that details course content, objectives, policies, grading criteria, and assignments within the first week of classes;
6. Timely feedback on assignments and exams;
7. Reasonable access to advisors and instructors outside of class;
8. Confidentiality as detailed in this handbook and the Family Educational Rights and

Privacy Act;

1. Advising and an opportunity to improve when academic performance or behavior places their status in the program in jeopardy (Students are responsible for monitoring their own grade point average to assure retention);
2. Freedom to organize when following the policies established by the University;
3. Input into program design, policies, and procedures;
4. Reasonable accommodation of documented disabilities; and
5. Input into the evaluation of the MSW program, its courses, and instructors.

There are three vehicles by which students can provide input into policies affecting academic and student affairs. (These are outlined in the Student Handbook immediately following the list of student rights.) First, in accordance with UW System Open Meeting requirements, students have an open invitation to attend Social Work faculty meetings, Advisory Committee meetings, and open University Committee meetings, provide feedback on agenda topics, and request an item to be placed on the meeting agenda. The Social Work faculty, comprised of all faculty members in the Social Work Program, is the governing committee for the MSW program, charged with full oversight of all matters affecting structure, curriculum, policies, and evaluation. Meeting dates are posted on a universal UW-Green Bay calendar.

Second, it is the policy of the Social Work Program to solicit student input before finalizing any policy or major procedural changes that would result in changes to the MSW Student Handbook. Any proposed changes will first be discussed in a faculty meeting. The Social Work Chair, or designee, will contact the student body and invite them to a meeting to learn about the potential changes. At that meeting, the Chair, or designee, will provide information about the proposed changes, along with any relevant rationale for the changes, and solicit student feedback. In situations where students do not agree with the proposed faculty changes, student input will be seriously considered by the faculty and good effort attempts at compromise will be made. Ultimately, faculty members are the only persons with voting rights to any and all policy and procedural changes affecting the Social Work Program.

Lastly, in addition to the end-of-semester course evaluations completed by students each semester, MSW students are invited to complete a comprehensive evaluation of the program each spring. Aggregate data from both sources are used for the program’s evaluation efforts and to maintain its accreditation status. Once a year, the Chair of the Social Work Program and/or the MSW Program Coordinator invite students to a meeting whereby the findings from the previous year’s evaluations are presented and discussed.

**Students’ Responsibilities to Participate in Academic and Student Affairs Policymaking**

Students in the MSW Program are made aware of the following list of their [responsibilities](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Student_Responsibilities) through the MSW student handbook:

1. To deal responsibly with controversial issues related to course content, drawing on sound research and documented sources;
2. To realistically assess their fit with the social work profession, taking into consideration the ability to practice within the value base, standards, and ethics of the profession;
3. To respect the rights and dignity of classmates, faculty, agency personnel, and service recipients and to model civility toward these persons as individuals and groups;
4. To responsibly address disagreements, conflicts, complaints, or grievances informally with the appropriate persons before initiating a formal procedure;
5. To carefully read and familiarize themselves with program and course policies, handouts, and syllabi;
6. To meet the requirements of the MSW program curriculum and of each course;
7. To come to class and team meetings prepared, to attend regularly, and to contribute positively to the class climate and to the learning of self and others;
8. To practice timeliness of attendance in class and field, submission of work, and completion of practicum assignments;
9. To follow through on commitments to the program, classmates, personnel and service recipients in the field;
10. To take responsibility for their own learning, identify their own learning needs and take steps to meet them, responsibly addressing concerns with instructors if problems or issues arise, and monitor one’s own progress, seeking remediation when necessary;
11. To follow the NASW Code of Ethics, classroom and field confidentiality policies and to observe academic honesty;
12. To make responsible and alternative efforts to contact instructors when they cannot be reached immediately, making appropriate use of e-mail, voicemail, and messages;
13. To use mechanisms such as evaluation of the work of fellow students and student rating of courses responsibly, observing honesty and objectivity, and providing constructive feedback; and
14. To give appropriate advance notice when special accommodations are requested for any reason.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.1.10:The program describes how it provides opportunities and encourages students to organize in their interests. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates how the program provides opportunities and encourages students to organize in their interests for each program option. |

**Provides Opportunities for Student Organization**

The UWGB Social Work Professional Programs is named the Phi Delta chapter of the [Phi Alpha](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Phi_Alpha) Honor Society. Each year, all eligible social work students are invited to join the chapter and carry out its mission to promote humanitarian goals and ideas. In addition, the Social Work Professional Programs provides advising for the Social Justice Club, a UWGB student organization charged with promoting social justice and working towards social change.

In addition, as non-University opportunities arise for students to organize, announcements are made via email ,in individual classes, and through the MSW Program Portal. Examples of such opportunities include NASW-WI Lobby Day, political or social justice community events, volunteering for social service organizations, etc.

**Encourages Student Organization**

While students are informed of these opportunities through the MSW student handbook, orientation, the social work website, and via email, this is one area the MSW Program could strengthen. The majority of our MSW students are non-traditional age, working, and raising families; resulting in only a few who are interested in organizing as a group. The faculty continue to discuss ways to improve in this area, while honoring student self-determination. This remains a goal for the upcoming year(s).

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

# Accreditation Standard 3.2 — Faculty

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.2.1:The program identifies each full- and part-time social work faculty member and discusses his or her qualifications, competence, expertise in social work education and practice, and years of service to the program. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: The program submits a complete faculty summary form and uniform faculty data forms (CVs) for each full- or part-time faculty member teaching in the current academic year inclusive of faculty across all program options. |

The pages which follow include the faculty summary form and the faculty data forms for all who teach social work courses.

**Faculty Summary Form**

**Council on Social Work Education Commission on Accreditation (COA)**

This form is used to assist the COA in the evaluation of the program’s compliance with the following *Accreditation Standard*s:

***3.2.1*** *The program identifies each full- and part-time social work faculty member and discusses his or her qualifications, competence, expertise in social work education and practice, and years of service to the program.*

***3.2.2*** *The program documents that faculty who teach social work practice courses have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post–master’s social work degree practice experience.*

***B3.2.4*** *The baccalaureate social work program identifies no fewer than two full-time faculty assigned to the baccalaureate program, with full-time appointment in social work, and whose principal assignment is to the baccalaureate program. The majority of the total full-time baccalaureate social work program faculty has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program, with a doctoral degree preferred.*

***M3.2.4*** *The master's social work program identifies no fewer than six full-time faculty with master's degrees in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and whose principal assignment is to the master's program. The majority of the full-time master's social work program faculty has a master's degree in social work and a doctoral degree, preferably in social work.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Each Full- and Part-time Faculty Member** | **Title of Faculty Member** | **Full-time Faculty Member?**  **(Per AS B/M3.2.4)** | **Degree from CSWE-Accredited Master’s Program1?**  **(Per AS 3.2.1 and AS 3.2.2)** | **Doctoral Degree?**  **(Per AS 3.2.1 and AS M3.2.4)** | **Number of Years of Post-MSW Social Work Practice Experience2**  **(Per AS 3.2.2)** | **Teaching Practice Courses3?**  **(Per AS 3.2.2)** | **Number of Years of Service to the Social Work Program**  **(Per AS 3.2.1)** | **Percentage of Time Assigned to Program4**  **(Per AS B/M3.2.4)** | |
| **Baccalaureate** | **Master’s** |
| T. Francis Akakpo | Associate Professor & MSW Program Coordinator | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | 8 | Yes ☐  No☒ | 12 | 0 % | 100% |
| Susan Exworthy | Associate Lecturer | Yes ☐  No☒ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☐  No☒ | 6.5 | Yes ☐  No☒ | .5 | 0% | 11% |
| Sara Greenwood | Lecturer & MSW Field Coordinator | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☐ No☒ | 6 | Yes ☒  No☐ | 1.5 | 22% | 78% |
| Joan Groessl | Associate Professor & Department Chair | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | 22 | Yes ☒  No☐ | 13 | 29% | 71% |
| Corinna Heindel | Associate Lecturer | Yes ☐  No☒ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☐  No☒ | 3 | Yes ☒  No☐ | .5 | 0% | 25% |
| Heather Lawrence | Lecturer & Child Welfare Coordinator | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☐ No☒ | 12 | Yes ☒  No☐ | 3 | 72% | 28% |
| Sheng Lee Yang | Lecturer | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☐ No☒ | 7.5 | Yes ☒  No☐ | 3 | 33% | 67% |
| Brittany Maas | Associate Lecturer | Yes ☐  No☒ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☐  No☒ | 1 | Yes ☐  No☒ | 1 | 33% | 0% |
| Andrea Pasqualucci | Associate Lecturer | Yes ☐  No☒ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☐  No☒ | 19 | Yes ☐  No☒ | 3 | 0% | 14.8% |
| Stephanie Rhee | Associate Professor | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | 13.5 | Yes ☒  No☐ | 4 | 0% | 100% |
| Jolanda Sallmann | Associate Professor & BSW Program Coordinator | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒  No☐ | 1.25 | Yes ☐  No☒ | 18 | 100% | 0% |
| Jennifer Schanen-Materi | Senior Lecturer & BSW Field Coordinator | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☐  No☒ | 2 | Yes ☒  No☐ | 6 | 74 % | 26% |
| Nicole Schneider | Lecturer | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒  No☐ | 18 | Yes ☒  No☐ | .5 | 24 % | 76% |
| Gail Trimberger | Associate Professor | Yes ☐  No☒ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | 24 | Yes ☒  No☐ | 13 | 0% | 63% |
| Sherry Warren | Assistant Professor | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | 10.25 | Yes ☒  No☐ | 3 | 87.5% | 12.5% |
| Cary Waubanascum | Assistant Professor | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☒ No☐ | 7 | Yes ☒  No☐ | .5 | 29% | 71% |
| Vacant A | Lecturer | Yes ☒ No☐ | Yes ☐ No☐ | Yes ☐ No☐ | -- | Yes ☐  No☐ | -- | (22%) | (62.5%) |
|  | | | | | | | | Total FTE:  5.04 | Total FTEB:  7.35 |

A **Note:** A faculty member left employment one week before the start of the 2021-2022 academic year. Because courses needed to be covered and search required more time, the courses for the Program were contracted out to Associate Lecturers, Susan Exworthy (3 CR-MSW) and Brittany Maas (3 CR- BSW). The remaining credits were taught as overload by faculty: Dr. Akakpo (3 CR-MSW), Dr. Groessl (3 CR-MSW), Ms. Lee Yang (3 CR- BSW), Dr. Rhee (2 CR-MSW) & Dr. Trimberger (7 CR-MSW). Coverage was 15 CR MSW and 6 CR BSW. Associate Lecturer courses are included in the table’s FTE. Overload FTE: .22 BSW and .625 MSW. (Remaining credits were electives which were not taught; FTE in parenthesis is the overload credits).Search for replacement approved in Fall 2021 with an initial screen date of January 10,2022 and will be completed during the spring 2022 semester.

B **Note**: Required summer MSW courses are not included in this table since funding for summer is an additional contract. For summer 2021-2022, this is equal to .5 FTE. Also not included was a 3 CR cross listed BSW/MSW course taught during Winterim (.11 FTE)

.

**Akakpo** **Faculty Data**

**Tohoro Francis Akakpo**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | PhD |
| Institution Granting Degree | Michigan State University |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May 2008 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Michigan-Ann Arbor |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | December 2002 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Public Administration |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Michigan-Flint |
| Major | Public Administration |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May 1994 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Arts |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Benin-Togo W. Africa |
| Major | English |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | June 1999 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | MSW Program Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 07/2021 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Associate Professor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/2015 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Assistant Professor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/2009 |
| End date (month/year) | 08/2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Michigan State University |
| Title | Clinical Assistant Professor |
| City and state | East Lansing, MI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/2008 |
| End date (month/year) | 05/2009 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Michigan State University |
| Title | Teaching Assistant |
| City and state | East Lansing, MI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/2003 |
| End date (month/year) | 05/2005 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Devonport University |
| Title | Adjunct Instructor |
| City and state | Flint, MI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/1995 |
| End date (month/year) | 05/1997 |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | MI Dept. of Human Services & Bureau of Juveniles |
| Position | Clinical Social Worker |
| City and state | Whitmore Lake, MI |
| Start date (month/year) | 01/2005 |
| End date (month/year) | 07/2009 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | MI Dept. of Human Services & Bureau of Juveniles |
| Position | Youth Specialist |
| City and state | Whitmore Lake, MI |
| Start date (month/year) | 11/1997 |
| End date (month/year) | 12/2005 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Beecher Community School District |
| Position | Title IIV-E Family Service Coordinator |
| City and state | Flint, MI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/1995 |
| End date (month/year) | 11/1997 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* National Association of Social Workers
* Council on Social Work Education
* Licensed Master Social Worker (Clinical and Macro Practice) # 680187273 [MI]
* National Adolescence Perpetration Network (NAPN)

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Brown County Martin Luther King Jr – Committee Member
* Green Bay School District School, Volunteer Presenter

Professional presentations during the last 5 years.

Akakpo, T.F. (July, 2017). Self-reported deviant sexual offense among juvenile male offenders. 35 International Academy of Law and Mental Health Congress Conference, Prague, Czech Republic

Akakpo, T. F (June, 2016). Embracing change in the 21st Century Ghana Police Service and community empowerment. Ghana National Police Training School, Accra Ghana

Professional publications for the last 5 years.

Fletcher, A. M. C., & Akakpo T. (2021). Can we do better: Mitigating negatively racialized attitudes in child welfare through self-awareness in training. *Journal of Child welfare 98(3)* 1-23

Brown, J.R. Karikari, I, Abraham, S. & Akakpo, T. (2018). Left off the route; A qualitative examination of urban bus drivers wanting to be players in the bully prevention solution. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 00(0), 1-25. DOI: 101.1177/088626051878204.

Liebowitz, G.S., Akakpo, T.F., & Burton, D.L. (2016). Comparison of non-sexual crimes committed by male juvenile sexual offenders and delinquent youth in residentials treatment in the United States. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse 2*(5), 595-613.

**Exworthy Faculty Data**

**Susan Exworthy**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | August, 2014 |
|  | |
| Degree | Bachelor of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May, 2013 |

* Graduate Certification from the Masters of Medical Sciences-Gerontology & Aging, University of Florida-August. 2019
* Grief Support Specialist Certificate, UW Madison- September, 2017
* AODA Counselor Certificate, NWTC Green Bay- May, 2012

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Adjunct Lecturer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 1/2022 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Oneida Behavioral Health |
| Position | Dual Diagnosis Therapist |
| City and state | Oneida Nation, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 12/2018 |
| End date (month/year) | Present |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Door County Human Services Department |
| Position | Dual Diagnosis Therapist |
| City and state | Sturgeon Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 03/2018 |
| End date (month/year) | 11/2018 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Oneida Behavioral Health |
| Position | Psychotherapist/ Dual Diagnosis Therapist |
| City and state | Oneida Nation, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 11/2016 |
| End date (month/year) | 03/2018 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Baeten Counseling |
| Position | OWI First Offenders-Insights Group Facilitation |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 07/2017 |
| End date (month/year) | 03/2018 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Brown County/ Nicolet Psychiatric |
| Position | Clinical Social Worker (Part time) |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 02/2016 |
| End date (month/year) | 02/2018 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Jackie Nitschke Center |
| Position | Residential Substance Abuse Counselor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 3/2015 |
| End date (month/year) | 11/2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Independent Assessment & Counseling |
| Position | AODA Counselor & MH Therapist |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 05/2014 |
| End date (month/year) | 04/2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Brown County Human Services |
| Position | AODA Counselor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 10/2013 |
| End date (month/year) | 5/2014 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* LCSW Licensed Clinical Social Worker
* CSAC Clinical Substance Abuse Counselor
* Crisis Certification (Current- since 2/2014)
* CSOTP, Certified Sex Offender Treatment Professional

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Oneida Elder Services Community Advisory Board for Alzheimer’s & Dementia – Current

**Greenwood Faculty Data**

**Sara Greenwood**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Arts |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Michigan |
| Major | Psychology |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | 4/2003 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Michigan |
| Major | Interpersonal Practice, Management of Human Services |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | 4/2006 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Lecturer, MSW Field Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 07/2020 |
| End date (month/year) | present |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Department of Veterans Affairs |
| Position | Education and Training Coordinator |
| City and state | Ann Arbor, MI |
| Start date (month/year) | 8/200 |
| End date (month/year) | 5/2014 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Department of Veterans Affairs |
| Position | Social Worker |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 5/2014 |
| End date (month/year) | 7/2020 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | University of Michigan School of Nursing |
| Position | Social Worker |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 5/2014 |
| End date (month/year) | 7/2020 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* National Association of Social Workers (2019 to present)
* Council of Social Work Education – Wisconsin Chapter (2021)
* State of Michigan Licensed Master Social Worker-Clinical and Macro (since 2016)

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Northeast Wisconsin Master Gardner Association (2020)

**Groessl Faculty Data**

**Joan Groessl**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | PhD |
| Institution Granting Degree | Marian University |
| Major | Leadership Studies |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May, 2013 |

.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May, 1989 |
|  | |
| Degree | Bachelor of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May, 1984 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Associate Professor & Social Work Department Chair |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 7/2019 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Assistant Professor & BSW Program Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 7/2016 |
| End date (month/year) | 6/2019 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Assistant Professor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 8/2015 |
| End date (month/year) | 6/2016 |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Assistant Professor & BSW Field Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 06/2014 |
| End date (month/year) | 07/2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Lecturer & MSW Field Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 7/2008 |
| End date (month/year) | 7/2014 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | NEW Partnership for Children & Families |
| Position | Curriculum Development & Trainer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 05/2012 |
| End date (month/year) | 06/2016 |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Brown County Human Services Department |
| Position | Clinical Supervisor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 03/2003 |
| End date (month/year) | 08/2008 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Brown County Human Services Department |
| Position | Psychiatric Social Worker |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 02/1999 |
| End date (month/year) | 03/2003 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Kewaunee County Human Services |
| Position | Mental Health Coordinator |
| City and state | Algoma, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 07/1989 |
| End date (month/year) | 02/1999 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Beverly Enterprises (Dorchester NC & Kewaunee HCC) |
| Position | Social Worker |
| City and state | Sturgeon Bay & Kewaunee, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/1984 |
| End date (month/year) | 07/1989 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* National Association of Social Workers
* Council on Social Work Education
* Licensed Clinical Social Worker # 828-123

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Algoma Venture Academy, Board President, 3/2021 – Current
* Algoma Medical Center Board, President, 2/2014 – Current
* Us2 Behavioral Health Services, Board member, 2019 – Current
* Live Algoma, Team Lead, Consultant & Program Evaluation, 2016 – Current

Special awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition you have received during the last 3 years.

* UWGB Speaker of the Senate, 2021-2022.
* Certified Site Visitor, Council on Social Work Education Commission on Accreditation, 2021.
* UWGB Distance Education Grant Award [Department Award/Participant], 2021.
* UW Certificate in Online Learning. Jan. 2021.
* Wisconsin Teaching & Learning Scholar, 2019-2020.
* National Association of Social Workers- WI Delegate, 2018-2021 & 2021-2024.
* Basic Needs Giving Partnership Grant for Resiliency Based Program for Youth. Greater Green Bay Foundation to Live Algoma/Algoma School District (2018, $91,000 x 3 years) [T. VanLanen co-writer].
* QPR Certified Trainer since 2018 (renewed 2021 x 3 years).
* Association of Social Work Boards, Path to Licensure Scholar, 2017-2020.

Professional presentations during the last 5 years.

2021

* Ethics and Boundaries: Risk, Vulnerability & Resilience in Practice [Synchronous/Virtual 4-hour] Wisconsin AIRS Conference.
* Ethics & Boundaries: Best Practices in Addressing Spirituality (with Sherry Warren), [4 hours] National Association of Social Workers Annual Conference, WI Dells, WI.
* Continuing Professional Education: Best Practice or Convenience (with Brittany Maas), [75 min.] National Association of Social Workers Annual Conference, WI Dells, WI.
* Ethics and Boundaries of Mentoring [4 hours/Synchronous Virtual & 2 hours Online with 2 hours Synchronous Virtual]. University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Continuing Education and Community Engagement.
* Ethics and Boundaries: Risk, Vulnerability & Resilience in Practice [Asynchronous Online - designed to meet MPSW 19 guidelines for ethics & boundaries continuing education/4 hour]. University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Continuing Education and Community Engagement.

2020

* Effectiveness of Teaching Professionalism in a BSW Course. Council on Social Work Education Annual Conference [Virtual/On Demand], Nov. 12-14, 2020.
* Effectiveness of Teaching Professionalism in a BSW Course [Narrated Poster]. UW System Spring Conference on Teach and Learning.

2019 - 2021

* Ethics & Boundaries: Collegial Relationships [4 hours]. Department of Corrections, Oshkosh & Madison: Wisconsin AIRS Conference, Green Bay; Winnebago County Human Services; Family Services, Green Bay [Virtual], Wisconsin Resource Center & Winnebago Mental Health Institute [2 sessions/Virtual]

2018

* Get licensed, Live licensed. Baccalaureate Program Directors Annual Conference, Atlanta, GA. [with Jan Fitts, ASWB]
* Crisis Intervention in Challenging Situations [90 minutes], East Shore Industries, Algoma.
* Train the Trainer/APS Curriculum [4 hours], Wausau.
* APS Curriculum, Day 3: Intervention Strategies in Adult Protective Services [5.5 hours], Eau Claire, Kimberly, Madison and Wausau.
* APS Curriculum, Day 2: Collaborating for Best Practice [5.5 hours], Eau Claire, Kimberly, Madison and Wausau.
* APS Curriculum, Day 1: Foundations of Adult Protective Services. [5.5 hours], Eau Claire, Kimberly, Madison and Wausau.
* Links in the Chain: Responding Ethically to Trauma. [4 hours]. Wisconsin Department of Corrections, offering in Oshkosh and Appleton.
* Self-Care: At the Center of Ethics and Boundaries. [4 hours] University of WI- Eau Claire; UW-Hospitals, Madison; Rainbow Hospice Care, Jefferson, WI; Aging & Disability Resource Center, Manitowoc, WI; St. Vincent, Bellin, & Aurora Hospitals, Green Bay.

2017-2018

* Ethics and Boundaries through the Lens of trauma [4 hours]- University of WI-Green Bay Continuing Education & Community Engagement. Contracted to provide training through biennium.

2017

* Ethical leadership in human services: Preparing students for moral courage within organizational contexts. International Society for Ethics across the Curriculum Annual Conference, Grand Rapids, MI.
* Review of license and certification violations: Implications for social work education. Baccalaureate Program Directors Annual Conference. New Orleans, LA
* Ethics and Boundaries along the Pathway in End of Life Care. [4 hours] UW-Colleges, Sheboygan
* Self-Care: At the Center of Ethics and Boundaries. [4 hours] University of WI- Whitewater
* Moral Courage in the Workplace. [4 hours]. Wisconsin Social Services Association [Annual Conference]. Wisconsin Dells, WI

2016 & 2017

* Ethics and Boundaries in the Healthcare Environment [4 hours]. HSHS Hospital Sisters, Green Bay WI.

Professional publications for the last 5 years.

Groessl, J. (2021). Book review: Evaluation practice for collaborative growth: A guide to program evaluation with stakeholders and communities. *Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work, 26*(1), 115-117. https://doi.org/10.18084/1084-7219.26.1.115

Groessl, J. (2020, accepted). Book review: Spiritual diversity in social work practice. *Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work*

Groessl, J. (2020) Teaching note: Birth order theory critique as a learning opportunity. *Social Work Education*. [Online.] https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2020.1819972

Groessl, J. (2020). Book review: People and climate change: Vulnerability, adaptation, and social justice. *Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics, 17*(1), 81.

Kennedy, S. & Groessl, J. (2020). Teaching for retention through the lens of inclusion. *Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping.* [Online]. *26*(4), 79-85.

Groessl, J. (2020, submitted). Lesson plans. In K. Zgoda (2021, in preparation). Active learning lessons, activities, & assignments for the modern social work educator.

Groessl, J. & Kennedy, S. (2020). Research brief: Professional continuing education survey. [Completed as Path to Licensure Scholar]. Association of Social Work Boards.

Groessl, J & Vandenhouten, C. (2019). Examining students’ attitudes and readiness for interprofessional education and practice. *Education Research International*, Article ID 2153292, 7 pages. https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/2153292

Groessl, J. (2019). Book Review: Assessment in counseling: Practice and applications. *Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work, 24*(1), 71-72. https://doi.org/10.18084/1084-7219.24.1.71

Groessl, J. (2019). Interdisciplinary ethics exercise. In L. Hitchcock, M. Sage, & N.J. Smyth. *Teaching Social Work with Digital Technology.* CSWE Press*.*

Groessl, J. (2018, Summer). The social work curriculum as opportunity for integrating licensure awareness. *ASWB Newsletter*. Retrieve from https://www.aswb.org/path-to-licensure-newsletter-summer-2018/#GROESSL

Groessl, J. (2018, December). Adult protective services curriculum training report. [Completed for the Wisconsin Department of Health Services]. University of Wisconsin-Green Bay.

Groessl, J. (2018). Adult Protective Services Training Curriculum. [Curriculum manual and training materials for three day foundation training.] University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Continuing Education and Continuing Engagement under a grant provided by the WI Department of Health Services.

Groessl, J. (2017). Leadership in the field: Fostering moral courage. *Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics, 14* (1), 72-79.

Vandenhouten, C., Groessl, J. & Levintova, K. (2017). How do you use problem-based learning to improve interdisciplinary thinking? (pp. 117- 133). In R. Gurung and D. Voelker (eds.). *New Directions for Teaching & Learning,* Wiley Online Library. DOI: 10.1002/tl.20252

National Association of Social Workers (2017). Professional self-care and social work. *Social work speaks*. (11th ed). NASW Press: Author.

[Assisted with policy statement revision.]

National Association of Social Workers (2017). Social work in the criminal justice system. *Social work speaks*. (11th ed). NASW Press: Author.

[Assisted with policy statement revision.]

Groessl, J. (2017, June). *Ethics & Boundaries in Community Behavioral Health*. [Curriculum manual and training materials]. Behavioral Health training Partnership.

**Heindel Faculty Data**

**Corinna Heindel**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | 05/2019 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Arts- Social Welfare |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Madison |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | 05/2017 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | School Social Work Coordinator & Associate Lecturer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 11/2021 |
| End date (month/year) | Ongoing |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Shawano School District |
| Position | School Social Worker |
| City and state | Shawano, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 9/2020 |
| End date (month/year) | Ongoing |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | DC Everest Area School District |
| Position | School Social Worker |
| City and state | Schofield, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 8/2019 |
| End date (month/year) | 9/2020 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, School Social Work Provisional License
* Advanced Practice Social Worker #131758

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Wisconsin School Social Work Association Board Member; Legislative & Legislative Committee Member
* Shawano and Menominee County Public Health Department improvement teams
* f NEW Family Services Shawano Area Early Childhood
* Partnership

Special awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition you have received during the last 3 years.

* Certification as Trauma Informed & Resilient Schools’ Trainer & Trauma Informed Practitioner (12/2020)- Starr Commonwealth
* First Nations Studies Professional Certification ( 2/2019)- University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

**Lawrence Faculty Data**

**Heather Lawrence**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May 2002 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May 2007 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin – Green Bay |
| Title | Lecturer, Child Welfare Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August 2019 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Outagamie County DHHS |
| Position | Division Manager |
| City and state | Appleton, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | October 2016 |
| End date (month/year) | August 2019 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Winnebago County DHS |
| Position | Program Manager- Child Protective Services |
| City and state | Neenah, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August 2014 |
| End date (month/year) | October 2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Outagamie County DHHS |
| Position | Supervisor |
| City and state | Appleton, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | January 2010 |
| End date (month/year) | August 2014 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Outagamie County DHHS |
| Position | Social Worker |
| City and state | Appleton, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | May 2007 |
| End date (month/year) | January 2010 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Waupaca County DHHS |
| Position | Social Worker |
| City and state | Waupaca, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | January 2004 |
| End date (month/year) | May 2007 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare- Innovative Family Partnerships, Inc. |
| Position | Ongoing Case Manager |
| City and state | Milwaukee, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | June 2002 |
| End date (month/year) | January 2004 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* Advanced Practice Social Worker, Wisconsin #128063

Awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition you have received during the last 3 years:

* UWGB Distance Education Grant Award (Department Award Participant), 2021.

Professional presentations during the last 5 years:

* 2017 Conference on Child Welfare and the Courts: Young Adult Offender Program – Moving 17 Year Olds Back to the Juvenile Justice System (October 19, 2017)

**Lee Yang Faculty Data**

**Sheng Lee Yang**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin- Madison |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | 05/2014 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree |  |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) |  |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin- Green Bay |
| Title | Lecturer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/2018 |
| End date (month/year) | Current appointment |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Us 2 Behavioral Health Care, Inc. |
| Position | Executive Director |
| City and state | Appleton, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 09/2019 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Strategic Behavioral Health- Willow Creek |
| Position | Director of Admissions |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 01/2017 |
| End date (month/year) | 08/2018 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Outagamie County Mental Health |
| Position | Community Support Specialist/Clinical Therapist |
| City and state | Appleton, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/2011 |
| End date (month/year) | 01/2018 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* Licensed Clinical Social Worker, Wisconsin, Number: 8613-123, issued 09/2016
* National Association of Social Workers (NASW)- WI Chapter
* NASW Professional Standards and Regulation Committee

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* DSPS- Social Work Examining Board, LCSW Representative, 09/2021- current
* Imagine Fox Cities, Vision Committee Member, 07/2021
* NEW Hmong Providers, Committee Member, 01/2019

Special awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition you have received during the last 3 years.

* Fox Cities Chamber, Future 15, 2021
* UWGB Distance Education Grant Award (Department Award Participant), 2021
* Women of Influence in the North Region, 2021
* WI Hmong Chamber of Commerce, Young Professional of the year, 2020
* UWGB Psychology Department, I am Psyched Keynote Speaker, 2019

Professional presentations during the last 5 years.

* HOPE Conference, "*Fundamentals of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion,* 2021
* UW Green Bay- BHTP, *Addressing crisis with minoritized youth*, 2021
* Harbor House, *When culture affects decision making*, 2021
* Harbor House, *Fundamentals of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion,* 2021
* CAP Services, *Fundamentals of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, 2021*
* UW Green Bay- Continuing Education Dept, *Desperate Journeys*, 2021
* UWGB Nursing Department, *Trauma Informed Care*, 2020
* State Bar of Wisconsin, *Fostering brave spaces to asking for help*, 2020
* Appleton West High School Hmong Club, *Health and Wellness*, 2020
* WI Annual MH & AODA Recovery Conference, *Understanding Equity, Diversity and Inclusion*, 2020
* Wellness Mental Health, *Strategies for healing during a pandemic*, 2020
* Wellness Mental Health, *Ethics & Boundaries: Pandemic effects on mental health*, 2020
* NAMI Fox Valley, *Fundamentals of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion*, 2020
* NAMI Fox Valley, *Trauma Informed Care from a multicultural approach*, 2020
* Manitowoc County, *Understanding Diversity, Inclusion and Equity,* 2019
* Brown County ADRC, *Trauma Informed Care*, 2019

**Maas Faculty Data**

**Brittany Maas**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | MSW |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | 05/2021 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | BSW |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | 05/2019 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Associate Lecturer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 09/2021 |
| End date (month/year) | Ongoing |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Foundations Health & Wholeness |
| Position | Resident Therapist |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 05/2021 |
| End date (month/year) | Ongoing |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Behavioral Health Training Partnership |
| Position | Project Assistant |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/2020 |
| End date (month/year) | Ongoing |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | SELF Program of Family Services of Northeast WI |
| Position | Youth & Family Specialist |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 04/2019 |
| End date (month/year) | Ongoing |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* National Association of Social Workers

Special awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition you have received during the last 3 years.

* Teaching Assistant- University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, Social Work Department 2020-2021
* Ambassador, National Association of Social Workers 2019-2020

Professional presentations during the last 5 years.

* Continuing Professional Education: Best Practice or Convenience (with Dr. Joan Groessl), [75 min.] National Association of Social Workers Annual Conference, WI Dells, WI. Nov. 2021

**Pasqualucci Faculty Data**

**Andrea Pasqualucci**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | MSSW with School Social Work Certification |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Madison |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | 05/1993 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | BSW |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | 05/1990 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Associate Lecturer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 01/2020 |
| End date (month/year) | Current/Ongoing |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Ashwaubenon School District |
| Position | School Social Worker |
| City and state | Ashwaubenon, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/2008 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | North Chicago Community Unit School District #187 |
| Position | School Social Worker |
| City and state | North Chicago, IL |
| Start date (month/year) | 8/2000 |
| End date (month/year) | 5/2002 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Chicagoland Children's Service Network |
| Position | Executive Director |
| City and state | Chicago, IL |
| Start date (month/year) | 1998 |
| End date (month/year) | 8/2000 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Mary Bridge Children’s Hospital |
| Position | Pediatric Medical Social Worker |
| City and state | Tacoma, WA |
| Start date (month/year) | 1997 |
| End date (month/year) | 1998 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Pierce County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office |
| Position | Victim Advocate |
| City and state | Tacoma, WA |
| Start date (month/year) | 1995 |
| End date (month/year) | 1997 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Crystal Lake School District #47 |
| Position | School Social Worker |
| City and state | Crystal Lake, IL |
| Start date (month/year) | 1993 |
| End date (month/year) | 1995 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Manitowoc County Human Services Department |
| Position | Juvenile Court Social Worker |
| City and state | Manitowoc, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 1990 |
| End date (month/year) | 1992 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition
* Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Professional Standards Council, 2015-current
* Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Teacher of the Year Council, 2014- current

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Partnership Action Committee Member/Ashcares Coordinator, Ashwaubenon School District, McKinney Vento Liaison

**Powell Faculty Data**

**Nina Powell**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | 05/2005 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Science in Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Nebraska-Omaha |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | 05/2000 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin- Green Bay |
| Title | Lecturer & MSW Field Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/2015 |
| End date (month/year) | 08/2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin- Green Bay |
| Title | Lecturer/Senior Lecturer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 08/2016 |
| End date (month/year) | 08/2021 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Phoenix |
| Title | Certified Advanced Facilitator |
| City and state | Tempe, AZ [On-Line Instruction] |
| Start date (month/year) | 04/2009 |
| End date (month/year) | 07/2015 |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Betterhelp |
| Position | Therapist [Online] |
| City and state | Mountain View, CA |
| Start date (month/year) | 02/2020 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | CHAPS Academy, Inc. |
| Position | Part-Time Therapist |
| City and state |  |
| Start date (month/year) | 11/2016 |
| End date (month/year) | 7/2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Family Services Day Treatment |
| Position | Experiential Therapist II |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 07/2011 |
| End date (month/year) | 07/2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Family Services Silvercrest Group Home/FRST |
| Position | Family Therapist |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 10/2005 |
| End date (month/year) | 10/2007 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Lutheran Family Services |
| Position | Foster Care Specialist/SNAP Case Manager/Pride Trainer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 10/2002 |
| End date (month/year) | 3/2004 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | West Iowa Family Services |
| Position | In-Home Therapist |
| City and state | Des Moines, IA |
| Start date (month/year) | 03/2001 |
| End date (month/year) | 10/2002 |

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Red Cross Disaster Mental Health Volunteer (Certified)

Special awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition you have received during the last 3 years.

* Earned Senior Lecturer status at University of Wisconsin- Green Bay (2020)
* Certified ACRA (Adolescent Community Reinforcement Approach) Therapist

**Rhee Faculty Data**

**Stephanie Rhee**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Ph. D. |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Kentucky |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | December, 2013 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Science in Social Administration |
| Institution Granting Degree | Case Western Reserve University |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May, 1999 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Arts |
| Institution Granting Degree | Case Western Reserve University |
| Major | Medical Anthropology |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May, 1997 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Arts |
| Institution Granting Degree | Korea University |
| Major | English Literature |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | February, 1988 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Arts |
| Institution Granting Degree | Seoul Women’s University |
| Major | English Literature |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | February, 1984 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Associate Professor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | September, 2021 |
| End date (month/year) | Present |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Assistant Professor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August, 2017 |
| End date (month/year) | August, 2021 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Youngstown State University |
| Title | Assistant Professor |
| City and state | Youngstown, OH |
| Start date (month/year) | August, 2014 |
| End date (month/year) | May, 2017 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Northern Kentucky University |
| Title | Adjunct Faculty |
| City and state | Highland Heights, KY |
| Start date (month/year) | January, 2014 |
| End date (month/year) | May, 2014 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Kentucky |
| Title | Adjunct Faculty |
| City and state | Lexington, KY |
| Start date (month/year) | August, 2006 |
| End date (month/year) | May, 2011 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Training Resource Center, University of Kentucky |
| Title | Research Assistant |
| City and state | Lexington, KY |
| Start date (month/year) | January, 2007 |
| End date (month/year) | September, 2007 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences, CSWE |
| Title | Research Assistant |
| City and state | Cleveland, OH |
| Start date (month/year) | June, 1998 |
| End date (month/year) | August, 1998 |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | University of Cincinnati Medical Center |
| Position | Part-Time Medical Social Worker |
| City and state | Cincinnati, OH |
| Start date (month/year) | September, 2005 |
| End date (month/year) | August, 2014 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | University of Cincinnati Medical Center |
| Position | Full-Time Medical Social Worker |
| City and state | Cincinnati, OH |
| Start date (month/year) | November, 2000 |
| End date (month/year) | August, 2005 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Veterans Affairs Medical Center |
| Position | Social Work Trainee |
| City and state | Brecksville, OH |
| Start date (month/year) | May, 1998 |
| End date (month/year) | August, 1998 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* National Association of Social Worker
* Gerontological Society of America
* Council on Social Work Education
* Society for Social Work and Research
* Wisconsin Council on Social Work Education

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Curative Connections Advisory Committee, Yesteryear Village Project, Member, October 2021--Present
* Innovation in Aging Planning Committee, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, Member, September 2020—Present
* Journal of Social Work Education, Three-year Contract Reviewer, July 2018--June 2021
* Invited Peer Reviewer for Asia Pacific Education Review, October 2020
* Gerontological Society of America Korean/Korean American & Aging Interest Group, Member, October 2020
* Medical College of Wisconsin-Green Bay Inter-Professional Geriatric Case Study Session, Faculty Facilitator, November 2020
* UWGB Innovation in Aging Kickoff Event Presentation, Presenter, November 2020
* Invitation for the Common Read Town Hall Panel Discussion, Panel Speaker, September 2020
* Asian Professor Panel, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, Panel Speaker, April 2019
* Asian Heritage Fashion Show, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, Participant, April 2019

Special awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition you have received during the last 3 years.

* UWGB Distance Education Grant Award, Department Award/Participant, 2021
* UWGB CATL Distance Education Course Badges, Summer 2021
* UWGB Inclusivity & Equity Certificate Level I Award, October 2020
* UWGB CATL Student Nominated Teaching Award, 2020
* UWGB Teaching and Learning Scholar, 2018-2019

Professional presentations during the last 5 years.

Rhee, S. (2021, January 19-22). Effects of expressive and reflective writing on perceived stress, self-efficacy, and approaches to learning among Master of Social Work students. [Paper presentation]. Society for Social Work and Research 25th Virtual Conference.

Rhee, S. (2020, November). Exploring acculturation experiences of Korean immigrant older adults through expressive writing [Paper presentation]. Gerontological Society of America 2020 Annual Scientific Meeting Virtual Conference.

Rhee, S. (2020, April 16-17). The effect of expressive and reflective writing on perceived stress, self-efficacy, and approaches to learning among graduate-level social work students [Paper presentation]. Office of Professional and Instructional Development 2020 Spring Conference on Teaching & Learning, Madison, WI, United States—Cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic

Rhee, S. (2018, November 14-18). *Expressive writing among Korean immigrant elders residing in non-Korean ethnic enclaves* [Poster presentation]. Gerontological Society of America 70th Annual Scientific Meeting, Boston, MA, United States.

Professional publications for the last 5 years.

Peer Reviewed Journal Articles

Rhee, S. (in press). Expressive writing for Korean immigrant older adults residing in areas without well-established Korean communities. *Social Work Research*.

Kim, H. K., Jun, M. H., Rhee, S., & Wreen, M. (2020). Husserlian phenomenology in Korean nursing research: Analysis, problems, and suggestions. *The Journal of Korean Academic Society of Nursing Education, 26*(1), 5-15.

Kim, H. K., Jun, M. H., Rhee, S., & Wreen, M. (2020). Husserlian phenomenology in Korean nursing research: Analysis, problems, and suggestions (the secondary publication). *Journal of Educational Evaluation for Health Professions*. <http://doi.org/10.3352/jeehp.2020.17.13>

Rhee, S. (2019). Korean immigrant older adults residing in non-Korean ethnic enclaves: Acculturation strategies and psychosocial adaptation. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 29*(7), 861-873. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2019.1627970>

Rhee, S. (2019). Acculturative stress and coping among Korean immigrant elders residing in non-Korean ethnic enclaves. *International Social Work, 62*(2), 622-639. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872817741183>

Rhee, S. (2017). A caterpillar morphs into a butterfly. *Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping. 22*(3), 18-21. <https://reflectionsnarrativesofprofessionalhelping.org/index.php/Reflections/issue/view/121>

Rhee, S. (2017). Structural determinist aspects of depression in Freud’s Mourning and Melancholia. *Psychoanalytic Social Work, 24*(2), 96-113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228878.2017.1321998>

Rhee, S. (2017). Acculturative stress and depressive symptoms among Korean immigrant elders residing in non-Korean ethnic enclaves. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 26*(4), 347-365. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15313204.2016.1242101>

Published Conference Proceedings

Rhee, S. (2021, January 19-22). Effects of expressive and reflective writing on perceived stress, self-efficacy, and approaches to learning among Master of Social Work students [Paper presentation]. Society for Social Work and Research 25th Virtual Conference.

Rhee, S. (2020, November). Exploring acculturation experiences of Korean immigrant older adults through expressive writing. Innovation in Aging, Gerontological Society of America Annual Scientific Meeting Abstract: Paper Session.

Rhee, S. (2018, November). Expressive writing for Korean immigrant elders residing in non-ethnic enclaves. Innovation in Aging, 2(Suppl, 1), 634-644. Annual Scientific Meeting Abstract: Poster Session. https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igy023.2403

**Sallmann Faculty Data**

**Jolanda Sallmann**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | PhD |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Madison |
| Major | Social Welfare with a minor in Sociology |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | December 2005 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee |
| Major | Social Work with a concentration in children, youth & families |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | August 1996 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee |
| Major | Social Work with a minor in Psychology |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | December 1992 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Associate Professor of Social Work & BSW Program Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | July 2019 |
| End date (month/year) | Present |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Associate Professor of Social Work |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | May 2009 |
| End date (month/year) | Present |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay | |
| Title | Associate Professor of Social Work & Social Work Department Chair | |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI | |
| Start date (month/year) | July 2010 | |
| End date (month/year) | July 2019 | |
| Employing academic institution | | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | | Associate Professor of Social Work, Social Work Department Chair, & BSW Program Coordinator |
| City and state | | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | | July 2010 |
| End date (month/year) | | July 2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Assistant Professor of Social Work & Collaborative MSW Program Field Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | July 2006 |
| End date (month/year) | July 2008 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Assistant Professor of Social Work |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August 2004 |
| End date (month/year) | May 2009 |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Dane County Department of Human Services, Area Agency on Aging |
| Position | Social Worker, LTE—Elder Abuse Investigator |
| City and state | Madison, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | November 2002 |
| End date (month/year) | January 2003 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | YWCA of Madison |
| Position | Community Organizer/Curriculum & Training Coordinator |
| City and state | Madison, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | February 2001 |
| End date (month/year) | February 2002 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | St. Aemilian-Lakeside |
| Position | Youth Counselor, On-call |
| City and state | Milwaukee, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | October 1994 |
| End date (month/year) | December 1994 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Ethan Allen School for Boys—Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Youth Services |
| Position | Youth Counselor I |
| City and state | Wales, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | March 1993 |
| End date (month/year) | May 1993 |

Professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* Certified Social Worker # 3832-120

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Brown County Annual Martin Luther King (MLK) Community Celebration Committee, 2005-present
* Chair of Brown County MLK Poster/Essay/Poetry Competition Subcommittee, 2012-present
* Northeast Wisconsin Technical College Human Services Advisory Committee, 2017-present

Special awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition you have received during the last 3 years.

AWARDS

2017-2018 UWGB Founders Award: University Award for Excellence in Collaborative Achievement—MLK Jr. Community Celebration Event Committee (awarded to: F. Akakpo, G. Bansal, M. Lo Lee, J. Sallmann, & M. Teclezion).

2017-2018 Student Success, Recruitment, and Retention Award from CHESW: $5,000 received to complete activities revolving around diversity and equity.

2016-2017 Professional Development Related to Student Success and Retention Award from Provost’s Office: $5,250 to support sending a team to the Symposium on the Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Populations. Team included: J. Groessl, L. Poupart, J. Sallmann, and G. Trimberger.

GRANTS

Principal Investigator, *Title IV-E Long Term Child Welfare Training Program* (2010-present), average annual award exceeds $500,000.00. Wisconsin Division of Children and Family Services (from federal funds made available through Title IV-E of the Social Security Act.

Sallmann, J. & Trimberger, G. (Team leads). (2021-2022). *Distance Education Grant*. UW-Green Bay Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. Awarded $21,750 for curricular design and redesign of social work courses.

Professional presentations during the last 5 years.

Sallmann, J., Maas, B., Mitchell, S., & Remington, T. (2021, September 23). *Increasing human trafficking awareness through a general education course: Collaborating with community partners.* 18th Annual International Human Trafficking & Social Justice Conference.

Sallmann, J. (2017, March). *Students’ perceptions of BSW diversity climate: Examining implicit curriculum in a PWI.* Association of Baccalaureate Social Work Program Directors Annual Program Meeting.

Professional publications for the last 5 years.

Sallmann, J., Akakpo, T., Bansal, G., Teclezion, M., & Lo Lee, M. (Summer/Fall 2019). One man’s vision, my responsibility: Brown County Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Birthday Celebration. *Voyageur: Special Issue on African Americans in Northeast Wisconsin.* Green Bay, WI.

Other relevant information.

Webinar Co-Facilitation: Racial Battle Fatigue; Green Bay, WI

* + 1. With Eric Arneson: September 22, 2017
    2. With Susan Gallagher-Lepak: October 17, 2017

Coordination of campus-wide equity trainings, with Dean Susan Gallagher-Lepak:

1. Workshop I: The Complexity of Racism & Antiracist Practices in the American Academy; January 9, 2018
2. Workshop II: Setting the Stage; January 9, 2018
3. Workshop III: Using Equity to Guide Curriculum and Antiracist Pedagogy; January 11, 2018

**Schanen-Materi Faculty Data**

**Jennifer Schanen-Materi**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin – Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | August 2013 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin – Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May 2008 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin – Green Bay |
| Title | Senior Lecturer, BSW Field Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August 2020 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin – Green Bay |
| Title | Lecturer, BSW Field Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August 2015 |
| End date (month/year) | July 2020 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin – Green Bay |
| Title | Associate Lecturer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August 2014 |
| End date (month/year) | July 2015 |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Wise Women Gathering Place |
| Position | Program Outreach & Evaluation Specialist |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | February 2010 |
| End date (month/year) | August 2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Calumet County Health & Human Services |
| Position | MSW Intern |
| City and state | Chilton, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | January 2013 |
| End date (month/year) | August 2013 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Paragon Community Services |
| Position | Adult Program Instructor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | September 2009 |
| End date (month/year) | February 2010 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | N.E.W. Curative Rehabilitation Services |
| Position | Community Support Worker |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August 2009 |
| End date (month/year) | February 2010 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Golden House Family Violence Center |
| Position | Victim Advocate |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | May 2008 |
| End date (month/year) | September 2008 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* Advanced Practice Social Worker, Wisconsin #5274
* Certified Technology of Participation (ToP) Facilitator, ToP Network
* Qualified Technology of Participation Trainer, ToP Network

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Wise Women Gathering Place, Board Chair, October 2019-Present
* Wise Women Gathering Place, Board Member, September 2015-October 2019
* St. Matthew Catholic Community, Youth Program Volunteer, January 2019-Present
* Unity Hospice, Residence Volunteer, May 2017-Present
* Technology of Participation Facilitation Network, Board Secretary, January 2017-January 2019

Special awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition received during the last 3 years.

* UWGB Faculty Senate, Social Work Department Alternate, 2021-Present
* UWGB Distance Education Grant Award (Department Award Participant), 2021.
* Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, August 2020.
* Equity-Minded Institutional Change Teaching & Learning Community member, UWGB Center for the Advancement of Teaching & Learning, September 2019-May 2020.
* UWGB Wellness Committee, Faculty Representative, 2017-2020
* UWGB Individualized Learning Committee, College of Health, Education & Social Welfare Representative, 2017-2020

Professional presentations during the last 5 years

* Survey of Wisconsin Social Workers (PI, with B. Maas and BSW Senior Cohort 2021). (1 hour). Synchronous/Virtual. March 2021.
* Pivotal Pedagogies Advanced Canvas Training (with A. Chu, K. Farley, & L. Konkol). UWGB Center for the Advancement of Teaching & Learning. Asynchronous, Virtual. August 3-17, 2020.
* Learner Centered Discussions Advanced Canvas Training (with K. Farley). UWGB Center for the Advancement of Teaching & Learning. Asynchronous, Virtual. July 20-August 3, 2020.
* Cultivating Participatory Classrooms & Cohesive Groups. UW-Green Bay Instructional Development Institute. 20 minutes. Green Bay, WI. January, 2020.
* Rising Strong in the Field Environment. (1 hour). UWGB BSW Field Orientation. Green Bay, WI. September 2019.
* United Way ALICE PhotoVoice Research (PI, five student posters). WI Council on Social Work Education Spring Conference. Wisconsin Dells, WI. April 2019.
* United Way ALICE PhotoVoice Research (PI, one student poster). UW System Undergraduate Research, Scholarly & Creative Activity Symposium. Green Bay, WI. April 2019.
* First Nations Professional Certificate Session 4: Ethics & Boundaries for First Nations Communities (with F. Brooks). (4 hours). UWGB Continuing Education & Community Engagement. Green Bay, WI. January 2019.
* Boys & Girls Club Teens 2 Work Program Evaluation (PI, one student poster). WI Council on Social Work Education Spring Conference. Wisconsin Dells, WI. April 2018.
* Boys & Girls Club Teens 2 Work Program Evaluation (PI, one student poster). UW System Undergraduate Research, Scholarly & Creative Activity Symposium. Green Bay, WI. April 2018.
* Connecting to College Students: Use of ToP Facilitation to Create Meaningful Dialogue in Higher Education Settings. (1 hour). ToP Network Annual Gathering. Omaha, NE. January 2018.
* Promoting & Evaluating Seven Dimensions of Well-being in a Rural Community (with students H. Bergelin, A. Gruber, & T. Steele). WI Campus Compact Civic Engagement Institute. Green Bay, WI. April, 2017.
* Leveraging Our Multiple Intelligences for Effective Communication. (1 hour). UWGB BSW Field Orientation. Green Bay, WI. September 2016.
* Building Sustainability for Healing Programs in Native American Communities (with students G. Jochman, N. Kahler, & R. Saldana). WI Campus Compact Civic Engagement Institute. Milwaukee, WI. April 2016.
* White Bison Program Evaluation (PI, one student poster). WI Council on Social Work Education Spring Conference. Wisconsin Dells, WI. April 2016.
* 25 Years of Tools – An Introductory Exploration of the ToP Network Online Toolkit (with R. Moen & B. Glommen). (1 hour). ToP Network Annual Gathering. Phoenix, AZ. January 2016.
* Leveraging and Shaping our Online Tool Kit – Interactive Discussion (with R. Moen & B. Glommen). (1 hour). ToP Network Annual Gathering. Phoenix, AZ. January 2016.

Professional publications for the last 5 years

Schanen, J., Skenandore, A., Scow, B., & Hagen, J. (2017). Assessing the impact of a healthy relationships curriculum on Native American adolescents. *Social Work, 62*(3).

**Schneider Faculty Data**

**Nicole Schneider**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | PhD |
| Institution Granting Degree | Brandeis University |
| Major | Social Policy & Management |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | April, 2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Science |
| Institution Granting Degree | Brandeis University |
| Major | Social Policy |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | August, 2012 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | MSW |
| Institution Granting Degree | Columbia University |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | October, 1998 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | BSW |
| Institution Granting Degree | Loyola University |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May, 1997 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Lecturer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | September, 2021 |
| End date (month/year) | Present |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Simmons University |
| Title | Adjunct Faculty (DSW) |
| City and state | Boston, MA |
| Start date (month/year) | June, 2021 |
| End date (month/year) | December, 2021 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Kentucky |
| Title | Part-time Instructor & Course Developer |
| City and state | Lexington, KY |
| Start date (month/year) | January, 2021 |
| End date (month/year) | August, 2021 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Fordham University |
| Title | Adjunct Faculty Member |
| City and state | New York, NY |
| Start date (month/year) | September, 2018 |
| End date (month/year) | December, 2018 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Adjunct Lecturer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | September, 2015 |
| End date (month/year) | December, 2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Bellin College |
| Title | Lecturer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | September, 2013 |
| End date (month/year) | December, 2013 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | BSW Field Coordinator & Lecturer |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | May, 2008 |
| End date (month/year) | June, 2010 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | St. Norbert College |
| Title | Director and Instructor of Human Services |
| City and state | De Pere, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August, 2005 |
| End date (month/year) | May, 2008 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | university of Wisconsin at Manitowoc |
| Title | Lecturer |
| City and state | Manitowoc, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | Fall, 2003 |
| End date (month/year) | Fall, 2003 |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Freedom House Ministries, Inc |
| Position | Executive Director |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | November, 2017 |
| End date (month/year) | November., 2019 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Green Bay Area Catholic Education System (GRACE) |
| Position | Research Officer (contracted) |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August, 2016 |
| End date (month/year) | November, 2017 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Green Bay Area Public Schools |
| Position | Facilities Planning Liaison, contracted .5FTE |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | November, 2015 |
| End date (month/year) | May, 2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Bellin Health System |
| Position | Research and Risk Analyst, .5FTE |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | May, 2013 |
| End date (month/year) | May, 2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Bellin College |
| Position | Research and Risk Analyst, .3FTE |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | May, 2013 |
| End date (month/year) | May, 2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | NS Research Design and Consulting Services LLC |
| Position | Owner/Researcher/Consultant |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | April, 2013 |
| End date (month/year) | November, 2017 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Family Services of Northeast Wisconsin, Inc |
| Position | Youth and Family Programs: Consultant & Grant Writer and Program Manager/Supervisor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | March, 2000 |
| End date (month/year) | December 2005 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Family Services of Northeast Wisconsin, Inc |
| Position | Multiple Positions: Outpatient Counselor, Crisis Counselor, & Sexual Assault Service Coordinator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | September, 1999 |
| End date (month/year) | July, 2000 |

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Board of Directors Hospital Sisters Health System, Wisconsin Region
* Board of Directors, Freedom House Ministries, Inc. Homeless Shelter
* Advisory Board of Directors, Northwestern University School of Education and Social Policy
* The Farmory, Advisor for Capital Campaign
* Greater Green Bay Community Foundation, US Oil Basic Needs Granting Committee Member
* Service League of Green Bay, WI; Active, Associate and Board Member responsible for funding proposal designs

Other relevant information

* Wisconsin International School, De Pere, WI; Founding Member, Academic Committee Chairperson
* Funding Proposals Written for: The Salvation Army, Healthy Teeth, Healthy Kids, BAD DADS, Inc.

**Trimberger Faculty Data**

**Gail E. Trimberger**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Arts in Comprehensive Social Work (BSW) |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May 1981 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Science in Social Work (MSSW) |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin-Madison |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May 1982 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Doctorate of Philosophy (PhD) |
| Institution Granting Degree | Marian University |
| Major | Leadership Studies |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May 2013 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Associate Professor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August/2008 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Texas Department of Health |
| Position | Medical Social Worker |
| City and state | Tyler, TX |
| Start date (month/year) | September/1984 |
| End date (month/year) | February/1987 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Heritage Nursing Center |
| Position | Director of Social Services/Consultant |
| City and state | Sheboygan, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | May/1988 |
| End date (month/year) | August/1993 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | St. Vincent Hospital |
| Position | Medical Social Worker |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August/1993 |
| End date (month/year) | February/1995 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Unity Hospice and Palliative Care |
| Position | Medical Social Worker/Director of Patient Services/Director of Community Development/Director of Quality Improvement |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August/1994 |
| End date (month/year) | August/2008 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

Licensed Clinical Social Worker, state of Wisconsin

National Association of Social Work, member

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

Camp Lloyd Grief Camp, Co-director and head grief counselor

Lakeshore Care Appeal and Grievance Committee, member

Oral Health Partnership, Executive board member

Special awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition you have received during the last 3 years.

RECOGNITIONS

Speaker of the Senate (2019-2020). University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

GRANTS

Trimberger, G. (Principle Investigator). (2021-2024). *Federal School-Based Mental Health Professionals* *Project.* Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Awarded $149, 998 for 2021-22.

Sallmann, J. & Trimberger, G. (Team leads). (2021-2022). *Distance Education Grant*. UW-Green Bay Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. Awarded $21,750 for curricular design and redesign of social work courses.

Trimberger, G. (Recipient). (2018-2019). *Teaching with Transparency*. UW-Green Bay Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. Received stipend for curricular redesign.

Professional presentations during the last 5 years.

Franklin, C., Groessl, J., & Trimberger, G. (2020, January 23). *From Intangible to Transparent: Grading Rubrics*. [Conference session]. Presented at the UW-Green Bay Instructional Development Institute.

Trimberger, G. (2018, October 29). *Ethics and end-of-life care: A respectful approach*. [Workshop]. Unity Hospice, Green Bay, WI.

Trimberger, G. (2018, October 11). *Ethics and end-of-life care: A respectful approach*. [Workshop]. UW-Green Bay Continuing Professional Education, Appleton, WI.

Trimberger, G. (2018, October 4). *Ethics and end-of-life care: A respectful approach*. [Workshop]. UW-Green Bay Continuing Professional Education, Oshkosh, WI.

Trimberger, G. (2018, June 18). *Ethics and end-of-life care: A respectful approach*. [Workshop]. UW-Green Bay Continuing Professional Education, Green Bay, WI.

Trimberger, G. (2018, June 1). *Ethics and end-of-life care: A respectful approach*. [Workshop]. UW-Green Bay Continuing Professional Education, Wausau, WI.

Trimberger, G. (2017, April 20). *Social Work Students’ Understanding of Professionalism.* [Poster presentation].OPID 2017 Conference on Teaching and Learning, LaCrosse, WI.

Trimberger, G. (2017, March 24). *Developing leaders: Empowering human service practitioners*. [Workshop]. UW-Green Bay Continuing Professional Education, Green Bay, WI.

Two presentations were accepted but not presented due to COVID-19:

Groessl, J. & Trimberger, G., (2019, July). *Exploring the Complexity of Professional*

*Conduct Violations.* Proposal **accepted** for Association of Social Work Boards Annual Education Conference, April 24, 2020, Chicago, IL.

Trimberger, G. (2019, May). *Collaborative Education: Improving Interdisciplinary Care*.

Proposal **accepted** for The Teaching Professor Annual Conference, May 29-31, Atlanta, GA.

Other relevant information below or as a separate attachment.

Book Review

Trimberger, G. (2019). [Review of the book proposal *Grief and Loss Across the Lifespan: A Biopsychosocial Perspective*, by J. McCoyd, J. Koller, and C. Walter].

**Warren Faculty Data**

**Sherry Warren**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | PhD |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Kansas |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | July, 2020 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Master of Social Work |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Kansas |
| Major | Social Work (Clinical Specialization) |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May, 2005 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Arts |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Kansas |
| Major | Latin American Areas Studies |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | May, 1992 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay |
| Title | Assistant Professor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | June, 2019 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Clarke University |
| Title | Assistant Professor |
| City and state | Dubuque, IA |
| Start date (month/year) | August, 2016 |
| End date (month/year) | July, 2019 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Kansas |
| Title | Graduate Teaching Instructor of Record |
| City and state | Lawrence, KS |
| Start date (month/year) | August, 2011 |
| End date (month/year) | June, 2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | Ottawa University |
| Title | Adjunct Instructor |
| City and state | Ottawa, KS |
| Start date (month/year) | Fall 2015 |
| End date (month/year) | Spring 2016 |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Us2 Behavioral Health Care |
| Position | Project Consultant |
| City and state | Appleton, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | November, 2020 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | United Church of Christ and Unitarian Universalist Association |
| Position | Curriculum Trainer |
| City and state | Nationwide |
| Start date (month/year) | 2014 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | MidAmerica Region of Unitarian Universalist Association |
| Position | Professional Congregational Consultant |
| City and state | 13 States/200 congregations |
| Start date (month/year) | January, 2006 |
| End date (month/year) | Current |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Kansas-Oklahoma Conference of United Church of Christ |
| Position | Community of Practice Facilitator |
| City and state | 59 congregations, KS &OK |
| Start date (month/year) | October, 2015 |
| End date (month/year) | July, 2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Kansas-Oklahoma Conference of United Church of Christ |
| Position | Justice Witness Organizer |
| City and state | 48 Congregations, KS |
| Start date (month/year) | October, 2014 |
| End date (month/year) | January, 2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Plymouth Congregational United Church of Christ |
| Position | Interim Associate Minister |
| City and state | Lawrence, KS |
| Start date (month/year) | October 2013 |
| End date (month/year) | August,2014 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Prairie Star District of Unitarian Universalist Association |
| Position | Youth and Young Adult Specialist |
| City and state | 8 states in Midwest |
| Start date (month/year) | January, 2006 |
| End date (month/year) | August, 2011 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Unitarian Fellowship of Lawrence |
| Position | Director of Religious Education |
| City and state | Lawrence, KS |
| Start date (month/year) | August, 2002 |
| End date (month/year) | July, 2004 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Interfaith Caring Neighbors |
| Position | Director |
| City and state | Lawrence, KS |
| Start date (month/year) | April, 2002 |
| End date (month/year) | July, 2004 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | National Science Foundation |
| Position | GK-12 Project Co-Director |
| City and state | Lawrence, KS |
| Start date (month/year) | April, 1999 |
| End date (month/year) | January,2002 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* Phi Beta Delta, International Scholars Honors Society (since 2016)
* National Association of Social Workers

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years

* Ecumenical Partnership for Housing, Green Bay, Member, Board of Trustees, 8/2021-present.
* Loretto @ the UN NGO, Advisory Board Member, 2017-present.

Special awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition you have received during the last 3 years.

* Grant in Aid of Research, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, 2020 & 2021
* Teaching Enhancement Grant- University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, 2020
* Senator, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, 2021-2023; Alternate 2020-2021.
* Mackin - Mailander Faculty Lecturer, Clarke University, 2018-2019
* University of Kansas Graduate Studies Research Award for Doctoral Research, 2018.

Professional presentations during the last 5 years.

Warren, S. & Groessl, J. (2021, November 1-3). *Ethics & Boundaries: Best Practices in Addressing Spirituality* [Conference Workshop]. NASW Wisconsin Conference, Wisconsin Dells, WI.

Warren, S. & Chappell Deckert, J. (June 2021). *Food-focused advocacy and policy: We all have to eat.* Influencing Social Policy Teaching Institute, St. Louis, MO.

Warren, S. (May 2021). *An exploratory study of current themes and topics in international social work courses in the USA.* Paper presentation at the International Congress on Qualitative Inquiry, Urbana-Champaign, IL.

Warren, S. & Werner, L. (May 2021). *Developing Recommendations for Trans Persons’ End of Life Expressions of Self: Maintaining One’s Identity After Death.* Paper presentation at the International Congress on Qualitative Inquiry, Urbana-Champaign, IL.

Warren, S. (2020, October 26-28). *Incorporating Spirituality into Practice* [Conference Workshop]. NASW Wisconsin Conference, Wisconsin Dells, WI. https://www.naswwi.org/continuing-education/2020-annual-conference/

Warren, S. (2020, October 26-28). *Policy, Practice and Advocacy: Give me the Courage to Make Change*. [Conference Workshop]. NASW Wisconsin Conference, Wisconsin Dells, WI. https://www.naswwi.org/continuing-education/2020-annual-conference/

Warren, S. (2020, November 8-11). *Current themes and topics in international social work courses in the USA: An exploratory study*. [Poster presentation]. Joint World Conference on Social Work, Education, and Social Development. Rimini, Italy. (Conference canceled)

Warren, S. (2020, May 20-23). *An exploratory study of current themes and topics in international social work courses in the USA*. [Conference Presentation]. International Congress on Qualitative Inquiry, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL. (Conference canceled)

Warren, S. & Chappell Deckert, J. (2020, May 28-30). *Because we all have to eat*. [Conference Workshop]. Influencing Social Policy MACRO Teaching Institute at the Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, MO. (Conference canceled)

Warren, S. (2019). *Current themes and topics in international social work courses: An exploratory study*. Poster presented at the Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education. Denver, CO.

Warren, S., Chappell Deckert, J., Gomi, S. Paceley, M.S. (2019). *Creatively engaging abstract concepts: Arts-based education for social issues*. Panel Presentation at the Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education. Denver, CO.

Warren, S. (2018). *Not all who wander are lost: Therapeutic labyrinth walking for health*. Presentation at the Joint World Conference on Social Work, Education, and Social Development. Dublin, Ireland.

Warren, S. (2018). *Contemplative practices for mindful presence: Deepen, connect, and transform your classroom.* Workshop presented at the Joint World Conference on Social Work, Education, and Social Development. Dublin, Ireland.

Warren, S. & Chappell Deckert, J. (2018). *Postcolonial feminist theory in international social work: Mohanty's 'feminist in solidarity' explored*. Symposium presented at the Joint World Conference on Social Work, Education, and Social Development. Dublin, Ireland.

Warren, S., Cantu Gregory, S., Murphy, L. & Darrouzet, H. (2018, April). *Sharing the silence: An interdisciplinary college mindfulness group*. Panel at the Annual Ethics Conference: Contemplation., at Viterbo University’s D.B. Reinhart Institute for Ethics in Leadership. Lacrosse, WI.

Warren, S. (2018). *Spirituality and ethics in social work practice*. Continuing Education Workshop (6 hours). Clarke University, Dubuque, IA.

Professional publications for the last 5 years.

Warren, S. (in process). Review of the book No refuge: Ethics and the global refugee crisis, by S. Parekh [book]. *Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work*.

Canda, E.R. and Warren, S. (accepted). Spiritual well-being. In *Encyclopedia of Positive Psychology*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Warren, S**.** & Chappell Deckert, J. (2020). Contemplative practices for self-care in the social work classroom. *Social Work (Special Issue on Self-Care for the Social Work Profession)*, *65*(1), 11-20. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swz039

Chappell Deckert, J., Warren, S**.** & Britton, H. (2018). Midwestern service provider narratives of migrant experiences: Legibility, vulnerability, and exploitation in human trafficking. *Advances in Social Work, Special Issue Immigrants and Refugees,18*(3), 887-910. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18060/21657

Other relevant information.

* Peer Reviewer MACRO 2020 Conference Proposals.
* Peer Reviewer: Journal of International Migration and Integration (2019-present).
* Applied Suicide Intervention Skills Training (ASIST) certification.
* Certified Trainer of Trainers, Our Whole Lives Sexuality Curriculum, Grades K-1, 4-6.
* Certified Our Whole Lives sexuality educator/facilitator, all curriculum levels.
* Graduate Certificate in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, University of Kansas (2017).

**Waubanascum Faculty Data**

**Cary Waubanascum**

Degree information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | PhD |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Minnesota- Twin Cities |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | July, 2021 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | MSW |
| Institution Granting Degree | University of Wisconsin – Green Bay |
| Major | Social Work |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | August, 2008 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degree | Bachelor of Arts |
| Institution Granting Degree | Alverno College |
| Major | Social Science, Professional Communication |
| Date Awarded (month/year) | December, 2001 |

Academic appointments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Wisconsin – Green Bay |
| Title | Assistant Professor |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | August, 2021 |
| End date (month/year) | Present |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | St. Catherine’s University |
| Title | Adjunct Faculty |
| City and state | St. Paul, MN |
| Start date (month/year) | January, 2021 |
| End date (month/year) | May, 2021 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employing academic institution | University of Minnesota – Twin Cities |
| Title | Community Faculty |
| City and state | St. Paul, MN |
| Start date (month/year) | January, 2019 |
| End date (month/year) | August, 2020 |

Professional post–baccalaureate and post–master’s social work experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | National Criminal Justice Training Center, Fox Valley Technical College |
| Position | Project Manager, Tribal Programs |
| City and state | Appleton, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 12/2013 |
| End date (month/year) | 8/2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Wisconsin Tribal Community Reintegration Program, Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council |
| Position | Social Worker |
| City and state | Oneida, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 3/2013 |
| End date (month/year) | 12/2013 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | College of Menominee Nation |
| Position | Suicide Prevention Coordinator |
| City and state | Keshena, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 1/2010 |
| End date (month/year) | 3/2013 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Oneida Housing Authority |
| Position | Social Worker, Transitional Living Coordinator |
| City and state | Oneida, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 6/2007 |
| End date (month/year) | 1/2010 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | Golden House |
| Position | Violence Prevention Educator |
| City and state | Green Bay, WIU |
| Start date (month/year) | 10/2006 |
| End date (month/year) | 6/2007 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Employer | WI Department of Corrections, Division of Community Corrections |
| Position | Limited Term Probation and Parole Agent |
| City and state | Green Bay, WI |
| Start date (month/year) | 8/2006 |
| End date (month/year) | 10/2006 |

Current professional, academic, community-related, and scientific memberships.

* Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), current member
* National Association of Community and Restorative Justice, current member

Community service responsibilities and activities for the last 3 years.

* Advisory Council Member**,** University of Wisconsin – Madison, Native American Center for Health Professions (NACHP), 2013- Present
* PhD Student Representative, PhD Program Committee, University of Minnesota, School of Social Work, 2018-2019
* Mentor,Menominee Doctoral Student Support Group, 2021- present
* Vice-Chair, American Indian Parent Committee, Roseville Area School District, Roseville MN, 2019-2020
* American Indian Parent Committee Chair, Roseville Area School District, Roseville MN, 2016-2018.

Special awards, fellowships, grants, or any other recognition you have received during the last 3 years.

* University of Wisconsin – Green Bay, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee, CHESW Consultant, 2021-2022
* NCRE Scholars Program: Cohort 10 2021-2023,National Children’s Research Exchange, Centers for American Indian and Alaska Native Health, University of Colorado, Colorado School of Public Health
* Community Engagement and Community-Based Participatory Research Award: *Three Sisters Project* with Oneida Nation. Sub award from Center for the Ethics of Indigenous Genomic Research, Center of Excellence in Ethical, Legal and Social Implications Research. National Institutes of Health, National Human Genome Research Institute (RM1HG009042). 2021
* Mary E. Pennock Scholarship, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities, 2020
* University of Minnesota, School of Social Work Social Innovation Challenge: Organizational Advisor to MSW student’s implementation of a toolkit for their peers to operationalize vital conversations on race with an intentional trajectory toward collective liberation and justice. Facilitation of a series of “train-the-trainer” seminars on the toolkit and organize check-in/follow-up sessions for fellow students in the School of Social Work, 2020

University of Minnesota, College of Education and Human Development, Education Research & Education Equity category, “The Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Studies: Reducing disparities through Indigenous social work education, People’s Choice Award, 2019

Professional presentations during the last 5 years.

JURIED PRESENTATIONS

Waubanascum, C**.** (2021, October 7). *This is how we show up for our relatives”: Understanding how Indigenous relative caregivers embody traditional kinship to resist the colonial child welfare system.* [Virtual Presentation]. Seven Generations Inter-Tribal Leadership Summit.

Waubanascum, C**.** (2021, October 5). *Understanding how Indigenous relative caregivers resist the colonial child welfare system*. [Virtual Presentation]. Kempe International Virtual Conference: A Global Call to Action to Change Child Welfare.

Singh, V., Waubanascum, C., Elias, G., Seidl, C., & Savariego, A. (2020, May 7). *Back to Indigenous Futures: Engaged Research on Canoe Culture with Pacific Islanders and Dakota in Minnesota: Part 2 of 2* [Roundtable presentation]. Native American and Indigenous Studies Association Conference, Toronto, CA. (Conference canceled).

Waubanascum, C.,(2020, March 26).*The Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Studies: Impact of an Anishinaabe-centered social work program on MSW alums* [Poster session]. College of Education and Human Development Research Day, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN. (Conference canceled).

Waubanascum, C., (2020, March 12). *The Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Studies: Reducing disparities through Indigenous social work education* [Oral presentation]. Minnesota Social Services Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Waubanascum, C. (2019, October). *The Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Studies: Reducing disparities through Indigenous social work education* [Oral presentation]. Council on Social Work Education, Annual Program Meeting, Denver, CO.

Waubanascum, C. (2019, July). *Do No Harm: Working better with Indigenous communities through Indigenous social work education* [Oral presentation]. Summer Institute on Global Indigeneities. Seattle, WA.

Waubanascum, C., Haight, W., Glesener, D., Day, P., Bussey, B., & Nichols, K. (2019, March). *The Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Studies: Reducing disparities through Indigenous social work education* [Poster session]. College of Education and Human Development Research Day, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Waubanascum, C., Glesener, D. & Haight, W. (2019, January). *A scoping study of Indigenous child welfare: The long emergency and preparations for the next seven generations* [Poster session]. Society for Social Work Research Annual Conference, San Francisco, CA.

Waubanascum, C., Glesener, D. & Haight, W. (2018, November). *A scoping study of Indigenous child welfare: The long emergency and preparations for the next seven generations* [Poster session]. Council on Social Work Education, Annual Program Meeting, Orlando, FL.

Waubanascum, C., Glesener, D. & Haight, W. (2018, March). *A scoping study of Indigenous child welfare: The long emergency and preparations for the next seven generations* [Poster session]. College of Education and Human Development Research Day, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Waubanascum, C., Glesener, D. & Haight, W. (2018, March). *A scoping study of Indigenous child welfare: The long emergency and preparations for the next seven generations* [Poster session]. School of Social Work Research Conference, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN.

Waubanascum, C. (2018, May). *Examining the assimilationist views of the Governor’s Interracial Commission and “The Indian in Minnesota” in 1952* [Oral presentation]. School of Social Work History Conference, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS (Invited)

Waubanascum, C. (2021). Traditional Kinship as Resistance to the Child Welfare System. [Online Presentation & Community Discussion]. Minnesota Indian Women’s Resource Center, Minneapolis, MN.

Waubanascum, C. (2021). “This is how we show up for our relatives”: Understanding how Indigenous relative caregivers embody traditional kinship to resist the colonial child welfare system. [Online Presentation]. Distinguished Lecture Series. Native American Center for Health Professions. University of Wisconsin – Madison.

Waubanascum, C. & Haight, W. (2021). Transforming Social Work and Fostering Relationships through Anishinaabe-Centered Child Welfare Knowledge and Practice. [Online Presentation]. College of Education and Human Development. University of Minnesota-Twin Cities.

Waubanascum, C., Arnold, T., Thompson, L., Thompson, C., & Owen, C. (2020). Parent and Two-Spirit Native LGBTQ Youth Experiences. [Online Panel Presentation]. Sovereign Bodies Institute.

Professional publications for the last 5 years.

Waubanascum, C. (2021). *“This is how we show up for our relatives”: Understanding how Indigenous relative caregivers embody traditional kinship to resist the colonial child welfare system.* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Minnesota – Twin Cities.

Johnston-Goodstar, K., Waubanascum, C., & Eubanks, D. (In Press). Human Services for Indigenous Futures. In Bauerkemper, J. & Webster, R. (Eds.), *Tribal Administration Handbook.*

Haight, W., Waubanascum, C., Glesener, D., Day, P., Bussey, B., & Nichols, K. (2020). The Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Studies: Systems change through a relational Anishinaabe worldview. *Children and Youth Services Review, 119,* 105601.

Haight, W., Waubanascum, C., Glesener, D., Day, P., Bussey, B., & Nichols, K. (2019). The Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Studies: Reducing disparities through Indigenous social work education. *Children and Youth Services Review, 100*, 156-166.

Haight, W., Waubanascum, C., Glesener, D., & Marsalis, S. (2018). A scoping study of Indigenous child welfare: The long emergency and preparations for the next seven generations. *Children and Youth Services Review,* *93*, 397-410.

Manuscripts in Progress

Waubanascum, C., Haight, W., Glesener, D., Day, P., Bussey, B., & Nichols, K. (2021). The Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Studies: Students’ experiences of an Anishinaabe-centered social work education program. Manuscript under review.

Other relevant information below or as a separate attachment.

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

* Associate**,** Center for Restorative Justice and Peacemaking, University of Minnesota Duluth, 2019- present
* Research Assistant,Back to Indigenous Futures, Traditional Ecological Knowledge, Canoe project, Dakota star knowledge with Upper Sioux, Lower Sioux, and Micronesian Communities in Minnesota, 8/2019-2021
* Principal Investigator**,** Doctoral Dissertation**,** School of Social Work, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities, 9/2018-2021
* Research Assistant**, “**Indian Child Welfare scoping study”, “Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Ethnography”, “Indigenous Kinship Study”**,** Gamble Skogmo Chair in Child Welfare and Youth Policy, UMN, 9/2017-2021
* Research Consultant**,** The Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare, University of Minnesota – Duluth, “Indian Child Welfare Institutional Analysis project”, 9/2017-1/2019.
* Liaison, Publications Committee Member**,** Indigenous Wellness Research Institute, University of Washington, “Tribal Colleges and Universities Drug and Alcohol Study”, 9/2010- present

TRAINING MODULES (Research to Practice)

* Waubanascum, C.,Haight, W., Glesener, D., Day, P., Bussey, B., & Nichols, K. (2020). The Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Studies: Reducing disparities through Indigenous social work education.
  + *Minnesota Social Services Association Self-Study Educational Module.*
  + (Part 1). *Center for Advanced Studies in Child Welfare On*-*line Training Modules,* In preparation.
  + (Part 2). *Center for Advanced Studies in Child Welfare On*-*line Training Modules,* In preparation.
* Waubanascum, C.,Haight, W., Glesener, D., Day, P., Bussey, B., & Nichols, K. (2020). The Center for Regional and Tribal Child Welfare Studies: Systems change through a relational Anishinaabe worldview.
  + (Part 1). *Center for Advanced Studies in Child Welfare On*-*line Training Modules,* In preparation.
  + (Part 2). *Center for Advanced Studies in Child Welfare On*-*line Training Modules,* In preparation.
* Waubanascum, C.,Haight, W., Glesener, D., Day, P., Bussey, B., & Nichols, K. (2018). Indigenous child welfare: The long emergency (Part 1). *Center for Advanced Studies in Child Welfare On*-*line Training Modules,* [*https://cascw.umn.edu/portfolio-items/indigenous-child-welfare/*](https://cascw.umn.edu/portfolio-items/indigenous-child-welfare/)
* Waubanascum, C.,Haight, W., Glesener, D., Day, P., Bussey, B., & Nichols, K. (2018). Indigenous child welfare: Preparations for the next seven generations (Part 2). *Center for Advanced Studies in Child Welfare On*-*line Training Modules,* [*https://cascw.umn.edu/portfolio-items/indigenous-child-welfare/*](https://cascw.umn.edu/portfolio-items/indigenous-child-welfare/)

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.2.2:The program documents that faculty who teach social work practice courses have a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post–master’s social work degree practice experience. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative identifies and documents that faculty who teach social work practice courses have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post–master’s social work degree practice experience across all program options. |

As noted on the Faculty Summary Form, all faculty in the program graduated from an accredited MSW program. Individuals identified as teaching practice courses have at least two years of post-MSW practice experience. Eleven faculty teach practice courses (field and seminar, skills courses, and faculty field instructors to supplement when agencies lack a qualified social worker) across both the BSW and MSW programs. Practice experience ranges from 2 years to 24 years with mean practice experience of 11.39 years.

Instructors teaching practice courses and their post-MSW experience include:

* Sara Greenwood (6 years post-MSW experience)
* Dr. Joan Groessl (22 years post-MSW experience)
* Corinna Heindel (3 years post-MSW experience)
* Heather Lawrence (12 years post-MSW experience)
* Sheng Lee Yang (7.5 years post-MSW experience)
* Dr. Stephanie Rhee (13.5 years post-MSW experience)
* Jennifer Schanen-Materi (2 years post-MSW experience)
* Dr. Nicole Schneider (18 years post-MSW experience)
* Dr. Gail Trimberger (24 years post-MSW experience)
* Dr. Sherry Warren (10.25 years post-MSW experience)
* Dr. Cary Waubanascum (7 years post-MSW experience)

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

X The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.2.3:The program documents a full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio not greater than 1:25 for baccalaureate programs and not greater than 1:12 for master’s programs and explains how this ratio is calculated. In addition, the program explains how faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; number of program options; class size; number of students; advising; and the faculty’s teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities. |

Because most faculty teach in both the BSW and MSW Programs, this section of the self-study is identical for both the BSW and MSW documents. The faculty FTE determination includes the mix of program levels,

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative documents a full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio not greater than 1:25 for baccalaureate programs and not greater than 1:12 for master’s programs inclusive of all program options. |

**Numerical FTE Faculty-to-Student Ratio:** 1:16.22, inclusive of all program options

Faculty to student ratio is calculated annually using the 1:25 ratio for undergraduate students and 1:12 for MSW students. MSW admission targets are determined based on predicted students continuing in the BSW Program and planning 40 new majors and those continuing within the MSW program, Generalist Part-Time Year II and Specialized Year continuing students.

For the 2021-2022 academic year, there were 79 BSW majors. Each BSW student is counted as 1 FTE regardless of full- or part-time status in the program. There was a

total of 122 MSW students, totaling 104.78 FTE.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how this ratio is calculated inclusive of all program options. |

**Total FTE of faculty:** 12.39

**Formula used to calculate FTE of all faculty:**

FTE of faculty is calculated ona24-credit load for tenured individuals and those on the tenure track (Associate and Assistant or Full Professors). Individuals hired as lecturers carry a 27-credit load.

The 24-credit hour teaching load policy is located in the [Faculty Handbook](https://www.uwgb.edu/UWGBCMS/media/sofas/rules/Faculty_Handbook_2021.pdf) (p. 106**)**

|  |
| --- |
| **UWGB Twenty-Four Credit Hour Teaching Load Policy for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty**  Faculty positions at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay (UWGB) require teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service. A substantial portion (but not all) of the faculty job is accounted for using the credit-hour system, with 24 credit hours being the standard faculty load. Each of UWGB's four colleges has a policy for how this load is determined and adjusted when appropriate, based upon other duties and responsibilities done in support of the mission of the institution. The purpose of this document is to provide an overarching framework for teaching workload expectations of faculty across the University. |

The 27-credit workload is located in the [Employee Handbook for Academic and University Staff](https://www.uwgb.edu/UWGBCMS/media/hr/policies/Employee-Handbook-FINAL.pdf?ext=.pdf) (p.18).

|  |
| --- |
| **Lecturer (no-prefix):** The no-prefix Lecturer title is used when individuals have a teaching appointment of at least one full academic year. These positions may be temporary, one-year appointments or fixed-term renewable appointments. The full credit load for lecturers is 27 credits per academic year. Any additional credits taught would need to be compensated through approved overload. Fixed-term renewable lecturers are eligible for career progression pursuant to the Title Review Policy.  **Senior Lecturer:** The Senior Lecturer title may be used when individuals have a teaching appointment of at least one full academic year and have met the requirements for career progression to the senior level as identified in the Title Review Policy. This title is utilized only for fixed-term, renewable appointments. The full credit load for senior lecturers is 27 credits per academic year. Any additional credits taught would need to be compensated through approved overload. |

FTE for Associate Lecturers is calculated using the 27-credit workload. These faculty do not hold a permanent full- or part-time position and are hired to teach specific courses. These policies are outlined in the [Payment Guidelines for Temporary Instructional Staff](https://www.uwgb.edu/UWGBCMS/media/hr/policies/CompensationGuidelinesPayrollProceduresAdjInstrandAssLec.pdf?ext=.pdf).

|  |
| --- |
| **Associate Lecturers**  The Associate Lecturer title is used when individuals have a one-semester teaching appointment that consists entirely of semester-long credit courses. The full credit load for associate lecturers is13.5 credits per semester. Any additional credits taught would need to be compensated through approved overload. All Associate Lecturers will be paid on a C-basis. Associate Lecturers may or may not be eligible for fringe benefits depending upon their particular situation. *Contact Human Resources if you have questions and before you promise someone that they will receive benefits.* |

As noted on the Faculty Summary Form**,** and in Table 3.1 below**,** 11 faculty have full time appointments, one faculty member has a half time appointment, and the Program utilized four Associate Lecturers.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1 Faculty Appointments** | | |
| Full-Time Faculty | Tenured | Dr. Francis Akakpo  Dr. Joan Groessl  Dr. Stephanie Rhee  Dr. Jolanda Sallmann |
| Full-Time Faculty | Tenure Track | Dr. Sherry Warren  Dr. Cary Waubanascum |
| Full-Time Faculty | Lecturers | Sara Greenwood  Heather Lawrence  Sheng Lee Yang  Jennifer Schanen-Materi  Dr. Nicole Schneider |
| Part-Time Faculty | Tenured | Gail Trimberger |
| Associate Lectures |  | Susan Exworthy  Corinna Heindel  Brittany Maas  Andrea Pasqualucci |

**Total FTE of students:** 183.8

**Formula used to calculate FTE of all students:**

All BSW Students formally admitted to the program are counted as 1 FTE regardless of attending on a full-time or part-time basis. MSW students who are enrolled in part-time course work at either the generalist or specialized year are counted according to the credit load they carry (GPT-I. GPT-II, SPT-I and SPT-II). For graduate studies, full-time enrollment is nine credits per semester. (For example, 1 Specialized Year-2 Student who is part-time taking 10 credits per academic year equals .6 FTE). Students enrolled in full-time course work are counted as 1 FTE. Table 3.2 shows student enrollment in 2021-2022.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.2 2021-2022 Student FTE** | | | |
|  | | Students | FTE |
| BSW Students |  | 79 | 79 |
| MSW Students | Generalist Part-Time Yr. 1 | 14 | 12.4 |
| Generalist Part-Time Yr. 2 | 10 | 5.6 |
| Generalist Full-Time | 22 | 22 |
| Specialized Part-Time Yr. 1 | 15 | 10 |
| Specialized Part-Time Yr. 2 | 14 | 7.8 |
| Specialized Full-Time | 47 | 47 |

The figure below is what was used to calculate admissions targets for the MSW Program academic year 2021-2022. The total in cohort is multiplied by FTE (based on credits taken) to come up with the Total FTE. When added together, full student FTE is computed. Modifications in numbers of students in a cohort occurs in order to reach a student FTE which complies with Faculty FTE dedicated to the MSW Program.



|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; number of program options; class size; number of students; advising; and the faculty's teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities across all program options. |

**Faculty Size & Number and Type of Curricular Offerings in Class and Field:**

As noted earlier on the Faculty Summary Form, most faculty teach in both BSW and MSW programs. FTE allows for all core courses in both the BSW and MSW programs to be covered using the class size indicated below. (See Faculty Size and Class Size). In addition, the Program has been able to expand its elective offerings at both the BSW and MSW level. BSW electives added also meet general education requirements for the university. These additions allow students to target their general education studies toward topics of social work interest. For example, SW 213: Human Trafficking meets the global culture requirements, SW 204: Sustainability and Social Problems the sustainability perspective, and SW307: Ethics in Practice meets humanities criteria. The faculty have appreciated the opportunity to expand offerings to meet areas of interest/expertise beyond required courses. The ability to offer these elective courses demonstrates that faculty size is sufficient to curricular needs.

Course design and scheduling are completed to allow mixed modalities. Following the pandemic year, faculty discussed modalities for courses and determined which courses were best suited to the seated classroom, which should be synchronous, and which can be taught asynchronously online. It is our intention to offer sections of specific courses across modalities to meet student needs or preferences. Recognizing that our students have multiple responsibilities, we have coordinated schedules of required courses to meet using hybrid design, allowing two courses on the alternating dates the same night of the week.

**Faculty Size & Number of Program Options:**

There is only one program each option at both the BSW and MSW levels. With modifications due to COVID, more courses are being taught virtually but concern over the provision of practice courses virtually and integrity of program offerings has negated development of additional program options. At this point, controlled growth of the MSW Program has occurred but BSW enrollment has remained consistent. Because the Program maintains the minimum faculty to student ratios required by CSWE, additional program options would require additional resources to be allocated to the program but the program has not requested this to administration

**Faculty Size & Class Size:**

BSW cohorts are capped at 40 per year. Full-cohort lecture-based classes are set to a maximum of 40 students and labs, as well as field sections, are capped at 20 students. As of the 2021-2022 academic year, there are two sections of field and integrative seminar and two each for each of the methods and skills courses and those courses identified as writing emphasis.

MSW course enrollment is limited to 24 for lecture-based courses and 16 students for seminars or other practice courses. As enrollment has grown, additional sections have been added. In addition, sections for field, seminar, and courses where in-person seated modality is recommended have been allocated to be taught in Wausau. As of the 2021-2022 academic year, three sections of field and seminar have been allocated for the generalist level and five for the specialized year. Other generalist courses have two sections each except for *SW 700: Gateway to the Profession* which has three sections. (One of those sections is taught in Wausau). Specialized year courses have three sections for most courses but four for *SW 720: Multifamily Systems* to allow the course to be taught at the Wausau site. The number of sections for both generalist and specialized year are consistent with the program’s course cap guidelines.

Size of faculty is sufficient to meet the section requirements for both the BSW and MSW programs.

**Faculty Size & Number of Students:**

The BSW Program has up to 80 majors in the upper division social work courses, with a possible maximum of 40 juniors and 40 seniors in any given year. As noted in section AS 3.2, admission to the major is limited to 40 students annually. Faculty resources are demonstrably sufficient to carry out ongoing functions of the BSW Program.

Admissions to the MSW Program are calculated according to current faculty FTE. FTE required to meet the CSWE 1:25 criteria for the number of BSW student enrollment is subtracted from the total faculty FTE and then MSW student FTE is determined, ensuring a 1:12 ratio is maintained for the MSW program. For the 2021-2022 academic year, this allowed enrollment of 46 generalist and 76 specialized level students. The MSW program had several students withdraw or move to part time status, so student FTE was lower than had initially been planned.

Since the Program’s last self-study, additional faculty has been added to meet the growing need for MSW-level practitioners in the region. For the 2021-2022 academic year, an additional 1.5 FTE were added to allow expansion of the program to the Wausau area. Faculty resources are sufficient to carry out ongoing functions of the MSW program.

**Faculty Size & Advising:**

Faculty Mentor responsibilities are assumed by eleven faculty members.

Prior to the 2021-2022 academic year, faculty who did advising of students were granted a 3-credit release to provide that advising. With the new advising model, a Professional Advisor was assigned to the BSW program as 50% of his responsibilities. The PA advises both current majors and those interested in social work. Advising in the MSW Program had included a three-credit release for an MSW Faculty member. With the revised university policy, all faculty who are employed full-time in the program are now assigned as faculty mentors to students as an expected component of their position. Mentors for MSW students complete both professional and academic advising with the support of Graduate Studies and the MSW Program Coordinator.

Because of the differing needs of BSW and MSW students, the faculty developed the policy that student mentor assignments be calculated as one BSW student as equivalent to two MSW students. In terms of FTE, this was calculated as BSW = 1 student FTE, MSW = .5 student FTE. Each faculty member assumes a 12 student FTE mentoring load, with the mix of BSW and MSW students differing according to the student requests.

In addition to the Faculty Mentor role, Field and Child Welfare Coordinators provide field related advising, and the MSW Program Coordinator does pre-major advising for students interested in the MSW Program. The Program has a .25 LTE position for School Social Work Coordination (paid for through a contract with the Department of Public Instruction) who advises those interested in school social work.

With the new Professional Advisor/Faculty Mentor model, advising time for majors is increased over prior years but no longer fulfilled by social work faculty. Based on the division of responsibilities with mentor attention to professional rather than academic student needs, faculty can meet the time demands required. Further assessment of impact on students and workload will occur as the program implementation covers a more extensive period.

**Faculty Size & Faculty's Teaching Responsibilities:**

Current size of faculty allows full coverage of required coursework and opportunities to teach general education and elective courses and is sufficient to meet the ongoing needs of both the BSW and MSW Programs. Within the BSW Program, faculty credits are adjusted internally with writing emphasis and full cohort courses receiving extra credit allowances to faculty teaching those courses. Field section credits within faculty workload are determined based on the number of field visits per semester for both the BSW and MSW Program options.

Academic year required credits based on designated course caps:

BSW: 51 Fall, 46 Spring, Emphasis/Support 18 CR. Total = 117 CR

MSW: 74 Fall, 53 Spring, 15 Summer. 10 Spring electives. Total = 152 CR

Total BSW and MSW: 269 CR

Academic year faculty teaching credit availability: 318 CR (Less Scholarship allowances for tenure/tenure track faculty = -18 CR) = 300 CR

[*Note: Extra omits school social work courses since plan is for associate lecturers to teach those courses currently*.*]*

It should be noted that summer courses are not included in the calculation for teaching loads. Summer contracts are considered separately and up to the discretion of faculty if desiring to teach over the summer months. The MSW Program begins in June and all specialized year students must take one required and one elective course. In Summer 2021, offerings were three sections of the required *SW 728: Advanced Policy*, two of elective *SW 767: Mental Health & Substance Abuse in Generalist Practice*, and one of elective *SW 727: Psychopathology for Social Work Practice.* (Part-time specialized year students may take their elective the second summer of their program). The two elective courses are also open to special students seeking clinical licensure post-MSW. These courses are an additional .5 FTE.

In addition, January or “Winterim” courses can also be taught as overload or be integrated into the workload of the instructor. In Winterim 2022, *SW 683: Trauma Informed Care* (now renumbered to SW 723*)* was taught as part of the 27-credit workload for Sheng Lee Yang. Whereas *SW 544: Grant Writing*, was an additional overload payment for Jennifer Schanen-Materi. For Winterim courses, course enrollment must meet university requirements to be taught at full compensation. With lower enrollment, instructor has the prerogative to teach on a per pupil basis or cancel the course.

Overloads are offered when exigent circumstances require faculty to assume additional teaching responsibilities. For example, when a faculty member is unable to fulfill initially assigned teaching responsibilities due to illness or when faculty leaves employ unexpectedly. In academic year 2021-2022, a faculty member left university employ the week before the start of classes. Overload assignments and associate lecturer contracts were granted to ensure necessary courses were able to be offered.

Associate lecturers are hired when necessary to meet course demands when current faculty is unable to assume the course as relates to content expertise. Since the Program does not have faculty with school social work certification, for example, associate lecturers are hired to offer the coursework needed for this area of emphasis. Should a future search yield an applicant who meets the specialized certification, then the courses would be offered as part of that faculty member’s appointment.

**Faculty Size & Scholarly Responsibilities:**

Only faculty who are tenured or on the tenure track are required to demonstrate scholarly accomplishments. Each faculty member meeting these criteria is granted a 3-credit release for the purpose of scholarship activities.

Faculty who are tenured/tenure track and must participate in scholarship include Drs. Akakpo, Groessl, Rhee, Sallmann, Warren, and Waubanascum.

**Faculty Size & Service Responsibilities:**

The Program ensures that lecturers are given Faculty status through the University to allow all social work faculty to provide service to the Social Work Program as an expectation of their positions. Those who are contracted as associate lecturers are not required to do service. All faculty are involved in full faculty meetings, an admission, and a curriculum committee. Determination of which admission or curriculum committee is determined by the percentage of the teaching responsibilities in either the BSW or MSW Program.

Those faculty members who complete additional required programmatic responsibilities receive credit release to effectively perform the duties. BSW Program Coordinator (Dr. Jolanda Sallmann) and Program Chair (Dr. Joan Groessl) each receive a 6 CR release for the administrative role and the MSW Program Coordinator (Dr. Francis Akakpo) receives a 12 CR release consistent with CSWE standards. MSW Field Coordinator’s (Sara Greenwood) release is 13.5 credits and BSW Field Coordinator (Jennifer Schanen-Materi) receives 7 CR workload reassignment, both in alignment with CSWE requirements. The Child Welfare Coordinator (Heather Lawrence) receives six credits release for IV-E Program Administration. Additional releases embedded in the program are for evaluation activities (3 CR), IV-E program PI (3 CR), DPI contract PI (3 CR), and accreditation specialist activities (3 CR). Release times are sufficient to meet programmatic needs currently.

Those who are tenured or on the tenure track are expected to provide service to the university beyond the social work program itself. Faculty who are tenured/tenure track and must participate in service include Drs. Akakpo, Groessl, Rhee, Sallmann, Warren, and Waubanascum. Any additional university service by lecturers is at the discretion of the lecturer based on their interests

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M3.2.4:The master’s social work program identifies no fewer than six full-time faculty with master’s degrees in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and whose principal assignment is to the master’s program. The majority of the full-time master’s social work program faculty has a master’s degree in social work and a doctoral degree, preferably in social work. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative identifies no fewer than six full-time faculty with master's degrees in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and whose principal assignment is to the master's program across all program options. |

The Social Work Program deliberately has faculty teach in both the BSW and MSW programs when appropriate. This allows students to experience multiple perspectives, which the Program sees as beneficial to their development. When assigning courses, teaching loads consider need for sufficient faculty for the BSW and MSW programs.

Four full-time faculty’s primary teaching responsibilities are in the BSW Program: Heather Lawrence (72%), Dr. Jolanda Sallmann (100%), Jennifer Schanen-Materi (74%) and Dr. Sherry Warren (87.5%).

Seven full-time faculty’s primary teaching responsibilities are in the MSW Program: Dr. Francis Akakpo, Sara Greenwood (78%), Dr. Joan Groessl (71%), Sheng Lee Yang (67%), Dr. Stephanie Rhee (100%), Dr. Nicole Schneider (76%), and Dr. Cary Waubanascum (71%). Dr. Gail Trimberger, who is half-time, teaches all her time in the MSW Program.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates the majority of the full-time master's social work program faculty has a master's degree in social work and a doctoral degree, preferably in social work, across all program options. |

All faculty employed by the Program have earned MSW degrees from CSWE-accredited MSW programs and the majority with doctorates earned their PhDs in social work. All faculty have a completed faculty data form (see pp 190-248). This table identifies faculty with 9-month ongoing contracts.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Faculty Member** | **MSW Program** | **Doctorate** |
| BSW | Jolanda Sallmann | UW Madison | Social Work |
|  | Sherry Warren | University of Kansas | Social Work |
|  | Heather Lawrence | UW-Green Bay |  |
|  | Jen Schanen-Materi | UW-Green Bay |  |
| MSW | Francis Akakpo | Michigan State | Social Work |
|  | Joan Groessl | UW-Milwaukee | Education |
|  | Stephanie Rhee | Case Western University | Social Work |
|  | Nicole Schneider | Columbia University | Social Work |
|  | Gail Trimberger | UW-Madison | Education |
|  | Cary Waubanascum | UW-Green Bay | Social Work |
|  | Sara Greenwood | University of Michigan |  |

All faculty have earned MSW degrees from CSWE-accredited social work programs. All except one-half time position, who teach in both the BSW and MSW programs have full-time appointments to the social work program. As noted in the table above, six of eight faculty with doctoral degrees have doctoral degrees with a social work emphasis; four of those faculty have primary responsibility to the MSW program.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.2.5:The program describes its faculty workload policy and discusses how the policy supports the achievement of institutional priorities and the program’s mission and goals. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the program’s faculty workload policy across all program options. |

Faculty who are tenured (Full Professor or Associate Professor) and those on the tenure track (Assistant Professor) must adhere to the University Policy on Workload which identifies a 24-credit hour workload, of which three credits are allocated for scholarship and/or service.

The policy below outlines faculty responsibilities as outlined on page 105-106 of the [Faculty Handbook](https://www.uwgb.edu/UWGBCMS/media/sofas/rules/Faculty_Handbook_2021.pdf):

|  |
| --- |
| **Defining Responsibilities and Expectations**  Tenure-Track Faculty - Responsibilities include a combination of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service to the institution (e.g., student advising) and the community, including a twenty- four credit hour workload expectation per academic year.  **Faculty Expectations**  Based on a 24 credit hour workload, the following represent faculty expectations:   1. Tenure-track faculty shall not be required to teach more than 14 credit hours in any semester. Tenure-track faculty in the probationary period will have an 18 credit hour teaching load in the first year and a 21 credit hour teaching load until promotion to associate professor. Recognizing their substantial obligations to engage in research and service, the teaching load for associate and full professors will be 21 credits. 2. Administrative reassignments are provided in order to lead, manage, and conduct various activities associated with certain units, programs, and special undertakings at the University. The Dean allocates these reassignments to the budgetary unit. Budgetary Chair/Executive Committee in tum allocates the reassignments. However, it is important to keep in mind that the College needs to maintain its curriculum. 3. The Dean may approve other teaching reassignments for activities that would exceed normal responsibilities or expectations (e.g., new program development). Recommendations for such teaching reassignments will be generated by the Chair of the budgetary unit, with input from the budgetary unit faculty, and approved by the Dean. 4. Guidelines for the promotion to Associate Professor with tenure are provided by each budgetary unit and include requirements for "achievement of a record of high quality in each of the categories of Teaching, Scholarship, and University and Community Service." As per the post-tenure policy, tenured faculty must meet certain expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. 5. Historically, the vast majority of UW-Green Bay faculty members have met expectations in the areas of scholarship and service. This document seeks to recognize this work in the context of the 24-credit workload policy. In those cases where faculty do not meet the expectations, the assignment of additional teaching responsibilities (typically the equivalent of one additional three credit course) will help address workload equity and fairness concerns. It should be noted that faculty assigned a 24-credit teaching load are not in jeopardy of losing tenure, but they are having their workload adjusted to maintain equity in overall workload, while also noting that such faculty would still be subject to the post-tenure review process. This recommendation for a 24-credit teaching load would be generated by the budgetary Chair, with input from the Executive Committee, and be approved by the Dean |

Workload for those in the lecturer position is a 27-credit workload without expectation of service or scholarship outside of the unit. The workload policy is outlined in the [University and Academic Staff Handbook](https://www.uwgb.edu/UWGBCMS/media/hr/policies/Employee-Handbook-FINAL.pdf?ext=.pdf), page 18.

|  |
| --- |
| Lecturer (no-prefix):  The no-prefix Lecturer title is used when individuals have a teaching appointment of at least one full academic year. These positions may be temporary, one-year appointments or fixed-term renewable appointments. The full credit load for lecturers is 27 credits per academic year. Any additional credits taught would need to be compensated through approved overload. Fixed-term renewable lecturers are eligible for career progression pursuant to the Title Review Policy.  Senior Lecturer:  The Senior Lecturer title may be used when individuals have a teaching appointment of at least one full academic year and have met the requirements for career progression to the senior level as identified in the Title Review Policy. This title is utilized only for fixed-term, renewable appointments. The full credit load for senior lecturers is 27 credits per academic year. Any additional credits taught would need to be compensated through approved overload. |

The Executive Committee requests Faculty status for all permanent lecturers. When granted faculty status, lecturers are able to participate in governance of the University. This allows participation in some university committees including Faculty Senate.

The University policy for Associate Lecturers (or often referred to as Adjunct Instructors) is located in the same document as Lecturers, page 17-18.

|  |
| --- |
| Associate Lecturer:  The Associate Lecturer title is used when individuals have a one-semester teaching appointment that consists entirely of semester-long credit courses. The full credit load for associate lecturers is 13.5 credits per semester. Any additional credits taught would need to be compensated through approved overload.    All Associate Lecturers will be paid on a C-basis. Associate Lecturers may or may not be eligible for fringe benefits depending upon their particular situation. |

In the Social Work Program, Associate Lecturers are contracted for only one or two courses per semester but also consist of a minority of appointments. Associate Lecturers are considered with faculty expertise and availability is absent for a particular course, such as the school social work electives. Rarely is an Associate Lecturer contracted for a core social work course in either BSW or MSW Program.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative discusses how the policy supports the achievement of institutional priorities and the program's mission and goals across all program options. |

**Sufficiency of Workload Policy to Support the Achievement of Institutional Priorities:**

Workload policy noted in 3.2.5(1) is determined by the UW-System Board of Regents. An evaluation of workload requirements was conducted and approved by the Faculty Senate on April 8, 2020.

Strategic priorities for the university include increasing student success and retention, updating technology, forging community connections, among others. These priorities were developed as part of a strategic planning process with plans to develop more fully over the next 18 months.

Provision of additional resources as the program has grown, ensuring fidelity to the CSWE faculty to student ratios, additional resources for professional development, and enhanced technological resources are ways the University assists the Social Work Programs to support the achievement of the university priorities. For example, the Social Work Department was awarded a Distance Education grant with funding awarded to faculty as they re-evaluated courses for the appropriate modality. Included within that grant was training for online and backward design course development.

The revision of the advising model to include faculty mentoring is one way the strategic priorities have been implemented. Per the University Administration, this model “honors faculty workload and still ensures guidance to students from faculty. The new system must wrap career guidance and academic advising from a professional advisor into a cohesive experience that is given to all students and not just those who seek it out on their own.”

The Chancellor and Provost work closely with the University Committee and other shared governance committees to reinforce strategic priorities while also considering program demands. Workload policy is sufficient to achieve institutional priorities.

**Sufficiency of Workload Policy to Support the Achievement of The Program's Mission:**

The mission articulates that the Social Work Professional programs “provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being”.

University support through administrative releases promotes collaboration with external partners, such as our Program Advisory Committee, keeping faculty in tune with trends and needs of the region to address within the curriculum. Ability of faculty to autonomously outline program needs through the administrative support of shared governance strategies allows the program sufficient resources to support achievement of the Programs’ mission.

Funding for professional development toward developing anti-racist pedagogy, including the Speak Out conference in spring 2021 and support for the Social Justice summit planned for summer 2022 are ways the Program mission is supported. While no additional release time was granted for these activities, faculty receptive to involvement were encouraged to participate. Students were also given the opportunity to participate at no cost, too, which is also supportive of the Program’s mission and goals.

**Sufficiency of Workload Policy to Support the Achievement of The Program's Goals:**

Key goals of the Social Work Professional Programs that can be considered when determining sufficiency of workload policy to support them include (1) engaging in continual improvement of the curriculum, (2) community partnerships, (3) interdisciplinarity, (4) professional development, and (5) recruitment efforts.

Release time to complete administrative and additional tasks, such as regular program evaluation and this self-study document, reflect the integration of workload policy to support program goals. Ongoing accreditation release time is utilized to support continual improvement of the curriculum and program offerings. Additional release time for primary investigators in grants and other programs supports social work collaboration with interdisciplinary networks and additional opportunities and funding for students in the program

Workload policy allows and encourages community partnerships, through adequate time as field instructors and through field coordination, support for annual continuing education for agency field instructors. Opportunities for professional development to improve teaching are available both externally as well as through the University’s Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, and funding to support research activities and teaching enhancement opportunities. While not specific to the workload policy, sabbaticals (funded through the Provost’s Office) allow additional release when faculty have an area for more intensive research or collaboration.

Finally, promoting inclusivity within student body and faculty are encouraged through Policy’s allowance for shared governance including autonomy in the student admissions processes and leadership in faculty recruitments. The Graduate Studies Office supplements time demands assisting with processing of MSW applications. Guidance through Human Resources and policies allowing faculty leadership in hiring and recruitment efforts encourage selection of candidates whose values and professional goals align well with the Program’s mission and goals.

While additional time is not authorized for some of the activities noted within this section, policy is sufficient to support achievement of the Program’s goals.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.2.6:Faculty demonstrate ongoing professional development as teachers, scholars, and practitioners through dissemination of research and scholarship, exchanges with external constituencies such as practitioners and agencies, and through other professionally relevant creative activities that support the achievement of institutional priorities and the program’s mission and goals. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates ongoing professional development as teachers, scholars, and practitioners through dissemination of research and scholarship, exchanges with external constituencies such as practitioners and agencies, and through other professionally relevant creative activities that support the achievement of institutional priorities and the program’s mission and goals across all program options. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Examples of Faculty Research Experience** | **Relationship to…** | | |
| **Institutional Priorities** | **Component(s) of Program’s Mission** | **Component(s) of Program’s Goals** |
| Co- PI on Student research projects [Groessl (CPE), Warren (Trans End of Life)] | Improve student success & retention (*develop skills & perspectives and positively impact communities*) | Program provides “competency-based” programs that “elevate human and community well-being” (*Student research was then* *disseminated to a larger* *professional community*). | Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action |
| Rhee: Expressive Writing and stress perception in MSW Students | Improve student success & retention  (*Strategy is designed to promote stress awareness and reduction to enhance openness to learning*) | Program provides “competency-based” programs that “elevate human and community well-being” (*Students reflect on identity, self-care, this EPB fosters well-being*” | Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action |
| Sallmann: Diversity climate studies. Ongoing analysis of COBRA results | Inclusivity & Equity (*examining student experiences to promote inclusive environment*) | “Grounded in the values of the Profession”, Programs “promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world” (*ongoing analysis examines school climate and student development in terms of diversity*). | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks”  Curriculum: Engage in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core.  Recruitment & Persistence: Actively recruit students, faculty, and staff into an inclusive and extraordinary environment with highly effective supports to ensure that all are able to successfully meet academic and professional goals. |
| Schanen-Materi: Annual student research project for SW 461/SW 463 | Improve student success (improve skills) & Community Connections (*research develops from partnership with a community entity*) | Program is “regionally responsive” (*research projects focus on a need of the community partner*). | Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities.  Interdisciplinarity: Promote critical thinking through acquiring and applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice**.** |
| Warren: Qualitative Study: International SW courses. | Improve student success (*opportunities for growth in cultural awareness*) | Programs “promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world… strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being”. (*Focus of cultural awareness for the broader community/global perspectives*) | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks”  Curriculum: Engage in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core. |
| Waubanascum: multiple research assistant roles | Inclusivity & Equity (*Focus on Tribal Child Welfare*) and Community Connections (*through dissemination*). | Programs “promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world… elevates community well-being (*focus of research on intervention on behalf of First Nations individuals involved in child welfare/systems change*) | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks” Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities.  Interdisciplinarity: Promote critical thinking through acquiring and applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Examples of Faculty Scholarship Experience** | **Relationship to…** | | |
| **Institutional Priorities** | **Component(s) of Program’s Mission** | **Component(s) of Program’s Goals** |
| University Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Program [Sallmann & Groessl; Rhee, Trimberger] | Improve student success (*support curricular activities through SOTL research)* | Provide “competency-based programs… elevate individual well-being” (*focus on improved teaching to enhance learning*) | Curriculum: Engage in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core |
| Akakpo: Published article on mitigating negatively racialized attitudes in child welfare. | Inclusivity & Equity (*eliminate racial gaps in service*) | “Grounded in the values of the Profession”, Program “promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice” (*focus on strengths to improve services*) | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks”  Interdisciplinarity: Promote critical thinking through acquiring and applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice. |
| Sallmann: Human Trafficking Awareness through development of general education course | Improve student success (*support through general education*) | Program provides “regionally responsive… interdisciplinary programs”… “elevate human and community well-being” (*Northeast Wisconsin is a key corridor for human trafficking. As general education course, serves to educate the broader university community*). | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks”  Curriculum: Engage in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core  Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities. |
| Sallmann: Title IV-E CW Training Program | Improve student success (*stipend opportunities*) Community Connections (*partnership with DHS, improve workforce capabilities*) | Program provides “regionally responsive… interdisciplinary programs”… “elevate human and community well-being” (*Program includes extensive partnerships with County and Tribal CW in the region and involves student support as well as continued program development.)* | Curriculum: Engage in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core.  Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities |
| Schanen-Materi: ALICE Poster presentations | Improve student success & retention,  Inclusivity & Equity and Community connections (*focus on challenges of low SES college students*) | Program provides “regionally responsive… interdisciplinary programs… elevate human and community well-being”. (*Research was in partnership with the United Way and focused on students who were low-income*) | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks”  Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities  Interdisciplinarity: Promote critical thinking through acquiring and applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice. |
| Waubanascum: Indigenous caregivers & colonial CW system | Inclusivity & equity (*Increase awareness to improve CW system*) | Programs “promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being” (*Focus on improving outcomes for First Nations*) | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks”  Interdisciplinarity: Promote critical thinking through acquiring and applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice.  Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action. |
| Waubanascum: Series of CW online training modules. | Community connections (*training to foster effective CW services*) | Programs “provide regionally responsive… interdisciplinary programs… that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being” (*Focus on improving outcomes for First Nations*) | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks”  Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action. |
| Inclusive Excellence Certificate completion [Groessl, Rhee, Schanen Materi, Trimberger, Warren] | Inclusivity and Equity (*focus specifically on fostering greater diversity, equity, inclusion, and accountability at every level of university life*) | “Grounded in the values of the Profession”  Programs “promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world” (*Certificate demonstrates a commitment to understanding and implementing social change across spectrum of diverse populations*). | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks”  Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action.  Recruitment & Persistence: Actively recruit students, faculty, and staff into an inclusive and extraordinary environment with highly effective supports to ensure that all are able to successfully meet academic and professional goals. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Examples of Faculty Exchanges with External Constituencies** | **Relationship to…** | | |
| **Institutional Priorities** | **Component(s) of Program’s Mission** | **Component(s) of Program’s Goals** |
| Social Work Program Advisory Committee | Community Partnerships (to ensure support for current practice issues by the Program) |  | Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities.  Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action |
| Martin Luther King Committee involvement [Sallmann & Akakpo] | Inclusivity and Equity (focus MLK message) and Community Partnerships (*collaboration across systems*) | Programs “promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world … elevates human and community well-being” (*Organization of a community-wide event highlighting MLK and community efforts inclusivity toward Blacks*). | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks”  Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities |
| Ethics & Boundaries Workshops [Groessl, Lee Yang, Trimberger, & Warren] | Community Partnerships (*training to enhance professional behavior and ethical practice*) | “Grounded in the values of the Profession”,  “provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs” (*Wide range of professionals and settings for trainings*) | Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities.  Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action |
| Groessl: APS Curriculum and Trainings | Community connections (*statewide partnership and training to all APS workers in state*) | “provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs” (*focus on best practice in response to needs of the aging services network*) | Interdisciplinarity: Promote critical thinking through acquiring and applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice.  Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action |
| Lee Yang: DEI trainings and consultation | Community Connections & Inclusivity & Equity (*Organization based consultation and training on DEI, strategies to improve client outcomes***)** | “Grounded in the values of the Profession”,  “provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs**…** that elevates human and community well-being” (*Trainings and consultation aimed as improvement in organizational functioning on behalf of people of color*.) | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks”  Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action.  Recruitment & Persistence: Actively recruit students, faculty, and staff into an inclusive and extraordinary environment with highly effective supports to ensure that all are able to successfully meet academic and professional goals |
| Rhee: Curative Connections Advisory Committee | Community Connections (*enhance connection with university to benefit older adults and those with disabilities*) | “Grounded in the values of the Profession”,  **“**elevates human and community well-being” (*Involvement focuses on well-being of aging and those with disabilities, services to the population*) | Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities.  Interdisciplinarity: Promote critical thinking through acquiring and applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice. |
| Rhee: Innovation in Aging Planning Committee | Improve Student Success (*opportunities for innovation competition for students*) | “competency-based, interdisciplinary programs…elevates human well-being” (*Competition focuses on innovation for service development, enhance opportunities for older adults*). | Curriculum: Engage in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core  Interdisciplinarity: Promote critical thinking through acquiring and applying knowledge from across a diverse spectrum of reasoning while developing evidence-based professional practice |
| Schanen-Materi: Wise Women Gathering Place Board | Inclusivity & Equity, Community Partnerships (services to First Nations, linkage) | “elevates human and community well-being” (*Board membership for agency centered in First Nations traditions*). | Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities |
| Trimberger: Camp Lloyd co-director | Improve Student Success (*opportunities for student skill development in counseling grieving children*) | “engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human well-being” (*Teaches coping to childhood survivors of loss through death.)* | Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action |
| Trimberger: Oral Health Partnership Board | Community Connections (*improve dental services to youth of low SES)* | “Elevates human and community well-being” (*Board membership focused on access to dental care for children of low-SES*). | Community Partnerships: Seek, analyze, and respond to the dynamic urban and rural needs of the region by cultivating partnerships with diverse communities. |
| Trimberger: School-Based MH Professionals Project | Community Connections (*enhance MH services in schools/ opportunities for MSW students*) | “Provide regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice… engaging in strengths-based generalist practice” (*Focuses on training of MSW students to serve in schools underrepresented*.) | Curriculum: Engage in continuous improvement to provide a dynamic, professional, generalist-practice curriculum, with excellence and diversity at its core.  Professional Development: Seek and develop professional growth opportunities with an emphasis on social change, challenging oppression, and vital social action. |
| Waubanascum: UWGB EDI Consultant | Inclusivity & Equity (*Program developed as key aspect of strategic initiative, representative for CHESW*) | “Grounded in the values of the Profession”, provide competency-based, interdisciplinary programs that promote social justice in a diverse and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that elevates human and community well-being” (*Entire project is consistent with the mission and goals of the program.*) | “Grounded in anti-racism and anti-oppression frameworks”  Recruitment & Persistence: Actively recruit students, faculty, and staff into an inclusive and extraordinary environment with highly effective supports to ensure that all are able to successfully meet academic and professional goals. |

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.2.7:The program demonstrates how its faculty models the behavior and values of the profession in the program’s educational environment. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates how the program’s faculty models the behavior and values of the profession in the program’s educational environment across all program options. |

*Profession’s Values*

*“Service, social justice, the dignity and worth of the person, the importance of human relationships, integrity, competence, human rights, and scientific inquiry are among the core values of social work. These values underpin the explicit and implicit curriculum and frame the profession’s commitment to respect for all people and the quest for social and economic justice.”* *(EP 1.0, 2015 EPAS)*

Faculty model professional behavior and values in our day-to-day interactions with students, colleagues, and community partners through actualizing our professional values. Examples of how the NASW Code of Ethics guides our actions are described below.

**Examples of Faculty Modeling Professional Behavior in the Educational Environment:**

The *Code of Ethics* also provides the framework for our interpersonal interactions. The *Code* outlines respectful and professional behavior for interacting with persons whose identity statuses and religious/spiritual and political beliefs differ from our own, commitment to anti-racist practice, as well as how to dealing with conflict, impairment, and incompetence. We use these models in our interactions with students, colleagues, and community partners. Students are taught how to follow the *Code* when resolving interpersonal conflicts and are directed back to the Code for guidance on how to problem-solve in such arenas.

Additionally, the UW-Green Bay Social Work faculty model the behavior of the profession on a daily basis through their teaching, scholarship, and service activities, most of which have an explicit focus on issues of diversity and social justice. These engagements center on the needs of vulnerable and oppressed groups, including: survivors of violence, aging populations, communities of color, children in foster care, and persons with mental health diagnoses or developmental disabilities. Faculty dedicate their time specifically to advancing public sector services and non-profit organizations committed to providing free or low-income services in an inclusive manner.

Finally, the faculty are committed to lifelong learning. All of our faculty are licensed or certified social workers and therefore obligated to complete requisite continuing education. Through completing continuing education requirements, faculty remain informed of current practice trends, which can then be brought to the classroom. By talking with students about the professional development activities we participate in, we also model “competence” to our students.

**Examples of Faculty Modeling Professional Values in the Educational Environment:**

When working to revise our Program’s mission and goals, faculty first turned to the NASW *Code of Ethics* for inspiration. Faculty decided to ground our Program’s activities in our profession’s primary mission: “to enhance human well-being and help meet the basic human needs of all people, with particular attention to the needs and empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty,” (http://www.socialworkers.org/pubs/code/code.asp). Therefore, our first goal, Social Justice, is to, “advance the primary mission of the social work profession by advancing the needs and empowerment of vulnerable and oppressed populations.” In this way, the Profession’s values directly shape our Program.

Next, faculty intentionally embedded Competency 1 in every required upper-level course and created the course, *SW 300: Professionalism and Teamwork in Social Work* *Practice*, as foundations for attending to the values of the profession. These competencies and their corresponding behaviors explicitly articulate expectations for professional behaviors and values. By having these competencies in each course, faculty are provided the opportunity to consistently model these areas to students. Through providing such repetition throughout the curriculum, the importance of such behaviors is further highlighted for students

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

# Accreditation Standard 3.3 — Administrative Structure

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.3.1:The program describes its administrative structure and shows how it provides the necessary autonomy to achieve the program’s mission and goals. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the program’s administrative structure across all program options. |

As a free-standing unit within the College of Health, Education, and Social Welfare (CHESW), the Social Work Professional Program at UW-Green Bay has the autonomy necessary to achieve the Program's objectives. The Chair of the Program reports directly to the Dean of CHESW. The Program's Chair has full responsibility for the coordination and educational leadership of the Social Work Professional Program. The responsibilities of the Chair are codified in the [*UW-Green Bay Faculty Handbook*](https://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/rules/facultyhandbook.pdf) (see p. 22-24).

|  |
| --- |
| The unit chair shall have leadership and administrative responsibilities in relation to the faculty and the Executive Committee of the unit. The chair's primary responsibility is to organize faculty discussion of key intellectual and practical issues concerning the unit and the institution as a whole, and to work with the unit faculty to address them effectively. These functions are carried out on behalf of the executive committee and unit faculty and are particularly evident in five major areas.   1. Program/Curriculum Planning.    * + 1. In this area leadership responsibilities include initiating and organizing the unit’s curriculum planning and program development processes. These activities are coordinated with the preparation and implementation of the unit’s Program Development Plan and Program Assessment Plan.        2. The chairperson has leadership responsibilities to approve, schedule, and staff courses, subject to negotiation with other interdisciplinary units, relevant disciplines and programs. 2. Personnel Leadership. Leadership responsibilities in this area include promoting a sense of intellectual esprit and institutional purpose among faculty, staff and students. The chair encourages faculty in their professional growth and development and their sense of contribution to the unit and its programs. As a resource and guide, the chair helps ensure that faculty seeking tenure and promotion are appropriately mentored, and receive timely, formative feedback regarding their professional development. The chair is also responsible for helping to align faculty expertise with the needs of the unit; establishing a direction for the unit through discussion of intellectual issues related to the teaching and research of the unit; and the development of faculty/staff positions and appropriate recruitment strategies. 3. Resource Planning/Allocation. Planning and management of the unit’s resources is a key responsibility of the chair. Leadership responsibilities in this area include the development and the regular updating of the unit’s Program Development Plan, which is the basis for requests for funds and other resources to support program enhancement initiatives.   D. Unit Representation/Advocacy. The chair serves as the unit’s advocate within and outside of the University. The chair is also the official unit representative at all institutional meetings, official University functions, and in the community.  E. Student Learning Experiences. Chair responsibilities regarding student learning experiences involve facilitating a process of open communication between faculty and students (e.g., by facilitating student-faculty discussions; involving students in curricular planning and review) that enhances the opportunity for students to engage in and contribute to high quality learning. The chair also contributes to the campus student recruitment and retention plan and participation in UW-Green Bay information and orientation programs.  In carrying out the leadership responsibilities of the position, the chair of the interdisciplinary unit also has the following duties:   1. Serves as the official channel of communication for all matters affecting the unit as a whole, between the unit and the Chancellor, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the appropriate Dean(s), and other University officials, units and offices (e.g., Registrar, Admissions, General Studies). 2. Calls and presides over meetings of the interdisciplinary unit faculty and of the executive committee, including scheduling merit, tenure and promotion meetings. He/she shall call a meeting at the request of any two members of the interdisciplinary unit. Each interdisciplinary unit shall meet at least once every semester. 3. Prepares all official correspondence of the interdisciplinary unit, including memoranda, reports, brochures and other documents that describe the programs, services and activities under the auspices of the unit. He/she also ensures that the performance standards established by the unit are maintained, and that all necessary records of faculty activities are properly recorded. 4. Submits all official copy for the timetable, catalog and other University publications. 5. Monitors and maintains course periodicity and submits, through the Dean, the paperwork associated with the development of new courses, major revisions of existing courses and deletion of courses proposed by the interdisciplinary unit for action by the Academic Affairs Council and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. 6. Monitors and approves expenditures charged to the unit’s account(s). The chair is also responsible, in consultation with the Dean, for the preparation of an annual planning and budget document for the unit. 7. Assists students with the pursuit of their educational goals through the organization and implementation of an effective unit advising system, dealing effectively with student complaints, and supporting student organizations that complement the unit’s student learning outcomes and goals |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates how the program’s administrative structure provides the necessary autonomy to achieve the program’s mission and goals across all program options. |

The University of Wisconsin Green-Bay functions using a shared governance model which allows influence in larger university policymaking but also autonomy at the departmental level. Faculty has autonomy within the development of the Program’s vision and direction, admissions policies, curriculum, and other management decisions. Program’s mission and goals are created by social work faculty and reviewed annually at a full faculty meeting.

The [organizational chart for the university](https://www.uwgb.edu/UWGBCMS/media/Chancellor/files/UWGBOrgChart.pdf) notes the Chancellor as overseeing all aspects of the university. Each of the four colleges are under the direct supervision of the Provost. Each of the Department Chairs directly report to the Dean of the colleges who reports to the Provost.

The Program is an independent budgetary unit within the University. While the Provost sets the base budget for the Program, and the Dean has authority to approve specific expenditures, the Chair of the Program gives the primary direction in how that budget is to be used. Exclusive of salaries, the Chair of the Social Work Program the Program Chair has responsibility for developing and monitoring the Program’s budget and determining personnel assignment to courses and administrative functions that require course credit release.
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The governance structure of UW-Green Bay requires that each unit will have an Executive Committee. The Executive Committee carries major responsibility for personnel actions including the annual review of faculty and for recommending promotion, renewal, and tenure. At UW-Green Bay, the Executive Committee must consist of five tenured faculty members. Current membership includes Drs. Akakpo, Groessl, Rhee, Sallmann, and Trimberger.

Internally, the Department’s Leadership Team, the BSW and MSW Program Coordinators and Chair, regularly meet to discuss departmental affairs and ensure Program activities are consistently administered and any problems resolved. Within this structure, faculty meeting agendas are outlined so any need for policy development or change can be brought to the full faculty for attention.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.3.2:The program describes how the social work faculty has responsibility for defining program curriculum consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards and the institution’s policies. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the social work faculty has responsibility for defining program curriculum consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards and the institution’s policies across all program options. |

**Curricular Development Process:**

The Social Work faculty has complete authority to determine curriculum. Each faculty member participates in either the BSW or MSW Curriculum Committee. When faculty propose developing or modifying a course, the respective curriculum committee creates a proposal which is then brought to full faculty for approval. When a decision is made to add a new course or change the emphasis or title of an existing course, a member of the social work faculty is designated to develop a syllabus and to complete the necessary administrative forms. The proposed syllabus or change is approved at a Social Work faculty meeting and then forwarded to the Dean of the College Health, Education, and Social Welfare for approval. The Dean then asks the Academic Affairs Council to review the proposal and to recommend approval. If a graduate level course, the Graduate Studies Council also reviews the course as does the General Education Council for any proposed general education courses. These Councils are composed of elected faculty from across the University. If the Council finds problems with the submission, they meet with the Chair of the academic unit for clarification, and then submit a written recommendation regarding addition of the course to the course catalog.

This process has been beneficial to the Program in a number of ways. It assures that the quality of our offerings meets University standards; it educates other faculty about the Social Work Program; and it determines that the offerings are appropriate within the University mission, coordinated with other academic units, and can be offered with the resources of the Program. All of the University’s curriculum planning procedures are available at: <http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/curriculum/>.

With the implementation of the 2015 CSWE competencies and behavioral indicators, curricular evaluation was completed through full faculty meetings and appropriate course measures were developed as a result of those efforts. This curricular review is a demonstration of the autonomy of Program faculty to ensure that the curriculum is consistent with the EPAS standards.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.3.3:The program describes how the administration and faculty of the social work program participate in formulating and implementing policies related to the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of program personnel. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the administration and faculty of the social work program participate in formulating and implementing policies related to the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of program personnel across all program options. |

The faculty of the Social Work Program has the responsibility for developing the criteria for hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of program personnel. While most of the policies and procedures are codified and addressed in the University’s *Faculty Handbook*, the policies and procedures assure that each budgetary unit assumes a central role in all personnel matters.

**Recruitment and Hiring**

When recruiting new tenure track and non-tenure track (academic staff) positions, the Social Work faculty develops the position description identifying required qualifications, teaching responsibilities, and salary range. The Chair discusses preferred criteria and position description with the Dean. If the Dean approves, the recommendation is forwarded to a committee of the Provost to review and make a recommendation to the Provost. The position description is then sent to the Affirmative Action Officer for final approval.

Once approved, the Department establishes a Hiring and Recruitment Committee, led by faculty, and works with Human Resources to ensure University protocol and process is followed and in accordance with legal requirements. A schedule of all steps in the process is completed by the faculty member chairing the search. Following the screening and interviewing of applicants, the Hiring and Recruitment Committee provides an assessment of the final candidates to the Dean who then makes an offer to the preferred candidate.

**Promotion and Tenure**

Basic parameters for promotion and tenure departmental policy development are outlined in the university *Faculty Handbook*. Guidelines for both merit reviews and responsibility of the Unit’s Executive Committee for conducting those reviews is outlined in section [3.10](https://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/rules/facultyhandbook.pdf) of that handbook. Those who are classified as academic staff (lecturers) have reviews conduced annually by the Department Chair, while Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor ranks are reviewed by the Executive Committee. The University *Document on Tenure* ([pp. 99-106](https://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/rules/facultyhandbook.pdf)) outlines the general university policy.

The social work faculty developed merit and promotion policies reflecting an emphasis on the value of teaching, service, and scholarship. Most recently revised in 2018, the policy reflects the institutional priorities and mission and goals of the University of Wisconsin Green-Bay and provides a template for the Professional Activities Report completed annually by faculty at all ranks, Lecturer, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors. Benchmarks for merit review ratings are outlined to assist in equitable evaluation.

Consistent with University policy, the Executive Committee evaluates tenured faculty every five years and non-tenured faculty annually for merit reviews. Academic staff (lecturers) and clerical staff are evaluated annually by the Program Chair. In addition to merit reviews, an annual review is conducted with simple indication of meeting or not meeting departmental expectations.

**Policies Related to Recruitment of Faculty**

**Role of social work faculty/administration in policy formulation:**

General [policy for recruitment and hiring](https://www.uwgb.edu/UWGBCMS/media/policies/files/2017-10-24_Policy-for-Recruitment-and-Hiring-FINAL.pdf?ext=.pdf) is established by the University to ensure adherence to relevant laws. As a public institution, meetings must be posted, and minutes maintained pursuant to Wisconsin Open Meetings Law. Any policy changes within the purview of faculty are voted on by the Faculty Senate, although most are managed through the UW System with adoption by the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Human Resources.

**Role of social work faculty/administration in policy implementation:**

University Human Resources outlines the [procedures](https://www.uwgb.edu/human-resources/recruitment-hiring/procedures/) for all steps in the Hiring and Recruitment Process. As noted above, a Hiring and Recruitment Committee led by social work faculty, implements the policies and protocols for hiring and recruitment as established by the University.

**Policies Related to Hiring of Faculty**

**Role of social work faculty/administration in policy formulation:**

The University of Wisconsin Green Bay uses a shared governance structure. This structure ensures representation of each university department on [faculty committees](https://www.uwgb.edu/CMSAssets/sofas/committees.asp?ID=2) and recommend policies to administration. Any policy changes within the purview of faculty are voted on by the Faculty Senate. Faculty interest in additional committees is obtained annually and elections held to fill roles.

**Role of social work faculty/administration in policy implementation:**

The explanation noted above for recruitment applies to the hiring process as well. Once an offer of employment has been accepted by the candidate, the Department Chair works with the new employee to provide essential information relative to the university processes and procedures and departmental functioning and operations.

**Policies Related to Retention of Faculty**

**Role of social work faculty/administration in policy formulation:**

The University policy for faculty retention is outlined in the Faculty Handbook (outlined in the review procedures (beginning page 39). The Executive Committee of the Unit has responsibility of determining contract renewal recommendations. In cases where renewal is not recommended, the faculty member being denied renewal has right of reconsideration to the Executive Committee. Should that not be successful, right of appeal is granted (outlined in Section 3.12 of the [Faculty Handbook](https://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/rules/facultyhandbook.pdf)).

**Role of social work faculty/administration in policy implementation:**

During the annual review process, contract renewal recommendations are required for faculty who are not yet tenured. The Department Chair receives a listing of required reviews in early fall with completion due date deadlines from Human Resources. That same listing identifies if the review also requires contract renewal. The Executive Committee confirms renewal recommendations to the Dean upon completion of the annual reviews.

**Policies Related to Promotion of Faculty**

**Role of social work faculty/administration in policy formulation:**

As noted in the prior discussion of this standard, Tenure and Promotion Policies are established at the University level although Units identify specific criteria relevant to their units. The Social Work Faculty, working through the Executive Committee, have created policies and a template for Professional Activities Reports and their consideration during the review process. Promotion recommendations are sent to the Dean once it is felt the faculty member sufficiently meets criteria outlined by the University for tenure and/or promotion. These recommendations are then considered by the Personnel Council (elected tenured faculty), and then affirmed by the Dean, Provost and Chancellor with final decision from the UW Board of Regents.

**Role of social work faculty/administration in policy implementation:**

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion is evaluated on teaching, scholarship, and institutional and community service. The candidate prepares and submits written statements describing accomplishments in these four areas along with files documenting evidence of same. The candidate is first reviewed by the Social Work Executive Committee, who vote on whether or not to support the candidate’s application for tenure or promotion to full professor. The candidate is then reviewed by the Personnel Council, a committee of tenured faculty from across campus, which makes a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean votes whether or not to support the candidate; a vote of “yes” is then referred to the Provost, who recommends the candidate for tenure to the University Chancellor. The Chancellor votes to support the candidate, and refers the candidate to the Board of Regents, who ultimately confer tenure.

Opportunities to appeal and/or grieve the process are available following each vote. The recommendations of the Social Work Executive Committee have historically been approved in every case for tenure of social work faculty

**Policies Related to Tenure of Faculty**

**Role of social work faculty/administration in policy formulation:**

See the section above related to Promotion of Faculty. Tenure accompanies promotion of an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. As noted earlier, policies for the Social Work Department have been created and reviewed by the Unit’s Executive Committee. Within that policy are the appropriate requirements for promotion to Full Professor.

**Role of social work faculty/administration in implementation:**

See the above section on Promotion of Faculty since the policy addresses both promotion and tenure.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.3.4:The program identifies the social work program director. Institutions with accredited baccalaureate and master’s programs appoint a separate director for each. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative identifies the social work program director inclusive of all program options. |

Social Work Professional Programs Chair: Dr. Joan Groessl

BSW Program Coordinator: Dr. Jolanda Sallmann

MSW Program Coordinator: Dr. Francis Akakpo

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: In institutions with accredited baccalaureate and master’s programs, narrative demonstrates that a separate director is appointed to each program. |

Both Program Coordinators have 100% assignment to their respective programs. Dr. Jolanda Sallmann is BSW Program Coordinator and Dr. Francis Akakpo is MSW Program Coordinator.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M3.3.4(a):The program describes the master’s program director’s leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in social work. The program documents that the director has a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. In addition, it is preferred that the master’s program director have a doctoral degree, preferably in social work. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the master’s program director’s leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in social work across all program options. |

**Teaching Experience:**

Dr. T. Francis Akakpo joined the faculty of UW-Green Bay in August 2009 and was granted tenure in 2015. He has taught both BSW and MSW courses with particular expertise in macro practice and research. Prior to joining UWGB faculty, Dr. Akakpo spent one year as a clinical assistant professor at Michigan State, having served as a teaching assistant the two years prior to that appointment. He was also an adjunct lecturer at Devonport University in MI for two years.

**Scholarship Experience:**

Dr. Akakpo’s scholarship has focused on equity in child welfare and juvenile justice. He has conducted research in Ghana with a similar focus. As a long-time instructor of the MSW Program Diversity course, Dr. Akakpo collects data related to student attitudes and changes over time.

**Curricular Development Experience:**

Dr. Akakpo served on the curriculum committee as the Program created a solo MSW Program (previous MSW Program was collaborative with UW-Oshkosh) and since that time. He has designed as well as redeveloped courses in alignment with program objectives.

**Administrative Experience:**

In addition to his MSW, Dr. Akakpo has a master’s degree in Public Administration. Prior to joining academia, his work with the Michigan Department of Human Services and Bureau of Juveniles involved program administration responsibilities. He also served as a Title IV-E Family Service Coordinator in the school system.

**Other Academic and Professional Experience:**

Dr. Akakpo has served on Faculty Senate and other committees for the broader University. He has been a mentor to students of color and serves as an Advisory Board Member for BIPOC R.I.S.E.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative documents that the director has a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. |

See Dr. T. Francis [Akakpo’s Faculty Data](#Akakpo) form which outlines his MSW, additional master’s degree, and Doctoral degrees

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M3.3.4(b):The program provides documentation that the director has a full-time appointment to the social work master’s program. |

Program Coordinator is elected by the faculty for a three-year term. Dr. Akakpo was elected by faculty to begin his term July 1, 2021.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative provides documentation that the director has a full-time appointment to the social work master’s program inclusive of all program options. |

**Personnel Letter:**

Text, letter

Description automatically generated

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M3.3.4(c):The program describes the procedures for determining the program director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program. To carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the social work program, a minimum of 50% assigned time is required at the master’s level. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the procedures for determining the program director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program inclusive of all program options. |

MSW Program Coordinator must be tenured. A twelve-credit release per academic year is assigned to whomever fulfills the role of MSW Program Coordinator. Since July 2021, that role has been held by Dr. Francis Akakpo.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates a minimum of 50% of assigned time is provided to carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the social work program inclusive of all program options. |

Dr. T. Francis Akakpo is the MSW Program Coordinator with 12-credit release for the MSW Program. This release is consistent with 50% of assigned time.

The BSW Program Coordinator and Department Chair positions are filled by Drs. Jolanda Sallmann and Joan Groessl, each with a 25% release.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative discusses that this time is sufficient for each program option. |

MSW Program Coordinator focuses on curricular issues only, departmental responsibilities related to personnel and budget are under the role of the Social Work Professional Programs Chair. Release time allows attention to issues influencing student success resulting in sufficiency to meet the needs of the Program consistent with the mission and goals of the Program.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.3.5:The program identifies the field education director. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative identifies the social work field education director Inclusive of all program options. |

The MSW Field Coordinator is Sara Greenwood. Sara is employed full-time and receives a 13.5 credit release to complete the responsibilities of MSW Field Coordinator. (Faull credit load is 27 credits, 13.5 credits is 50% of workload).

Program utilizes a separate individual as BSW Field Coordinator. Jenifer Schanen-Materi fulfills this role.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.3.5(a):The program describes the field director’s ability to provide leadership in the field education program through practice experience, field instruction experience, and administrative and other relevant academic and professional activities in social work. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the field director’s ability to provide leadership in the field education program through practice experience, field instruction experience, and administrative and other relevant academic and professional activities in social work. |

**Practice Experience:**

Ms. Greenwood’s practice experience is all post-MSW as her undergraduate degree was in psychology. Sara worked with the Veteran’s Administration providing mental health services and case management beginning in May of 2014. Prior to that time, she was situated in Ann Arbor, MI, and coordinated education and training for interdisciplinary providers within the VA.

**Field Instruction Experience:**

Prior to joining the faculty in July 2020, Sara was in direct practice with the Veteran’s Administration. In her role there, she worked collaboratively with students working toward their MSW degrees. Since joining the faculty, she has been the instructor for specialized field and the seminar/capstone experience.

**Administrative Experience:**

Sara has completed all responsibilities in the administration of the MSW Field Program since July 2020. She had organized and facilitated trainings within the Veteran’s Administration prior to her clinical experience. Administrative re3sponsibilities were in collaboration with the University of Michigan School of Nursing and focused on an inter-professional training program.

**Other Academic and Professional Experience:**

Sara’s work with the University of Michigan involved extensive in-person and online training development and implementation. She trained other providers on curricular delivery.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M3.3.5(b):The program documents that the field education director has a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post-master’s social work degree practice experience. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative documents that the field education director has a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post-master's social work degree practice experience. |

See [Sara Greenwood’s Faculty Data](#Greenwood) form which outlines her MSW degree, attained through the University of Michigan in April 2006, and fourteen years of post-MSW practice experience. She began her full-time position at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay in July 2020.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard M3.3.5(c):The program describes the procedures for calculating the field director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education. To carry out the administrative functions of the field education program at least 50% assigned time is required for master’s programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the procedures for determining the program director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education inclusive of all program options. |

Field Coordinator’s time is allocated according to the workload plan for the Department. Field Coordinator automatically receives a 13.5 credit release for field program administration when the position is filled by an individual who is an Academic Staff (Lecturer). [If the role were filled by Assistant or Associate Professor, credit release would be twelve credits consistent with 50% of workload.] An additional two-week contract, outside of standard workload, is authorized for summer to ensure adequate preparation of the field manual and orientation requirements for the next academic year.

Program Chair consults with Field Coordinator when assigning courses to ensure that Field Coordinator is comfortable with credit allocation across semesters. The Program intentionally assigns a field course sequence to the Field Coordinator in order to assure understanding of the demands of field for students, agency field instructors, and faculty field instructors. In spring, the Field Coordinator teaches only the f the field/seminar courses to reduce time demands during the placement process. These courses are sequenced as continuation from the prior semester which reduces teaching demands for the spring semester.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates a minimum of 50% of assigned time is provided to carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the social work program inclusive of all program options. |

Credit release is 13.5credits for the MSW Field Coordinator. This allocation is equal to 50% of workload, consistent with that required by accreditation standards. Not included in this calculation is the summer contract (2 weeks) also provided to the MSW Field Coordinator to prepare for the start of field for the next academic year.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative discusses that this time is sufficient for each program option. |

The MSW Field Coordinator assumes the lead in chairing the Joint Field Committee. Since primary teaching responsibility is for field, the MSW Field Coordinator is able to effectively integrate policies that reflect the demands of course provision. Working with the BSW Field Coordinator, queries for agency field supervisors are efficiently conducted. The credit allocation is sufficient to meet the needs of the MSW Program.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.3.6:The program describes its administrative structure for field education and explains how its resources (personnel, time and technological support) are sufficient to administer its field education program to meet its mission and goals. |
|  |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the program’s administrative structure for field education across all program options. |

Field structure includes oversight of the field program by the BSW Field Coordinator. The BSW senior cohort is divided into two field sections, each under the instruction of a separate faculty member (Faculty Field Liaison [FFL]) who is responsible for the Field and Integrated Seminar instruction student evaluation, and site supervision. The Field Coordinator assists with problem resolution when requested by any of the FFI’s. In addition, a Faculty Field Instructor (FFI) is assigned to those students who do not have a qualified social work agency field supervisor. Assignments for the FFI are created by the Department Chair once field placement supervision is determined. Table below diagrams the BSW field structure:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Program Chair | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | MSW Field Coordinator | | | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Generalist FFL  (3 instructors) |  | Specialized Year FFL  (5 Instructors) | |  | FFI  (# vary) |

To deal with programmatic review of the field program, a Joint Field Committee meets at least once per semester to address global issues in field. This committee is co-chaired by the BSW and MSW Field Coordinators and includes all faculty members teaching field courses during the academic year.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the program’s resources (personnel, time and technological support) are sufficient to administer its field education program to meet its mission and goals for each program option. |

**Description & Sufficiency of Personnel Resources:**

In addition to the Field Coordinator as discussed in Standard 3.3.5, faculty field liaisons (FFL) are associated with each field course. To ensure consistency, students enroll in the field course taught by the same instructor for both fall and spring (SW 713/714 and SW 717/718). Students are also enrolled in a seminar course taught by the same instructor. Workload credits of the FFL were determined by full faculty according to the number of field visits scheduled within a semester. Each faculty member teaching graduate field is assigned five credits total (3.0 for fall and 2.0 for spring) to teach the course. In line with all MSW practice courses, section enrollment is limited to 16 students to promote more effective instruction and management.

Faculty are never assigned more than one field section across BSW and MSW Programs. This workload allocation ensures that personnel resources (field instructors) are sufficient to meet the needs of the field program at the MSW program level.

**Description & Sufficiency Time Resources:**

The Department’s Administrative Assistant (ADA) aids the Field Coordinators with data entry and other services when requested by the Field Coordinators. The ADA creates and downloads data from Qualtrics surveys and creating data bases within excel. She is able to assist in mass email communication as well, further enhancing the sufficiency of time resources for field coordination.

Associated with each field course is a seminar course. In addition to the field credit release listed above, faculty receive an additional credit release for the seminar course. This allows for effective sharing of student experiences in the field placements. The credit allocation between the field and seminar courses is designed to address time demands of grading, field site visits and any additional monitoring needed. While much depends on the faculty’s personal time management, the time allocated is sufficient to meet the needs of students and the program’s mission and goals.

**Description & Sufficiency Technological Support Resources:**

Technological support is addressed on multiple fronts. Field Coordinators have established databases and use Qualtrics survey technology for the queries as well as program evaluation efforts. Administration was open to purchasing a field-specific software license but after consideration, the BSW and MSW Field Coordinators decided the current system was sufficient to meet their needs.

Canvas, the learning management system, is used for orientation and ongoing programmatic communication. The Field Coordinator establishes an online orientation module as well as coordinating with field supervisors via technology. A Canvas course shell is created for each field section allowing faculty to upload information to their students and for students to deposit field logs and other written work. Within Canvas, Kaltura is utilized for recording messages, including video feedback if desired.

Field placements are not virtually conducted although the Program has supported virtual field visits over the past two years. The University has purchased Microsoft products (Teams) as well as Zoom to allow for visits by technological means when necessary.

In addition to the software, Program staff have ready access to IT support through the Academic technology Services as well as the Center for Advancement of Teaching and Learning.

Technological supports and resources are sufficient to meet the needs of the field program and to support the mission and goals of the Program.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

# Accreditation Standard 3.4 — Resources

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.4.1:The program describes the procedures for budget development and administration it uses to achieve its mission and goals. The program submits a completed budget form and explains how its financial resources are sufficient and stable to achieve its mission and goals. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes the procedures for budget development and administration the program uses to achieve its mission and goals across all program options. |

Social Work Program budget is a shared budget between the BSW and MSW programs. Annually, the Social Work Department Chair provides the Dean information related to anticipated program personnel changes (e.g., retirements, sabbaticals, leaves) and personnel needs for the program. Additional funding for supplies and other programmatic expenses is noted in the document as well as any costs for accreditation, software, or activities involved in faculty searches or special programs to be offered by the program. Any external influences which impact the budget are identified as well.

In addition, the Program receives support from the Title IV-E grant administered through the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families. A budget document is created by the Principal Investigator of the grant in collaboration with the Child Welfare Coordinator and the Department Chair. Program expenses used as match allow funding of the Child Welfare Coordinator position as well as stipends for students who are participating in the stipend program. Although funded by a grant, these funds have been consistent for the program through several accreditation review cycles.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative includes a completed budget form for all program options. |

**Program Expense Budget**

**Council on Social Work Education**

**Commission on Accreditation**

**2015 EPAS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| This form is used to evaluate a program’s compliance with Accreditation Standard (AS) 3.4.1.  Provide all of the information requested below. If accredited baccalaureate and master’s programs are being reviewed at the same time, use one form for each program. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Type of Program: |  | | Baccalaureate | | | X | | Master’s | |  | |
| ***Budget is a Program budget, reporting is joint BSW & MSW, only difference would apply to student financial aid.*** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Program**  **Expenses** | | **Previous Year**  **2020-2021** | | | **Current Year**  **2021-2022** | | | | **Next Year**  **2022-2023** | | |
|  | | **Dollar Amount** | | **% Hard Money** | **Dollar Amount** | | **% Hard Money** | | **Dollar Amount** | | **% Hard Money** |
| Faculty &  Administrators | | 742,909 | | 89% | 775,111 | | 89% | | 855,893 | | 89% |
| Support Staff | | 52,239 | | 41% | 54,184 | | 41% | | 50,494 | | 41% |
| Temporary or Adjunct Faculty & Field Staff | | 5250 | | 100% | 22,250 | | 100% | | 17,750 | | 100% |
| Fringe | | 345,571 | | 86% | 356,551 | | 86% | | 378,688 | | 86% |
| Supplies & Services | | 35,600 | | 50% | 49,500 | | 50% | | 49,500 | | 50% |
| Travel | | 24,000 | | 0% | 24,000 | | 0% | | 24,000 | | 0% |
| Student  Financial Aid | | 23,772 | | 0% | 24,372 | | 0% | | TBD | | 0% |
| Technological Resources | | (In S & E) | |  | (In S & E) | |  | |  | | (In S & E) |
| Other (Specify) | |  | |  |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **TOTAL** | | $1,229,341  (Less student financial aid: $1,105,502) | | ------- | $1,305,968  (Less student financial aid: $1,108,491 | | ------- | | $1,376,325 | | ------- |

1

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the program’s financial resources are sufficient and stable to achieve its mission and goals for each program option. |

The University budget structure has been variable over the past several years. Initially, a performance/incentive based was proposed. This resulted in concern for programs within the College with accreditation and other professional requirements. The funding model was seen to be ineffective based on the needs of the overall University so was not implemented past the pilot year. The new budgeting model is holistic in nature and promotes growth of programs. This revised process has been in part facilitated by growth in enrollments for the University itself.

Social work budget has grown over the last three years and additional resources have been added to support that growth while maintaining the integrity and commitment to the mission and goals of the Program. At the current enrollment numbers, the funds are sufficient and stable to allow the Program to achieve its mission and goals.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☐ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.4.2:The program describes how it uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes how the program uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program for each program option. |

**Continuous Program Improvement**

Supportive resources for continual program improvement are administered through the University structure and in special opportunities offered to faculty.

For example, with the onset of more online learning as occurred with the pandemic, training to faculty and staff in course design, inclusivity in the online environments and teaching with technology has been created and available, along with reimbursement for completing the courses. Many social work faculty members have taken advantage of this offering and also worked together to examine the curricula of both the BSW and MSW programs to determine appropriate course modalities.

**Response to Challenges**

The BSW and MSW programs have autonomy in addressing most challenges which arise within the programs. When additional resources are needed, the Program Chair and MSW Program Coordinator regularly meet with the Dean of the College of Health, Education, and Social Welfare and needs of the program and challenges can be addressed. The Dean is then able to provide resources directly or promote the needs of the department when decision-making is at a larger university level.

Recent challenges experienced by the program relate to hiring and recruitment of faculty. At the beginning of the 2021-2022 academic year, an individual hired in late spring to begin in fall decided to resign his position. As can be expected, this created challenges for the Program. The Dean’s office worked with us to approve overloads for faculty desiring to teach some of the courses and allowed us to hire adjunct positions to meet needs as well.

A frequent concern within the University, and echoed often by faculty and staff, is that of workload demands. The Provost’s office, under the assistance of Graduate Studies, provided funding for a Graduate Teaching Assistant for two years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. This funding allowed the program to have a TA for the first time ever as well as to investigate how this position could serve the program. As a result, the Program is funding a position beginning in 2022-2023 with plans to continue as an annual budgeted item. Because desired projects can be time consuming and in addition to the workload of faculty, this position is revised to be broader than simply a teaching assistant to that of program assistant.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.4.3:The program demonstrates that it has sufficient support staff, other personnel, and technological resources to support all of its educational activities, mission and goals. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative demonstrates that the program has sufficient support staff, other personnel, and technological resources to support all of its educational activities, mission and goals for each program option. |

**Description & Sufficiency of Support Staff and Other Personnel:**

The Social Work Program has a full-time Administrative Associate III (often referred to as AA) who assists program leadership and faculty with administrative tasks. The AA is responsible for recording faculty meeting minutes and ensuring department is following open meetings laws. The AA also administers course evaluations electronically, collates data and assists with evaluation processes.

In addition to the AA position, the Program can employ a student worker to assist with large projects or other clerical tasks for the department. To ensure adherence to professional boundaries and student confidentiality, student workers are selected from individuals who are not social work majors.

A third source of support is through the employment of a graduate assistant at 20 hours/week for the academic year. Like the student worker, the Grad Assistant assists with projects but is also available for assistance within the undergraduate classroom and with faculty research activities.

Current levels of support are sufficient to meet departmental needs consistent with the mission and goals of the program. Should an unexpected demand occur, the Dean’s office has offered additional assistance to meet program needs.

**Description & Sufficiency of Technological Resources:**

The University supplies laptops and ports to all faculty and staff. In addition, all in social work have requested and received large dual monitors promoting efficiency for task completion. The University provides the Microsoft office suite to all employees and students free of charge for home use as well as SPSS when desired. In addition to the standard technology, the Program utilizes File Maker Pro to maintain data bases for student records.

Faculty, staff, and students at UW-Green Bay have had excellent technology support services. The [Information Technology](https://www.uwgb.edu/it/about/our-services/) (IT) division provides a range of services to faculty benefiting work both in and out of the classroom. In addition, IT provides support for student technology issues and students may access the work remotely as well as through Office 365. The UW-system shared services provides technological support and the University hosts a “Help Desk” that provides ready access to computer experts who problem-solve technology concerns, as well as assist with software issues with programs like Excel or MS Word. This division responds to needs related to classroom technology, including hardware and software concerns. Classrooms are equipped with telephones and ATS staff will problem-solve over the telephone; if an issue cannot be resolved that way, staff will physically come to the classroom.

Field Coordinators had investigated additional software for the field database but in the end decided they did not wish to purchase any of the frequently utilized software programs since the programs currently being used were sufficient to meet their needs.

Technological resources are sufficient to meet the mission and goals of the Program.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.4.4:The program submits a library report that demonstrates access to social work and other informational and educational resources necessary for achieving its mission and goals. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative submits a library report that demonstrates access to social work and other informational and educational resources necessary for achieving the program’s mission and goals for each program option. |

**CSWE Accreditation Librarian’s Report**

Logo, company name

Description automatically generatedCSWE Accreditation

Librarian’s Report

**General Library Description**

The UW‐Green Bay Libraries (Library) is composed of four libraries across the four campus locations, and serve a student population of 6097 FTE (Fall 2020‐2021). The main library is on the Green Bay campus, and the three branch libraries are on each of the additional campuses in Manitowoc, Marinette, and Sheboygan. There are no subject specific libraries at UW‐Green Bay; the Library provides support, services, and resources to all academic programs. Students and faculty at any of the locations have access to the collections and services at any of the four library locations.

The Library’s collections are composed of approximately 173,000 print books, 614,000 e‐books, 1887 print journals, and 314,361 e‐journals. In addition, the collection contains both federal and state government publications, an instructional materials collection, maps, microforms, multi‐media, popular reading collection, music scores, and zines. The Library houses the university’s archival collection, which also serves as the Area Research Center (part of the Wisconsin Historical Society collection), providing faculty and students access primary materials from not only the 15 counties in Northeast Wisconsin, and from around the state.

During the fall and spring semesters the Cofrin Library, on the Green Bay campus, is open seven days a week for a total of 87 hours. The libraries at the three additional locations are open five days a week for a total of 43 hours each. The actual schedule for the semester for each location can be found below in Table 1.

Table 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Location** | **Sunday** | **Monday** | **Tuesday** | **Wednesday** | **Thursday** | **Friday** | **Saturday** |
| Green Bay | 12:00 pm  – 9:00 pm | 8:00 am –  11:00 pm | 8:00 am –  11:00 pm | 8:00 am –  11:00 pm | 8:00 am –  11:00 pm | 8:00 am  – 5:00  pm | 9:00 am –  6:00pm |
| Archives | CLOSED | Open by appt | 9:30 am –  7:00 pm | 9:30 am –  3:00 pm | Open by appt | Open by appt | CLOSED |
| Marinette | CLOSED | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am  – 3:00  pm | CLOSED |
| Manitowoc | CLOSED | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am  – 3:00  pm | CLOSED |
| Sheboygan | CLOSED | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am –  5:00 pm | 8:00 am  – 3:00  pm | CLOSED |

During the summer the Green Bay campus library reduces its hours to Monday – Friday 9:00 am – 4:00 pm, closed on Saturdays and Sundays. The libraries on the three additional campus locations are closed all summer from the third week in May until the last week in August.

Students have the ability to borrow a variety of equipment from the Library. Below is a list of the types of equipment that we have available on a first come first serve basis.

* 3D Pens
* Boomboxes
* Camcorders
* Digital Cameras
* Digital Voice Recorders
* DSLR Cameras
* Go Pros
* iPads
* Laptops
* LCD Projectors
* Memory Card Readers
* Microphones
* Screens
* Tripods
* Tripod Shoes
* USB Flash Drives
* USB Headsets
* USB Microphones
* Web cameras
* Wireless Presenters
* Misc. Cables/Cords

In addition to the equipment, students also have access to computer workstations throughout all of the library locations, both in open areas and within study rooms. All of the equipment is free to checkout for seven days.

**Library Faculty and Staff**

As valuable as the information resources we provide are, equally as important is the knowledgeable Library staff. The Library staff is comprised of 13 academic librarians (including the library director) and 10 support staff. Librarians at UW‐Green Bay do not hold faculty status, nor do we have tenure.

However, the academic librarians do have a career progression process where they can move within their job sub‐family. The academic librarians do participate professional within our field through participation in associations, presenting at conferences, writing book reviews and articles.

A Library Liaison, from our Research & Outreach Services team, is assigned to each academic discipline. For Social Work that librarian is Jodi Pierre. Jodi reaches out directly to the faculty in Social Work to provide more specialized support particular to Social Work. However, all of the research librarians have general knowledge and are able to support faculty and students from Social Work. While the Manager of Collection Development is responsible for the selection of materials for the Library’s collections, the Library Liaison to Social Work also provides feedback from the faculty and input on needed or missing resources. In addition, the Coordinator of Public Services, ILL assistant, and the University Archivist all provide support at various times to anyone from the Social Work program.

The Library is also in the process of working on an OER initiative with the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. Our OER initiative will provide faculty with an opportunity to learn how to incorporate open educational resources in their courses, to help reduce the costs for students. This training is open for any faculty member to apply.

**Access Services**

The Library uses Ex Libris’ Alma for the library management system (or catalog) and Ex Libris’ Primo for the discovery layer. Both of these systems are part of the shared services that we participate in through the Council of University Wisconsin Libraries (CUWL). The systems are managed centrally by UW Madison, but governed by a team from across the UW System Libraries. CUWL has a philosophy of “One System, One Library”, which is not only reflected in the systems we use, but also in the collections.

All students, faculty, and staff from UW‐Green Bay may borrow materials from all four library locations, as well as from any other UW institution. In addition, UW‐Green Bay students, faculty, and staff have borrowing privileges at all of the other UW System Libraries as well. Table 2 outlines the loan periods by patron category.

Table 2

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **General collection** | **14‐day loan** | **7‐day loan** | **3‐day loan** |
| Current Fac/staff/grad | Semester | AV media, laptops, GoPros | Most equipment, reference, maps | Journals/periodicals |
| Undergrad | 28 days | AV media | Most equipment, reference, maps | Laptops |
| Community | 28 days | AV media | Reference | None |
| UW borrower | 28 days | AV media | Reference | None |

There is no limit to the number of items that students, faculty, or staff can check out at one time, with the exception of equipment that is limited to one of each type of item. For the general collection, two renewals are available to undergraduate students and three for faculty, staff, and graduate students. There is one renewal available for all patron groups on media, and no renewals on equipment, reference, or reserve materials.

If the Library does not have an item that a student, faculty, or staff need then we provide two options:

1) submit a UW System Request and 2) submit an interlibrary loan request. Through *Search@UW*, our shared library catalog, a patron can request an item from another UW System Library. Generally, the item will arrive in 2‐4 business days through a UW System‐wide delivery system. If an item is not owned by any of the UW System Libraries, then an interlibrary loan (ILL) request is made for us to obtain the item from another library outside of the UW System. ILL articles usually arrive in 1‐3 days and physical items in 5‐8 business days.

Faculty can request to pout items on reserve. Physical items owned by the library or personal copies owned by the instructor can be put on reserve for the semester. Electronic items are put into Canvas (LMS) for access by the students in that particular course.

For students that need accommodations we have an accessibility room in the Cofrin Library. This room is equipped with a workstation that has accessibility software for voice recognition, as well as screen readers.

The Library takes federal copyright seriously, and ensures that copyright statements on all photocopiers, scanners, and ILL articles requests that are fulfilled. The Library provides information about copyright and fair use through a guide on copyright and a fair use checklist. In addition, a guide on finding and using “copyright friendly” images, audio, and video is also available. Every semester faculty, staff, and students are sent an email reminding them about the copyright laws.

**Reference Services**

The Research Librarians assist students on individual research support through a variety of methods: drop‐in, via chat, email, and phone. The research desk is staffed 50 hours per week, this includes evening and weekend hours. Students are also able to schedule a research appointment with any of the research librarians. In particular, Social Work students are encouraged to reach out directly to Jodi Pierre who serves as a Library Liaison to Social Work. Our chat service is provided by our research librarians for normal business hours, and additional chat hours are supported by a third‐party service that is also staffed by professional librarians.

We are unable to identify the usage of reference services by just social work students, however, table 3 provides an idea of the ways in which requests come into us.

Table 3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Request** | **Fall 2019** | **Spring 2020** |
| In‐Person: drop‐in, consultation, phone | 267 | 91 |
| Virtual: chat, email, online meeting | 502 | 623 |

**Instruction Services**

The Library offers general library orientation and program related instruction. We encourage course integrated instruction when possible, because students tend to retain the information more when it is relevant to their course work. The Instruction Librarians work with instructors to tailor instruction to meet learning outcomes. These sessions are offered in‐person at the library or in the classroom, as well as virtual. Sessions can be single‐shot or multiple sessions that build upon each other; and, are offered to all academic programs. Over the last few years Librarians have conducted library instruction sessions for Program Evaluation 1 and 2 (SOC WORK 461‐462) when it is offered. Data for all library instruction sessions can be found in Table 4.

Table 4

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Semester** | **Instruction Sessions** | **Students Instructed** |
| Fall 2019 | 145 | 3451 |
| Spring 2020 | 45 | 1014 (COVID) |
| Fall 2020 | 53 | 1742 (COVID) |
| Spring 2021 | 18 | 778 (COVID) |

In addition, the Instruction Librarians develop a variety of guides to help students navigate information resources or the research process. These guides are a mix of general research guides and specific course guides. Usage of these guides and the online videos are available below in Table 5. In should be noted that at the time of writing this report the fall 2021 data was incomplete and only reflects 9/1/21 to 10/19/21.

Table 5

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Guide Title** | **Fall 2021 Usage\*** | **Spring 2021 Usage** | **Fall 2020 Usage** |
| Social Work 461/463 | 226 | 34 | 124 |
| Getting Started with Research (2 guides) | 261 | 541 | 522 |
| Identifying and Evaluating Information (9 guides) | 10,415 | 41,169 | 11,233 |
| Creating Citations & References (4 guides) | 1546 | 3951 | 3982 |
| YouTube Channel video views | 300 | 1084 | 1333 |

The Instruction Librarians offer embedded librarian services to any instructor who would like to have a librarian participate in their online course, in order to provide additional student support. As previously stated, for Social Work, Jodi Pierre serves this role. In addition, the Instruction Librarians develop online videos that provide information on how to use certain tools, or conduct certain parts of the research process. These videos are available on the Library’s YouTube channel at [https://www.youtube.com/user/CofrinLibrary](http://www.youtube.com/user/CofrinLibrary).

We have not done a formal assessment of library instruction since 2016. However, Instruction Librarians collect and analyze class artifacts (activity sheets, discussion posts, Qualtrics forms) to informally assess the effectiveness of individual sessions and adjust teaching as needed. We also rely on our strong relationships with faculty and instructors to ensure library instruction is in alignment with course learning objectives.

**Social Work Resources/Collection Development**

The Library strives to provide the best resources possible to support the academic programs at UW‐ Green Bay. It can be difficult to quantify the holdings for any single academic program, because of the use of resources can differ based on the topic and approach of the student or faculty. However, in an attempt to quantify the collection as it pertains to the support of the Social Work program, the Library holds 518 titles of books, Federal and State documents, and various media formats, with the Library of Congress (LC) subject headings of “social work”, “social welfare” or child welfare”. Using those same terms as a keyword, rather than a controlled subject heading, the search within the Library’s catalog produces 1046 titles. Given the interdisciplinary nature of social work, there would certainly be more items if broader searches were executed. The Library currently subscribes to 8 specific social work journals, and provides access to 27 other titles through JSTOR.

* *Affilia*
* *Children and Youth Services Review*
* *Crime and Delinquency*
* *Families in Society*
* *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work*
* *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*
* *Research on Social Work Practice*
* *Social Service Review*

Similar to books, there are also related journals in the areas of human development, psychology, sociology, and education that supplement the core social work journals. Many of the social work journals are accessible in full‐text via the various databases, which greatly expands the access our students have to the social work literature. The Library subscribes to the following social work centric databases:

* *Social Work Abstracts*
* *Social Services Abstracts*
* *Sociological Abstracts*
* *Social Science Citation Index*

In addition to the more social work specific databases, the Library also provides access to following databases, that while focused on other disciplines, are related enough to provide useful resources to the field of social work:

* *Academic Search Complete*
* *CINAHL*
* *Clinical Key*
* *Consumer Health Complete*
* *CQ Researcher*
* *Criminal Justice Collection*
* *GenderWatch*
* *Education Research Complete*
* *EthnicNewsWatch*
* *GenderWatch*
* *Global Issues in Context*
* *Health Source: Nursing/Academic Edition*
* *MEDLINE*
* *National Criminal Justice Abstracts*
* *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*
* *Project Muse*
* *PsycArticles*
* *PsycInfo*
* *PubMed*
* *Women’s Studies International*

Finally, the following online reference, data, and streaming video resources are available:

* + *The Encyclopedia of Social Work*
  + *Statista*
  + *Academic Video Online*
  + *Docuseek*
  + *Films on Demand*
  + *LGBT Studies in Video*
  + *Mental Measurements Yearbook with Tests in Print*
  + *Nursing and Mental Health in Video*
  + *PBS Video Collection*

The Library continues to face a tight budget, and needs to seriously evaluate each resource to ensure maximum value. The Collection Development staff closely monitor the growth and initiatives of academic programs and makes allocation shifts where possible. Table 6 shows that allocations for Social Work increased over 2% from 2017/18 to 2018/19, but decreased slightly in 2019/20.

TABLE 6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fiscal Year** | **Expended Amount** | **% of Budget** | **Journals** | **Books/Media** | **Databases** |
| **2017/18** | $31,515 | 5.5% | $7,870 | $1,527 | $22,119 |
| **2018/19** | $44,827 | 7.7% | $8,390 | $1,080 | $35,357 |
| **2019/20** | $38,987 | 6.5% | $9,035 | $1,198 | $28,754 |

The allocations referenced in table 6 include books, journals, databases, and media that are purchased specifically for Social Work. As already referenced above, in the section on databases, purchases for other disciplines can often enhance the resources for Social Work students and faculty as well.

The Library’s capital purchases are also supplemented by CUWL’s Shared Electronic Collection (SEC). The SEC is a collection of online resources that are jointly selected by the UW System Libraries and largely funded by the UW System. The SEC provides UW‐Green Bay with access to over $1.5 million in information resources. This shared collection provides a uniform base of resources for all students at all 13 UW institutions, and contains a large amount of full‐text content that expands the resources we are able to purchase as a single institution. With the philosophy of “One System, One Library”, we try to stretch our combined buying power as from as possible by sharing the print collection among all of the institutions. As a Wisconsin library, our faculty and students also benefit from the resources found in a state‐wide service called Badgerlink which is an electronic collection provided by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

We highly encourage the faculty to recommend items that they would like to have for our UWGB collection, and we seek input on the SEC collection when items are up for renewal. We notify faculty through our faculty newsletter, through our library liaisons to the academic programs, and there is a link on the Library’s website for anyone to recommend a purchase. Recommendations that we receive, are handled quickly, and the requesting faculty member is notified by email when the new item arrives.

It is important to us that our collection is used as much as possible, so we do our best to notify faculty, staff, and students about new books. We have a new bookshelf near the Public Services desk on the third floor of the Cofrin Library, as well as by the Popular Reading collection on the fourth floor. Two of the three additional library locations have new book displays as well. We also draw attention to new collections or books in our newsletters, through our website, and via social media.

Tracking library usage by a specific user type is difficult, so we are not able to provide usage for social work faculty or students only. However, using the data for the checkouts by LC Classification (HV = social welfare) and database usage reports, we are able to provide the data in Table 7.

Table 7

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Library Resource** | **Usage 2019‐2020** | **Comments** |
| Books in HV (Social Welfare)  call number range | 2018/19 = 163  2019/20 = 57 | 2.9% of total items checked out (18/19) 1.7% of total items checked out (19/20)  \*19/20 data impacted by COVID‐19 shutdown/limited access to collections |
| Social Work Abstracts | Searches 2019/20 = 5,036 Item Investigations = 841 | “Investigations” represent the number of times a content item was accessed (ex. view abstract) |
| Sociological Abstracts and Social Services Abstracts | Searches 2019/20 = 2,024 Item Investigations = 993 | “Investigations” represent the number of times a content item was accessed (ex. view abstract) |
| Social Work individual journal subscriptions (titles listed above) | Article downloads 2019/20 = 1,003 |  |

*Reported written by: Paula Ganyard Director of Libraries October 22, 2021*

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.4.5:The program describes and demonstrates sufficient office and classroom space and/or computer-mediated access to achieve its mission and goals. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes and demonstrates sufficient office and classroom space and/or computer-mediated access to achieve the program’s mission and goals for each program option. |

**Description & Sufficiency of Office Space:**

The Social Work Professional Program has offices in a suite in Rose Hall. In the Social Work office suite, each faculty member and the Administrative Assistant has their own offices; there is also a student lounge for all students to meet and socialize. The student worker space is located within the reception area. All faculty and support staff have laptop computers in their offices. Computers and computer programs are upgraded regularly and the laptops allow for ease of working from alternate locations.

The Program has also been granted an office for use at the UW-Steven’s Point-Wausau Campus. This allows faculty who teach courses on the Wausau campus to have a location to meet with students and have technology (e.g., laptops and monitors) readily available.

In order to provide flexibility for faculty who must participate remotely in any meeting, the program also has access to a conference room capable of streaming the meeting and collaboration with those attending remotely.

Office and meeting space is sufficient to meet the needs of the program and supports our mission.

**Description & Sufficiency of Classroom Space:**

Social Work courses are generally taught in Wood Hall but additional space can be accessed in other building on campus. As a result, there are a sufficient number of classrooms at any one time. In addition, a Social Work skills lab was created with one-way viewing and recording capabilities. Use of the skills lab is reserved for all classes which benefit from the configuration and students may access the space independently with their student identification cards when recording an interview is required for a class. Each classroom space has computer assisted technology and projection in order to access the faculty drives and internet.

The Social Work Program schedules its classes carefully to maximize the efficiency of classroom space and minimize need for student’s to be on campus for longer periods especially when also completing field placements. In addition, the use of virtual or online course modalities have eased classroom demand. (The Program carefully selects those courses eligible for those modalities based on the learning goals for the course). While there are challenges with classrooms at times, university personnel are responsive to instructor needs. When scheduling a larger event which requires classroom space, the space cannot be reserved until all class needs across campus have been met. The University is in the process of planning for an additional “Health Services” building which would house the College’s Health and Social Welfare programs, adding additional office and classroom space to facilitate growth. This building proposal must go through the State’s legislative process for approval and funding.

Every semester, several courses are taught at the UW-Stevens Point-Wausau campus. One to two classrooms are needed on Mondays. MSW Program Coordinator works with UWSP facilities staff to arrange the room space. This arrangement has only been since the 2021-2022 academic year but there have been no difficulties attaining space and the classrooms are well-equipped with technology.

At this time, classroom space is sufficient to meet the needs and mission and goals of the program

**Description & Sufficiency of Computer-Mediated Access:**

As noted earlier, all faculty have laptops assigned to them which allows them to access their work e-mail and drives personal and social work drives remotely using a dual-factor authorization process. All faculty and support staff have ready access to fax and copying services and to modern communication equipment (conference calling, distance education equipment, etc.). All students have computing accounts and on-campus email addresses, making it easy for faculty to contact them quickly, to share course materials and class requirements, and to require that students utilize the internet for assignments.

The University, as part of the UW System, provides Canvas as the learning management platform and Zoom for synchronous remote learning. A Canvas course shell is automatically generated for faculty use at the onset of each semester and access is granted to students enrolled within the course. Also within Canvas are the option of a range of learning applications which can enhance the educational experience such as Kaltura (a video capturing program), VoiceThread (allows brief videos for student participatory assignments), and Play Posit (which can be used for simulation activities or enhancing student engagement in course lectures when course is asynchronous). The University is continually assessing technological programs which can be used to enhance learning and the educational experience.

For students without a computer, the University has several computer labs for student use. In addition, computer towers and printers are located in many of the common areas. There is also a system of borrowing for computers and other technologies through the library system.

There is sufficient computer-mediated access to achieve the mission and goals for the program.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 3.4.6:The program describes, for each program option, the availability of and access to assistive technology, including materials in alternative formats. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative describes, for each program option, the availability of and access to assistive technology, including materials in alternative formats. |

**List of Assistive Technology Resources Available:**

A wide range of [assistive technology resources](https://www.uwgb.edu/student-accessibility-services/assistive-technology-resources/what-is-assistive-technology/) are available to students through the Student Accessibility Services. Descriptions of applications available are listed many of which are free of charge.

* Reading and E-Text support
* Writing Aids and Apps
* Notes, Studying and Organization
* Vision Aids and Apps
* Hearing Support Apps
* Speech Support
* Accessibility in Computers
* Creativity Apps, and
* Self-Care Apps.

**How Students Access Assistive Technology:**

Students in the Program have ready access to assistive technologies through Accessibility Services at UW-Green Bay. [Student Accessibility Services](https://www.uwgb.edu/student-accessibility-services/) provide a range of services to students with registered disabilities: assistance in obtaining access to adaptive materials or in creating these materials for students, assistance in enhancing access to information provided in the classroom, help with test-taking and other resources to enhance student outputs, and assistance in seeking materials and help from other resources outside the University. If students need Braille, large print, books on tape, or other assistive learning systems, Accessibility Services will make every reasonable effort to help the students obtain them.

Instructions on how to access Accessibility Services if a student believes accommodations are needed are included within each syllabus for courses within the major, which all include the following statement (see Social Work syllabi in Volume III of reaffirmation documents):

Consistent with the federal law and the policies of the University of Wisconsin, it is the policy of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay to provide appropriate and necessary accommodations to students with documented physical and learning disabilities. If you anticipate requiring any auxiliary aids or services, you should contact the instructor or Student Accessibility Services at 920-465-2841 ([sas@uwgb.edu](mailto:sas@uwgb.edu)) as soon as possible to discuss your needs and to arrange for the provision of services.

In addition, alternative testing and formats, notetaking accommodations and sign language interpreting are available through Student Accessibility Services. All videos uploaded by faculty to Canvas sites are automatically closed captioned and Canvas offers an course accessibility checker feature which faculty are advised to complete to ensure the course is universally accessible.

UW-Green Bay’s Student Accessibility Services website offers additional assistance to any student in navigating assistive technology.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

# Accreditation Standard 4.0 — Assessment

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 4.0.1:The program presents its plan for ongoing assessment of student outcomes for all identified competencies in the generalist level of practice (baccalaureate social work programs) and the generalist and specialized levels of practice (master’s social work programs). Assessment of competence is done by program designated faculty or field personnel. The plan includes:   * A description of the assessment procedures that detail when, where, and how each competency is assessed for each program option. * At least two measures assess each competency. One of the assessment measures is based on demonstration of the competency in real or simulated practice situations. * An explanation of how the assessment plan measures multiple dimensions of each competency, as described in EP 4.0. * Benchmarks for each competency, a rationale for each benchmark, and a description of how it is determined that students’ performance meets the benchmark. * An explanation of how the program determines the percentage of students achieving the benchmark. * Copies of all assessment measures used to assess all identified competencies. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: The program’s assessment plan was presented for generalist levels of practice (baccalaureate social work programs) and the generalist and specialized levels of practice (master’s social work programs) for each program option. |

**Assessment Plan Development**

This section will be used for the description of how assessment plan was created and utilized by University of Wisconsin-Green Bay (UWGB) MSW Program to measure students’ outcomes for all identified competencies in the generalist practice and specialized practice.

The MSW Program’s competency attainment assessment plan was developed and refined over the course of five years, beginning in the spring of 2016. Beginning in the spring of 2016, the Social Work Leadership Team, comprised of the Social Work Chair, and the BSW and MSW Program Coordinators, developed a timeline for the implementation of 2015 EPAS into the curriculum. At this time, the MSW Program Coordinator also started mapping possible adaptations from our 2008 EPAS curriculum and assessment plan onto courses.

At the start of fall of 2016, faculty were presented with an initial draft of a curriculum and assessment plan for consideration. A full faculty discussion of the proposal resulted in some modifications, and the plan was turned over to the MSW Curriculum Committee for deeper assessment and revision. The Committee met regularly throughout the entire academic year, consulting with relevant faculty as appropriate, to refine and adapt the plan based on an examination of the curriculum and course objectives. This included identifying potential embedded assessment assignments for each competency and dimension. Concurrently, the Field Committee worked to adapt the field evaluation form to reflect the 2015 EPAS. The full faculty approved both the curriculum and assessment plan and the revised field evaluation for implementation during the 2017-2018 academic year. This plan included the use of three distinct outcome measures: embedded assessment assignments (EAA), final field evaluations (FFE), and end-of-semester course evaluations (CO).

Over the course of the next three years, data was collected and annually examined and discussed, resulting in numerous changes to the assessment plan. This process was collaborative and involved deep conversations about our curriculum. This plan was approved by the faculty for implementation in 2020-2021 and resulted in the current assessment of this reaffirmation self-study. The students are measured on the nine 2015 EPAS at the generalist practice level, and at specialized practice level tailored to their field experiences in their individual emphases and special interests (e.g., child welfare, mental health, criminal justice, gerontology, schools, etc.).

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Assessment of competence was done by program designated faculty or field personnel for all program options. |

**Assessment Plan Overview**

MSW Program uses multiple measures to evaluate its success in helping students master the competencies. Each measure is discussed in more detail below:

1. Embedded Assignment Assessments
2. Final Field Evaluation of Student Practice Competency
3. End-of-Semester Course Evaluations (Course Objectives)

Two of the measures are assessed in the classroom and one in the field practicum. Assessment in the field was conducted by the field instructors and field liaison (seminar instructors) and the assessment in the classroom of competencies was done by the faculty teaching the required courses in which competencies were measured using embedded assignments/rubrics. The third measure was by students via Part A of end-of-semester course evaluations which asks them to rate how well the course achieved each objective.

Outcome data are collected throughout the year and compiled in June and July of each year. Faculty review and interpret the data during the annual August faculty retreat. Plans for making changes based on the findings and recommendations, specifically regarding courses, are developed at that time. Outcome findings are then presented to stakeholder groups, including the BSW Program Advisory Committee and current students in the fall. Feedback is solicited at each stage and all recommendations are brought back to the faculty for further discussion and planning. It is the responsibility of the Chair and designated faculty and staff to follow-through with recommendations for change.

**Assessment of Competence for Measure #1 Done By:**

Assessment #1 is a measure of each competency across all dimensions through embedded assessment assignments. The MSW Curriculum Committee had identified assignments which best represented the competency mastery for both the generalized and specialist year of the program. The two curriculum matrices which follow include the complete Embedded Assessment Assignment (EAA) measurement plan.

**Assessment of Competence for Measure #2 Done By:**

Assessment #2 is the mastery of competencies grade for each of the competencies as compiled through the field evaluation of student performance.

**Assessment of Competence for Measure #3 Done By:**

Students complete an end of semester evaluation for each course within the program. Assessment measure #3 is the scores from the course objectives section of the end-of-semester evaluations.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Program provides a description of the assessment procedures that detail when, where, and how each competency is assessed for each program option, including any competencies added by the program. |

The same evaluation practices are used consistently in the Social Work Programs, BSW, MSW Generalized Year, and MSW Specialist Year. This section describes the multiple measures, when students are assessed on the mastery of the competencies, where assessed on each of the nine competencies and how each competency was assessed. The two tables below are broken into generalist practice (Table 4.2) and specialized practice (Table 4.3).

**Measure 1: the Embedded Assignment Assessment (EAA)**. Assignments that have been developed by faculty based on a rubric of a particular course and demonstrate mastery of a specified dimension of a competency. They may be administered in the fall or spring for students in the generalist practice and summer, fall and spring for those in the specialized year. Given the cohort model of our program students must take certain courses and be assessed before they proceed to the next sequence in the program. For example, a student in generalist practice must first take *SOC WORK 702: Generalist Practice I* which is offered in the Fall and be assessed before they can take *SOC WORK:704 Generalist Practice II* offered in the Spring of the same academic year.

**Final Field Evaluations** (see Mastery of Competencies EAA-[Generalist](#Gen_Progress_toward_Competencies) and [Specialized](#Spec_Progress_toward_Competencies)). As our students progress through the Program in a cohort model, the senior field evaluation is administered twice during the students’ two-semester field experience in both the generalist and specialized years, once at the end of the Fall semester and the final field evaluation completed at the end of the Spring semester. In the final field evaluation, students are assessed on their mastery of each competency using a scale from 0-10. This scale replicates our grading scheme in the major whereby an “A” begins at 94% and a “B,” which would be meeting our grade expectations, begins at 83%. Students must achieve an 83% or higher for each competency (e.g., an 8.3 in each competency) to pass Field. As such, the outcome measure benchmark for the final field evaluation is that students must earn 83% on each item in the evaluation. Identical to the outcome measure benchmark for EAAs, 83% was selected as it is the lowest threshold for a grade of “B” in the BSW Program, and therefore parallels our academic retention standards for GPA requirements for graduate coursework.

Both generalist practice and specialized practice students are assessed by faculty assigned to the field/seminar courses. With EAA assessment at the end of spring semester.

End of semester Course Evaluations of Course Objectives (CO) are assessed in every competency for each of the nine 2015 EPAS in the particular course students were enrolled in at the end of the semester. As an example, a generalist practice student who takes SOC WORK 707: HBSE in the spring will assess course objectives of that course.

**End-of-Semester Course Evaluations** ([Course Evaluation Template](#Course_Evaluation_Template))**.** As related to the assessment plan, course objectives reflect the competencies and domains the course is assigned to teach and embedded assessment assignments (along with other assignments) student outcomes for those competencies and domains. Consequently, the assessment plan requires aligning competencies and domains with course objectives and embedded assessment assignments. As discussed above in “[Assessment Plan Development](#Assessment_Plan_Development),” the MSW Curriculum Committee provides initial approval for all course objectives as they relate to embedded assessments, and the full faculty provides final approval. In the interest of transparency, all syllabi contain a table showing the relationship between the competencies and domains, course objectives, and embedded assessment assignments intended to capture student mastery.

The table below provides an example drawn from *SW 707: Human Behavior and the Social Environment.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4.1 Assessment Plan Table for SOC WORK 707** | | | |
| As part of the evaluation plan for the social work curriculum, this course has been designated to measure the following competencies through an embedded assessment assignment. See Section D for information on all course assignments. | | | |
| **Competency** | **Dimension** | **Course Objective** | **Assignment** |
| #2 | Knowledge  Values | #1  #4 | Movie Analysis  Developmental Environmental Influences Paper |

**Generalist Assessment Plan**

The Table 4.2 which follows summarizes the generalist year assessment plan measures.

**Specialized Assessment Plan**

The Table 4.3 below summarizes the specialized year assessment plan measures.

**Table 4.2: Generalist Practice: Assessment Measures**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identified Measures** | **Competencies Assessed** | **When** | **Where Assessed** | **How Assessed** |
| **Measure 1: Embedded Assessment Assignment (EAA**) | Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and professional behavior | Fall | 700 Gateway to the Profession | Values Assumption  Paper |
| Spring | 701: Contemporary Social Work Ethics | Final Ethics paper |
| Fall | 711: Foundations of Social Welfare | Discussion 1 |
| Competency 2: Engage in diversity and difference Practice | Spring | 707: HBSE | Movie analysis |
| Fall | 702: Generalist Practice I | Developmental environmental influence paper  & Applied learning cultural |
| 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice | Spring | 701: Contemporary Social Work Ethics | Social justice project |
| Fall | 711: Foundations of Social Welfare | Value quiz and reflection  & Policy Analysis Paper |
| Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice | Fall | 700 Gateway to the Profession | Group statute presentation &  Value assumption Paper |
| Fall | 702: Generalist Practice I | Applies Learning EBP |
| Fall | 711: Foundations of Social Welfare | Policy analysis Paper |
| Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice | Fall | 711: Foundations of Social Welfare | Policy analysis Paper  &  Exam |
| Competency 6: Engage in individuals, Families, Groups, organizations, Communities | Fall | 702: Generalist Practice I | Case Study I & Role Play |
| Fall | 700 Gateway to the Profession | Multicultural Practice Paper |
| Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | Fall | 702: Generalist Practice I | Case Study I & Role Play |
| Fall | 700 Gateway to the Profession | Multicultural Practice Paper |
| Spring | 704: Generalist Practice II | Community Assessment paper |
| Fall | 700 Gateway to the Profession | Multicultural Practice Paper |
| Competency 8: intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | Fall | 702: Generalist Practice I | Case Study III & Role Play |
| Spring | 704: Generalist Practice II | Community Assessment |
| Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | Spring | 704: Generalist Practice II | Community Assessment |
| **Measure 2: End of Semester Field Evaluation** | Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and professional behavior | End of Spring semester in field practicum | 714 Field II | Competency mastery Grade |
| Competency 2: Engage in diversity and difference Practice |
| 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice |
| Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice |
| Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice |
| Competency 6: Engage in individuals, Families, Groups, organizations, Communities |
| Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities |
| Competency 8: intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities |
| Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities |
| **Measure 3: Course Objectives** | Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and professional behavior | Fall | 700 Gateway to the Profession | CO 3 Analyze the impact of personal values on professional behavior and attitudes |
| Spring | 701: Contemporary Social Work Ethics | CO 3 Demonstrate self-awareness to evaluate the influence of personal values on decision-making and assure continual personal development and ethical decisions in practice.  CO 5 Apply models of ethical decision making in social work practice situations |
| Fall | 711: Foundation Social Welfare | CO 1 Identify how social work evolved as a profession and its leadership role in providing for human needs and influencing larger system change. |
| Competency 2: Engage in diversity and difference Practice | Spring | 707 HBSE | CO 1 Apply knowledge to critique theoretical assumptions about human behavior in a range of systems (families, groups, organizations, societal institutions, and communities  CO 4 Apply the ecological, systems and bio-psycho-social development frameworks across systems levels |
| Fall | 702 Gen Practice 1 | CO 3 Demonstrate sensitivity to identity statuses as significant variables in social work practice. |
| Competency 3. Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice | Spring | 701: Contemporary Social Work Ethics | CO 4 Analyze societal and organizational structures and institutional practices using standards identified within the NASW *Code of Ethics* with a focus on social and economic justice and the impact of privilege, oppression, and discrimination for vulnerable populations in practice |
| Fall | Foundations of social Welfare | CO 2 Articulate the ideological and cultural bases of politics and social welfare policies in the United States.  CO 3 Articulate the process of public policy formation in United States  CO 4 Assess the impact of social policy on diverse populations including but not limited to children and families applying knowledge of patterns, dynamics and consequences of discrimination, economic deprivation, and oppression. |
| Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice | Fall | 711: Foundations of Social Welfare | CO 5 Analyze social policy using a framework that considers the content of historical and contemporary factors that shape policy and applies the principles of social and economic justice. |
|  | Fall | 700 Gateway to the Profession | CO 1 Understand the guideposts for social work education and practice, including competencies, laws, social policy, values, principles, ethics, and conduct. |
| Fall | 702: Generalist Practice I | CO 4 Understands theories of human behavior and uses a person-in-environment perspective in promoting the health and well-being of diverse populations. |
|  | Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice | Fall | 711 Foundations of Social  welfare | CO 2 Articulate the ideological and cultural bases of politics and social welfare policies in the United States  CO 3 Articulate the process of public policy formation in United States  CO 5 Analyze social policy using a framework that considers the content of historical and contemporary factors that shape policy and applies the principles of social and economic justice |
| Competency 6: Engage in individuals, Families, Groups, organizations, Communities | Fall | 702: Generalist Practice I | CO 1 Demonstrate practitioner self-awareness and ‘professional use of self’ as an essential aspect in building helping relationships.  CO 5 Integrate theoretical concepts and practice methods in applying the change process |
| Fall | 700 Gateway to the Profession | CO 3 Analyze the impact of personal values on professional behavior and attitudes |
| Spring | 704: Generalist Practice II | CO 1 Apply the change process within macro-level practice |
| Competency 7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organization, Communities | Fall | 700 Gateway to the Profession | CO 3 Analyze the impact of personal values on professional behavior and attitudes |
| Fall | 702: Generalist Practice | CO 5 Integrate theoretical concepts and practice methods in applying the change process |
| Spring | 704: Generalist Practice II | CO 1 Apply the change process within macro-level practice |
| Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | Fall | 700 Gateway to the Profession | CO 3 Analyze the impact of personal values on professional behavior and attitudes |
| Fall | 702: Generalist Practice | CO5 Integrate theoretical concepts and practice methods in applying the change process |
| Spring | 704: Generalist Practice II | CO 1 Apply the change process within macro-level practice |
| Competency 9: Evaluate practice with individuals, Families, Groups, organizations communities | Fall | 700 Gateway to the Profession | CO 3 Analyze the impact of personal values on professional behavior and attitudes |
|  | Fall | 702: Generalist Practice | CO 5 Integrate theoretical concepts and practice methods in applying the change process |
|  | Spring | 704: Generalist Practice II | CO 1 Apply the change process within macro-level practice |

**Table 4.3: Specialized Practice: Assessment Measures**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identified Measures** | **Competencies Assessed** | **When** | **Where Assessed** | **How Assessed** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Measure 1: Embedded Assessment**  **Assignment (EAA)** | Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and professional behavior | Summer | 728 Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice | Policy practice Project |
| Fall | 717 Seminar III | Case study |
| Spring | 719 Seminar IV | Poster |
| Competency 2: Engage in diversity and difference Practice | Fall | 720 Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy | Diversity In-Service, Critical Reaction Journal & Resources Visit paper |
| Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice | Fall | 720 Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy | Diversity In-Service |
| Spring | 719 Seminar IV | Poster |
| Summer | 728 Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice | Policy Project |
| Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice | Spring | 731 Research for MSW Practice | Research Critique  & Research proposal |
| Spring | Seminar IV | Poster |
| Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice | Summer | 728 Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice | Policy practice Project & Canvas Discussion Facilitation |
| Competency 6: Engage in individuals, Families, Groups, organizations, Communities | Fall | 721 Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems | Student Choice Topic, Role play and Journal |
| Fall | 717 Seminar III | Case Study |
| Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | Fall | 721 Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems | Student Choice Topic, Role play and Journal |
| Fall | 717 Seminar III | Case Study |
| Competency 8: intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | Fall | 721 Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems | Student Choice Topic, Role play and Journal |
| Fall | 717 Seminar III | Case Study |
| Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | Fall | 721 Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems | Student Choice Topic, Role play and Journal |
| Fall | 717 Seminar III | Case Study |
| **Measure 2: End of Semester Field Evaluation** | Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and professional behavior | End of Spring semester in field practicum | 718 Field IV | Competency mastery Grade |
| Competency 2: Engage in diversity and difference Practice |
| 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice |
| Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice |
| Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice |
| Competency 6: Engage in individuals, Families, Groups, organizations, Communities |
| Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities |
| Competency 8: intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities |
| Competency 9: Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities |
| **Measure 3: Course Objectives** | Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and professional behavior | Summer | 728 Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice | CO 2 Assume a leadership/advocacy role which influences either (a) a social problem, (b) a policy change, or (c) a program or an organizational change  CO 5 Articulate underlying theoretical assumptions of policies in practice within organizations and communities which impact vulnerable and oppressed populations groups |
| Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and professional behavior | Fall | 717 Seminar III | CO 5 Become effective educators both in the classroom and the agency |
| Spring | 719 Seminar IV | CO 5 Become effective educators in the classroom and the agency |
| Competency 2: Engage in diversity and difference Practice | Fall | 720 Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy | CO 2 Recognize and challenge dynamics of oppression and their impacts on oppressed individuals, families, and neighborhoods and on communities and societies whose actions (or inactions) create oppressive conditions  CO 3 Understand the components of effective service delivery for diverse groups. |
| Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic and Environment | Fall | 720 Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy | CO 2 Recognize and challenge dynamics of oppression and their impacts on oppressed individuals, families, and neighborhoods and on communities and societies whose actions (or inactions) create oppressive conditions |
| Spring | 719: Capstone Seminar | CO 3 Address emergent issues in social work practice and social work education |
| Summer | 728: Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice | CO 2 Assume a leadership/advocacy role which influences either (a) a social problem, (b) a policy change, or (c) a program or an organizational change. |
| Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice | Spring | 731: Research for MSW Practice | CO 1 Demonstrate ability to evaluate social work research and related social sciences research to inform practice and contribute to the improvement of agency service delivery processes  CO 2 Demonstrate ability to conceptualize and design social service research that supports evidence-based practice. |
| Spring | 719: Capstone Seminar | CO 7 Integrate research findings and program evaluation studies into their field practicum |
| Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice | Summer | 728: Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice | CO 1 Critically analyze social welfare policy from a social justice framework within identified area of emphasis  CO 2 Assume a leadership/advocacy role which influences either (a) a social problem, (b) a policy change, or (c) a program or an organizational change.  CO 5 Articulate underlying theoretical assumptions of policies in practice within organizations and communities which impact vulnerable and oppressed populations groups. |
| Competency 6: Engage in individuals, Families, Groups, organizations, Communities | Fall | 721: Multi-Level Family Systems | CO 3 Students will seek out and apply practice approaches and interventions that are informed by research  CO 4 Students will use a variety of theoretical frameworks to understand family development and family interactions across the life course |
| Fall | 717 Seminar III | CO 4 Learn from social work peers and agency supervisors. |
| Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | Fall | 721: Multi-Level Family Systems | CO 3 Students will seek out and apply practice approaches and interventions that are informed by research  CO 4 Students will use a variety of theoretical frameworks to understand family development and family interactions across the life course |
| Fall | 717 Seminar III | CO 4 Learn from social work peers and agency supervisors |
| Competency 8: *Intervene* with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities | Fall | 721: Multi-Level Family Systems | CO 3 Students will seek out and apply practice approaches and interventions that are informed by research  CO4 Students will use a variety of theoretical frameworks to understand family development and family interactions across the life course |
| Fall | 717 Seminar III | CO 4 Learn from social work peers and agency supervisors |
| Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | Fall | 721: Multi-Level Family Systems | CO 3 Students will seek out and apply practice approaches and interventions that are informed by research  CO4 Students will use a variety of theoretical frameworks to understand family development and family interactions across the life course |
| Fall | 717 Seminar III | CO 4 Learn from social work peers and agency supervisors |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Program provides at least two measures to assess each competency, including any competencies added by the program, for all program options. |

Table 4.4 provides a snapshot of the multiple measures used to evaluate students’ mastery of the competencies and their acquisition of the requisite knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive/affective. Measures include **Embedded Assessment Assignment** **(EAA), Final Field Evaluations (FFE)** and **End-of- Semester Course Evaluations (CO).** Two measures are used to measure each dimension (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive/affective) across the nine 2015 EPAS competencies. As described above, Table 4.2 and 4.3 show when students are measured on competencies and where in the students’ progression throughout the program they are measured on each competency. The tables show how competencies are measured in stimulated assignments in the field practicum and course embedded assignments and students’ self-rated course objectives.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4.4: Outcome Measures Map** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Knowledge** | | **Values** | | **Skills** | | **Cognitive/ Affective** | |
| **Competencies** | **EAA** | **CO** | **EAA** | **CO** | **EAA** | **CO** | **FFE** | **CO** |
| Competency 1 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Competency 2 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Competency 3 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Competency 4 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Competency 5 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Competency 6 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Competency 7 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Competency 8 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Competency 9 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: At least one of the assessment measures is based on demonstration of the competency in real or simulated practice situations for all program options. |

As noted above, the final field evaluation (FFE) in the spring provides an assessment measure based on demonstration of each competency in real practice situations during field practicum in the field agency at both the generalist and specialized levels.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative explains how the assessment plan measures multiple dimensions of each competency, as described in EP4.0 (involving both performance and the knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes) for all program options. |

As noted in narrative for Standard 4.0.1(3) and 4.0.1 (4) above, the program uses multiple measures across dimensions to assess student competency.

**Generalist Practice Assessment Plan**

Table 4.5 presents the program’s [Assessment Plan for Generalist Practice](#Table_4_5). See column 1 (“Dimension”)

**Specialized Practice Assessment Plan**

Table 4.6 presents the program’s [Assessment Plan for Specialized Practice](#Table_4_6). See column 1 (“Dimension”)

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative includes benchmarks for each competency for all program options. |

Outcome measure level benchmarks are identified on Tables 4.5 and 4.6. See column 3 (“Competency Benchmark”) within both the Generalist Practice and Specialist Practice Assessment Plans.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative includes a rationale for each benchmark across all program options. |

The MSW Program set the overall Competency Benchmark at 90%. This is an increase from our previous self-study where our Competency Benchmark was 83%. Eighty-three percent was chosen for our 2008 EPAS self-study as it parallels our “B” grade in the major. However, as we were meeting the Competency Benchmark for all the competencies using that indicator, we decided to push ourselves to do better and raised the benchmark to 90% as an aspirational goal.

As noted above, the MSW Program uses three types of outcome measures for each competency. Each type of measure has its own outcome benchmark and rationale. These are described below.

**Embedded Assessment Assignments (EAA).** Per our [academic retention standards](UWGB%20MSW%20Handbook%20VOL%20III.docx#Academic_Non_Retention) outlined in the *MSW Student Handbook* (located in Volume III of reaffirmation documents.), students must earn a cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 (the equivalent of a letter grade of B) across their upper level required social work courses. ***As such, the outcome measure benchmark for embedded assessment assignments is a minimum score of 83%.*** Eighty-three percent was selected as it is the lowest threshold for a grade of “B” in the MSW Program, and therefore parallels our academic retention standards for GPA requirements in upper-level required social work courses.

**End-of-Semester Course Evaluations.** In end-of-semester course evaluations, students rate how well each course achieved its objectives using a scale from 1 (“not at all” to 4 (“very much”). The template used for end-of-semester course evaluations can be found in this section under the “Compliance Statement 11” heading (see section A: [Outcomes](#Course_Evaluation_Template)). Evaluations are averaged across students for each competency dimension, resulting in a summary score that is used as an outcome measure for each of the competencies. ***The outcome measure benchmark for end-of-semester course evaluations is a mean of 3.0 across courses within a competency.*** A mean of 3.0 was selected as it indicates agreement.

**Final Field Evaluations** (see Mastery of Competencies EAA- [Generalist](#Gen_Progress_toward_Competencies) and [Specialized](#Spec_Progress_toward_Competencies))**.** As our students progress through the Program in a cohort model, the senior field evaluation is administered twice during the students’ two-semester senior field experience, once at the end of the Fall semester and the **final field evaluation** completed at the end of the Spring semester. In the final field evaluation, students are assessed on their mastery of each competency using a scale from 0-10. This scale replicates our grading scheme in the major whereby an “A” begins at 94% and a “B,” which would be meeting our grade expectations, begins at 83%. Students must achieve an 83% or higher for each competency (e.g. an 8.3 in each competency) in order to pass Field. ***As such, the outcome measure benchmark for the final field evaluation is that students must earn 83% on each item in the evaluation.*** Identical to the outcome measure benchmark for EAAs, 83% was selected as it is the lowest threshold for a grade of “B” in the BSW Program, and therefore parallels our academic retention standards for GPA requirements in upper -level required social work courses.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative includes a description of how it is determined that students’ performance meets the benchmark for all program options. [summarized in column 7 of sample assessment plan table] |

See column 2 heading (“Outcome Measures (Outcome Measure Benchmark)”) of [Table 4.5: Generalist Assessment Plan](#Table_4_5) and [Table 4.6: Specialized Assessment Plan](#Table_4_6) below.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative provides an explanation of how the program determines the percentage of students achieving each benchmark for all program options. [summarized in column 8 of sample assessment plan table] |

As noted in 4.0.1(8) above, the holistic competency score is calculated by taking the average of percentage of students who score 83% in EAA and FFE or better, and of the students who rated CO at 3.0 or better were explained in Tables [4.5](#Table_4_5) and [4.6](#Table_4_6) broken into generalist and specialized levels of practice.

**Table 4.5: Assessment Plan for Generalist Practice**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures**(Outcome Measure Benchmark) | | | | **Competency Benchmark** | **Assessment Procedures: Competency** | |
| Course # and Title (Semester Measured) | | **EAA=** | | Embedded Assessment Assignment (83%+ on rubric items noted with "\*") | |  |  | |
| **CO=** | | Course Objective Rating on End-of-Semester Evaluation (3.0+ of 4.0) | |  |  | |
| **FFE=** | | Final Field Evaluation (83%+) | |  |  | |
| **Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior** | | | | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | | | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 701 | 700 Gateway to the Profession (Fall) | EAA | Final Ethics Paper | |
| CO | 3 | |
| 711 | Foundation of Social Welfare (Fall) | EA | Discussion 1 | |
| CO | 1 | |
| **Values** | | | | |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession of Social Work (Fall) | EAA | Values and Assumption Paper | |
| CO | 3 | |
| **Skills** | | | | |
| 701 | Contemporary Social Work Ethics (Spring) | EAA | Final Ethics Paper | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | |
| 714 | Field II  (Spring) | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice** | | | | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | | | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 707 | Human Behavior & the Social Environment (Spring) | EAA | Movie Analysis | |
| CO | 1 | |
| **Values** | | | | |
| 707 | Human Behavior & the Social Environment (Spring) | EAA | Developmental Environmental Influences Paper | |
| CO | 4 | |
| **Skills** | | | | |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I (Fall) | EAA | Applied Learning Cultural | |
| CO | 3 | |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | |
| 714 | Field II | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice** | | | | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | | | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 701 | Contemporary Social Work Ethics (Spring) | EAA | Social Justice Project | |
| CO | 4 | |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare (Fall) | EAA | Policy Analysis Paper or Video | |
| CO | 3 | |
| **Values** | | | | |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare (Fall) | EAA | Values Quiz and Reflection | |
| CO | 2 | |
| **Skills** | | | | |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare (Fall) | EAA | Policy Analysis Paper | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | |
| 714 | Field II | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice** | | | | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | | | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession (Fall) | EAA | Group Statute Presentation | |
| CO | 1 | |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare (Fall) | EA | Policy Analysis Paper | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Values** | | | | |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession (Fall) | EAA | Values and Assumption Paper | |
| CO | 1 | |
| **Skills** | | | | |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I (Fall) | EAA | Applied Learning EBP | |
| CO | 4 | |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | |
| 714 | Field II | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade | |
| CO |  | |
| **Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice** | | | | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | | | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare (Fall) | EAA | Policy Analysis Paper | |
| CO | 3 | |
| **Values** | | | | |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare (Fall | EAA | Exam | |
| CO | 2 | |
| **Skills** | | | | |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare (Fall | EAA | Policy Analysis Paper | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | |
| 714 |  | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | | | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I (Fall) | EAA | Case study 1 | |
| CO | 5 | |
| 704 | Generalist Practice II (Spring) | EAA | Community Assessment | |
| CO | 1 | |
| **Values** | | | | |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession (Fall) | EAA | Multicultural Practice paper | |
| CO | 3 | |
| **Skills** | | | | |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I (Fall) | EAA | Final Role Play | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | |
| 714 | Field II | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | | | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I (Fall) | EAA | Case Study II | |
| CO | 5 | |
| 704 | Generalist Practice II (Spring) | EAA | Community Assessment | |
| CO | 1 | |
| **Values** | | | | |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession (Fall) | EAA | Multicultural Practice Paper | |
| CO | 3 | |
| **Skills** | | | | |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I (Fall) | EAA | Final Role Play | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | |
| 714 | Field II | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | | | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I (Fall) | EAA | Case Study III | |
| CO | 5 | |
| 704 | Generalist Practice II (Spring) | EAA | Community Assessment | |
| CO | 1 | |
| **Values** | | | | |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession (Fall) | EAA | Multicultural Practice Paper | |
| CO | 3 | |
| **Skills** | | | | |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I (Fall) | EAA | Final Role Play | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | |
| 403 | Field II | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | | | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I (Fall) | EAA | Case Study IV | |
| CO | 5 | |
| 704 | Generalist Practice II (Spring) | EAA | Community Assessment | |
| CO | 1 | |
| **Values** | | | | |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession (Fall) | EAA | Multicultural Practice Paper | |
| CO | 3 | |
| **Skills** | | | | |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I (Fall) | EAA | Final Role Paly | |
| CO | 5 | |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | |
| 714 | Field II | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade | |
| CO | 5 | |

**Table 4.6: Assessment Plan for Specialized Practice**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures**(Outcome Measure Benchmark) | | **Competency Benchmark** | **Assessment Procedures: Competency** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | **EAA=** | Embedded Assessment Assignment (83%+ on rubric items noted with "\*") |  |  |
| **CO=** | Course Objective Rating on End-of-Semester Evaluation (3.0+ of 4.0) |  |  |
| **FFE=** | Final Field Evaluation (83%+) |  |  |
| **Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 728 | Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice (Summer) | EAA | Policy Practice Project |
| CO | 4 |
| **Values** | | | |
| 717 | Seminar III (Fall) | EAA | Case Study |
| CO | 5 |
| **Skills** | | | |
| 719 | Capstone Seminar IV (Spring) | EAA | Poster |
| CO | 5 |
| 728 | Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice (Summer) | EAA | Policy Practice Project |
| CO | 2 |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | |
| 718 | Field Practicum IV (Spring) | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade |
| CO | 6 |
| **Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 720 | 720 Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy (Fall) | EAA | Diversity In-service |
| CO | 2 |
| **Values** | | | |
| 720 | Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy (Fall) | EAA | Critical Reaction Journals |
| CO | 2 |
| **Skills** | | | |
| 720 | Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy (Fall) | EAA | Resource Visit Paper |
| CO | 3 |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | |
| 718 | Field Practicum IV | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade |
| CO | 6 |
| **Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 720 | Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy (Fall) | EAA | Diversity In-service |
| CO | 2 |
| **Values** | | | |
| 719 | Seminar IV (Spring) | EAA | Poster |
| CO | 3 |
| **Skills** | | | |
| 728 | Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice (Summer) | EAA | Policy Practice Project |
| CO | 2 |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | |
| 718 | Field IV | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade |
| CO | 6 |
| **Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 731 | Research for MSW Practice (Spring) | EAA | Research Critique |
| CO | 1 |
| **Values** | | | |
| 719 | Seminar IV (Spring) | EAA | Poster |
| CO | 7 |
| **Skills** | | | |
| 731 | Research for MSW Practice (Spring) | EAA | Research proposal |
| CO | 7 |
| 719 | Capstone Seminar IV (Spring) | EAA | Poster |
| CO | 2 |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | |
| 718 | Field IV | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade |
| CO | 6 |
| **Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 728 | Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice (Summer | EAA | Policy Project |
| CO | 5 |
| **Values** | | | |
| 728 | Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice (Summer) | EAA | Online Facilitation & Discussion |
| CO | 1 |
| **Skills** | | | |
| 728 | Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice (Summer) | EAA | Policy Project |
| CO | 2 |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | |
| 718 | Field IV | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade |
| CO | 6 |
| **Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 721 | Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems (Fall) | EAA | Student Choice Topic |
| CO | 4 |
| **Values** | | | |
| 717 | Seminar III | EAA | Case Study |
| CO | 4 |
| **Skills** | | | |
| 721 | Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems (Fall) | EAA | Role play and Journal |
| CO |  |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | |
| 718 | Field IV | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade |
| CO | 6 |
| **Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 721 | Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems (Fall) | EAA | Student Choice Topic |
| CO | 4 |
| **Values** | | | |
| 717 | Seminar III (Fall) | EAA | Case Study |
| CO | 4 |
| **Skills** | | | |
| 721 | Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems (Fall) | EAA | Role Play and Journal |
| CO | 3 |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | |
| 718 | Field IV | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade |
| CO | 6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 721 | Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems (Fall) | EAA | Student Choice Topic |
| CO | 4 |
| **Values** | | | |
| 717 | Seminar III (Fall) | EAA | Case Study |
| CO | 4 |
| **Skills** | | | |
| 721 | Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems (Fall) | EAA | Role Play and Journal |
| CO | 3 |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | |
| 718 | Field IV | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade |
| CO | 6 |
| **Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | 90% of students will demonstrate competence across all measures. | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score or higher).    Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence across all measures.    Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| 721 | Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems (Fall) | EAA | Student Choice Topic |
| CO | 4 |
| **Values** | | | |
| 717 | Seminar III | EAA | Case Study |
| CO | 4 |
| **Skills** | | | |
| 721 | Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems (Fall) | EAA | Role Play and Journal |
| CO | 3 |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | |
| 718 | Field IV | FFE | Competency Mastery Grade |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Program provides copies of all assessment measures used to assess all identified competencies. |

**Generalist**

The Generalist assignments are labeled, in order, by competency and dimension using the following system:

Competency number, initial of dimension, course number, assignment title (e.g., *C1V 700 Multicultural Paper*)

If an assignment is used more than once, it is repeated and re-labeled for each competency it measures.

Assignments that cover the entire change process are labeled as such, C6-9, rather than repeated each time.  Similarly, cognitive affective processes are measured in field and are labeled C1-9.

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C1-C9 CAP Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 712 & SW 714** **Progress Toward Competencies**  **(Complete assignment comprises the EAA score)** |

**University of Wisconsin – Green Bay**

**Social Work Professional Programs**

**SOC WORK 712 & 714: Generalist Field I & II**

**Progress toward Competencies Assignment**

**PURPOSE:** Field is the signature pedagogy of social work and is a required component for all social work students graduating from accredited social work programs. During the 2020-21 school year, at UW-Green Bay, students complete a minimum of 392 hours over the course of two semesters, in a social service setting related to their area of interest.

The field Practicum provides integrative experiences merging the application of knowledge, values, and skills with the goal of preparing students for social work professional practice. Students achieve this goal by demonstrating the integration and application of all nine CSWE competencies in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner to promote human and community well-being.

The field Practicum measures the students’ cognitive and affective processes which include critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment regarding unique practice situations.

The process of completing the field Practicum helps students achieve these primary objectives:

1. Apply knowledge and skills learned throughout the curriculum to daily experiences as advanced practice social workers in the field.
2. Examine implications of practice experiences for serving clients from diverse cultures, social classes, and communities.

**TASK:** The following information describes the goals and requirements of the field Practicum. These tasks are designed to be as individualized as possible in order to accommodate diverse learning needs, varying agency opportunities, and unique areas of social work practice.

These tasks build upon one another to guide the students’ learning experiences while in the agency field Practicum, and provide feedback/information of their advancing skills, knowledge, and professional development.

**1. Learning Contract**

Using the template provided on Canvas, students develop a learning contract at the beginning of the field Practicum. The learning contract consists of specific activities that will be performed during the field Practicum to address each of the competencies. These activities, along with the student’s plan to meet the minimum 196 hours per semester, are documented on the learning contract. While the learning contract is intended to be followed as written, the identified activities represent one means of meeting the competencies. Students may choose, or need, to alter the learning contract activities over the course of the semester in order to make progress toward mastery of the competencies. Developing and altering the learning contract is done in consultation with the agency field instructor (FI) and faculty field liaison (FFL) to ensure activities are feasible and directly related to the competencies. This consultation begins early in the fall semester with a meeting between the student, FI, and FFL. Examples of a learning contract will be discussed in Seminar. Students develop a new contract in the beginning of the spring semester.

**2. Field Instructor Feedback**

Near the end of the semester, field instructors are sent an electronic survey asking for feedback on the students’ progress toward each of the nine competencies. In addition, the student, FI, and FFL will hold an evaluative meeting at the end of the semester to discuss the overall field Practicum and student performance. This written and verbal feedback is used to inform the progress towards competencies grade.

**3. Self-Assessment**

At the end of each semester, students will submit a Self-Assessment summarizing their major accomplishments, development, and progress toward mastery of the competencies. The fall Self-Assessment is intended to demonstrate the journey towards competence in practice. Students are not expected to be “perfect social workers” but rather individuals who value inquiry, critical thinking, and understand the importance of self-critique and examination. Instructors will review the Self-Assessments with the following question in mind:

*Do the examples referenced throughout the Self-Assessment illustrate development as an entry-level practitioner and mastery of professional social work competencies?*

With this understanding in mind, students may elect to include examples where things went well, along with examples of challenges they faced and how these challenges promoted personal and professional growth. Self-Assessments are due prior to the end-of-semester field visits so the information can be used to guide those evaluative discussions. Further details are provided in class.

**4. General Contributions**

Students’ general contributions to their own learning is assessed in a number of ways including observations and documentation in the agency, classroom, and formal or informal meetings. In addition, students must complete the requisite number of field hours to pass the field Practicum course.

**CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS:** Progress towards the competencies accounts for 60% of the final field Practicum grade for each semester.  The grade for this portion of field is based on a combination of the tasks/assignments described above.  Feedback from field instructors and other agency staff, as well as Self-Assessments from the student, are used to inform the progress towards competencies portion of the field grade. Field instructors, however, do not determine a student’s grade. The faculty field liaison is responsible for assigning the official points and letter grade for all field assignments.

Each individual competency is assessed using the rubric below. The total of all nine competencies determines the final grade for this portion (60%) of the field grade.

**Progress Towards Competencies Grading Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring** | **Learning Contract Activities** | **Field Instructor Feedback** | **Self-Assessment** | **General Contributions** |
| 10-9.4: Excels | *Actively* sought opportunities to meet the competency as described in the learning plan, and/or initiated additional or alternative opportunities | Comments reflect a *high level* of critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment | *Thorough* articulation of knowledge of concepts, policies, and/or methods; provides appropriate examples of same | *Frequently:*  Asks critical questions;  Offers thoughts or suggestions in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner.  Completed required hours. |
| 9.3-8.3: Meets expectations | Activities not completed, as described in the learning plan, but are at an *acceptable* level of progress. | Comments reflect a *basic level* of critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment | *Basic* articulation of knowledge of concepts, policies, and/or methods: provides appropriate examples of same | *Periodically:*  Asks critical questions;  Offers thoughts or suggestions in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner  Completed required hours. |
| 8.3-7.7: Below expectations | *Passive* approach: Has not sought opportunities to meet the competency as described in the learning plan; nor alternative activities to meet the competency. | Comments reflect a *low level* of critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment | *Insufficient* articulation of knowledge of concepts, policies, and/or methods; and/or unable to provide appropriate examples of same | *Rarely:*  Asks critical questions;  Offers thoughts or suggestions in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner.  Completed required hours. |
| 7.7-6.0: Needs Improvement | *Refused and/or avoided* opportunities to meet the competency as described in the learning plan; has not pursued alternative activities. | Comments reflect *lack of* critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment | *Unable* to articulate knowledge of concepts, policies, and/or methods; and/or provided inappropriate examples of same | *Never:*  Asks critical questions;  Offers thoughts or suggestions in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner.  Completed required hours. |
| 5.9-0: Unacceptable |  |  |  | Conduct or interactions with agency staff, clients, etc. are *unethical and/or unprofessional*.  Did *not complete* required hours. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C1 – C9 Cognitive-Affective Dimension**  **Supporting Document (Behavior Assessment)**  **“****Field Learning Contract/Plan”** |

**Student:** **Field Agency:**       **Semester:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Competency***  *(As defined by the Council on Social Work Education)* | ***Activities to be completed to attain competence***  *Student: Complete this section as your learning plan at the beginning of the semester. Articulate the activities you will complete in the field placement setting this semester in order to demonstrate mastery of each of the competency practice behaviors. Write one activity per practice behavior.* | ***Self Assessment***  *Student: Complete this section at the end of the semester in order to assess your progress towards competence. If you did not complete an activity that you identified at the beginning of the semester, articulate how you have demonstrated that practice behavior through other activities. Finally, identify activities that will help you continue to attain competence in those areas still requiring emphasis.* |
| **Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior** | | |
| Social workers understand the value base of the profession and its ethical standards, as well as relevant laws and regulations that may impact practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Social workers understand frameworks of ethical decision-making and how to apply principles of critical thinking to those frameworks in practice, research, and policy arenas. Social workers recognize personal values and the distinction between personal and professional values. They also understand how their personal experiences and affective reactions influence their professional judgment and behavior. Social workers understand the profession’s history, its mission, and the roles and responsibilities of the profession. Social Workers also understand the role of other professions when engaged in inter-professional teams. Social workers recognize the importance of life-long learning and are committed to continually updating their skills to ensure they are relevant and effective. Social workers also understand emerging forms of technology and the ethical use of technology in social work practice.  Social workers:   * make ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context; * use reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations; * demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication; * use technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes; and * use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior. |  |  |
| **Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice** | | |
| Social workers understand how diversity and difference characterize and shape the human experience and are critical to the formation of identity. The dimensions of diversity are understood as the intersectionality of multiple factors including but not limited to age, class, color, culture, disability and ability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, marital status, political ideology, race, religion/spirituality, sex, sexual orientation, and tribal sovereign status. Social workers understand that, as a consequence of difference, a person’s life experiences may include oppression, poverty, marginalization, and alienation as well as privilege, power, and acclaim. Social workers also understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination and recognize the extent to which a culture’s structures and values, including social, economic, political, and cultural exclusions, may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create privilege and power.  Social workers:   * apply and communicate understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels; * present themselves as learners and engage clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences; and * apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies. |  |  |
| **Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice** | | |
| Social workers understand that every person regardless of position in society has fundamental human rights such as freedom, safety, privacy, an adequate standard of living, health care, and education. Social workers understand the global interconnections of oppression and human rights violations, and are knowledgeable about theories of human need and social justice and strategies to promote social and economic justice and human rights. Social workers understand strategies designed to eliminate oppressive structural barriers to ensure that social goods, rights, and responsibilities are distributed equitably and that civil, political, environmental, economic, social, and cultural human rights are protected.  Social workers:   * apply their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels; and * engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice |  |  |
| **Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice** | | |
| Social workers understand quantitative and qualitative research methods and their respective roles in advancing a science of social work and in evaluating their practice. Social workers know the principles of logic, scientific inquiry, and culturally informed and ethical approaches to building knowledge. Social workers understand that evidence that informs practice derives from multi-disciplinary sources and multiple ways of knowing. They also understand the processes for translating research findings into effective practice.  Social workers:   * use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research; * apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative and qualitative research methods and research findings; and * use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery |  |  |
| **Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice** | | |
| Social workers understand that human rights and social justice, as well as social welfare and services, are mediated by policy and its implementation at the federal, state, and local levels. Social workers understand the history and current structures of social policies and services, the role of policy in service delivery, and the role of practice in policy development. Social workers understand their role in policy development and implementation within their practice settings at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels and they actively engage in policy practice to effect change within those settings. Social workers recognize and understand the historical, social, cultural, economic, organizational, environmental, and global influences that affect social policy. They are also knowledgeable about policy formulation, analysis, implementation, and evaluation. Social workers:   * Identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services; * assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services; * apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice. |  |  |
| **Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | |
| Social workers understand that engagement is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers value the importance of human relationships. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge to facilitate engagement with clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand strategies to engage diverse clients and constituencies to advance practice effectiveness. Social workers understand how their personal experiences and affective reactions may impact their ability to effectively engage with diverse clients and constituencies. Social workers value principles of relationship-building and inter-professional collaboration to facilitate engagement with clients, constituencies, and other professionals as appropriate.  Social workers:   * apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies; and * use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies |  |  | |
| **Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | |
| Social workers understand that assessment is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge in the assessment of diverse clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand methods of assessment with diverse clients and constituencies to advance practice effectiveness. Social workers recognize the implications of the larger practice context in the assessment process and value the importance of inter-professional collaboration in this process. Social workers understand how their personal experiences and affective reactions may affect their assessment and decision-making.  Social workers:   * collect and organize data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies; * apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies; * develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies; and * select appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies. |  |  | |
| **Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | |
| Social workers understand that intervention is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers are knowledgeable about evidence-informed interventions to achieve the goals of clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge to effectively intervene with clients and constituencies. Social workers understand methods of identifying, analyzing and implementing evidence-informed interventions to achieve client and constituency goals. Social workers value the importance of interprofessional teamwork and communication in interventions, recognizing that beneficial outcomes may require interdisciplinary, interprofessional, and inter-organizational collaboration.  Social workers:   * critically choose and implement interventions to achieve practice goals and enhance capacities of clients and constituencies; * apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies; * use inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to achieve beneficial practice outcomes; * negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies; and * facilitate effective transitions and endings that advance mutually agreed-on goals. |  |  | |
| **Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | |
| Social workers understand that evaluation is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities. Social workers recognize the importance of evaluating processes and outcomes to advance practice, policy, and service delivery effectiveness. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge in evaluating outcomes. Social workers understand qualitative and quantitative methods for evaluating outcomes and practice effectiveness.  Social workers:   * select and use appropriate methods for evaluation of outcomes; * apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes; * critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate intervention and program processes and outcomes; and * apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. |  |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C1 (K) Dimension and C1(S) Dimension**  **SW 701** **Final Ethics Paper**  **(Entire assignment is used for EAA, excluding deductions)** |

**Grading Rubric: Final Ethics Dilemma Paper**

**Purpose of Assignment:** This assignment is a “capstone” of key learning in the course and is intended to demonstrate knowledge and skill in ethical decision making. The assignment requires students to demonstrate application of scholarly research and NASW ethical standards within an ethical decision-making framework to a practice situation. This assignment is an embedded assessment for *Competency 1: Professional Self* in the domains of both knowledge and skills. In part, this assignment assesses mastery of the following course objectives:

1. Demonstrate self-awareness to evaluate the influence of personal values on decision-making and assure continual personal development and ethical decisions in practice.
2. Apply models of ethical decision making in social work practice situations

This application of ethical decision making to a practice example reflects an essential task for competence as a practicing social worker.

*Competency 1* requires social workers to understand frameworks of ethical decision-making and how to apply principles of critical thinking to those frameworks in practice (knowledge). In addition, social workers must make decisions by applying the NASW *Code of Ethics*, relevant laws and regulations, using ethical decision-making models (skill).

**Task**: To complete the assignment, write a paper that follows the framework located as a separate document on Canvas situated just below this rubric. The paper should present an actual ethical dilemma encountered by the student in a practice situation; include research related to the focus of the dilemma, apply specific standards of the NASW *Code of Ethics*, and outline the application of ethical decision-making. (Students should protect for confidentiality in the example used for the paper.) Students who do not have practice experience should discuss options for completing this assignment with the instructor.

**Criteria for Success:** Attending to each of the components and following the format provided ensures greater success in completing this assignment. Use headings for each of the required sections. The instructor will assess for critical thinking and understanding of ethical practice requirements. In the past, student examples have not always conformed to social work ethical standards; the key to success in these situations is articulation of understanding of what is acceptable should such an incident occur in future. It is these situations which can provide opportunity for greater reflection and demonstration of learning.

All papers should follow APA format including references and citations. Headings are required to assist the instructor in reviewing the assignment for demonstration of understanding and application of concepts within the paper. Paper requires cover page but no abstract or running head. Students should write clearly, covering all the required components. There are no defined page parameters as some students can express their thoughts more concisely; quality is valued over quantity. Papers will be evaluated using the rubric that follows.

**Grading Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Points Possible | Grading Criteria | Points Earned |
| All components addressed within paper.  *[Up to 25 points]* | 2 | Follows framework (Format on Canvas) |  |
| 5 | Information thorough and complete |  |
| 6 | Looks beyond the surface to deeper analysis |  |
| 6 | linkage of values and experiences to impact on future ethical decision making |  |
| 6 | Evidence of peer-reviewed articles addressing dilemma components |  |
| Linkage to ethical (moral) theory  *[Up to 23 points]* | 6 | Accurately interprets theoretical basis and connects to situation |  |
| 6 | Demonstrates clear understanding of the linkage to course materials. |  |
| 5 | Summarizes key points and synthesizes with own ideas relative to the experience. |  |
| 6 | Shows thoughtful analysis and evaluation (multiple perspectives addressed) |  |
| Demonstrates awareness of ethical issues relative to the scenario  *[Up to 12 points]* | 6 | Correct application of the *Code of Ethics*. (Values, standards and principles) |  |
| 6 | Able to identify impact of personal values, feelings and biases on resolution |  |
| Evidence of Critical Thinking *[Up to 40 points]* | 10 | Communicates rationale for discussion. |  |
| 10 | Supports opinions with logical explanations. |  |
| 10 | Integrates responses from research/ understanding and course information |  |
| 10 | Critical analysis |  |
| **Total** | **100** |  |  |
| Deductions *[Up to 10 points]* | 2 | Errors in spelling, grammar, mechanics |  |
| 2 | Clarity and readable writing |  |
| 3 | Meets APA guidelines for formatting. |  |
| 3 | References and citations accurately completed. |  |
| **Adjusted Total** |  |  |  |

*Note: Because this is the final paper of the course, assignments not completed timely may not be accepted unless prior discussion with the instructor with modified due date established.*

**Final Ethics Paper Outline**

The paper must follow APA guidelines which include a cover page, references and citations and Times New Roman, font 12. (An abstract is not necessary but can be included if you wish.)

Length of paper is determined by the author (you). Tell me as much information as is necessary for me to understand your thoughts and reasoning.

As with any paper, there should first be an introductory paragraph that outlines the purpose of the paper and sets the stage for what will follow.

Use of headings for the remaining sections is highly recommended. (This will insure that points are not removed for the first section of the grading rubric. “All components addressed within the paper.”)

Sections to be included are:

**Describing the Case and Context**

This is a “case study” which outlines basic information about the situation, individuals and context involved within the dilemma.

**Define the Ethical problem**

Since ethical dilemmas are in essence competing needs between two parties, all that is necessary for this portion paper is “\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ vs. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_”. While a very brief part of the paper, this dilemma is the focus of the remaining sections so it is essential that you are able to define the dilemma accurately.

**Gathering Information**

This is the research based portion of your paper. For both sides of the ethical dilemma, you should find peer reviewed literature that articulates positions both in support and against potential decisions. This is also the section where you would articulate appropriate laws or statures relative to the issue.

**Determining Applicable Ethical Theories and Principles**

In this section, you utilize one of the theories discussed in the course that serves as a foundation for how you are making your decision. The Beauchamp and Childress reading as well as other discussion of moral theory can be used in order to assist you in this process.

**Determining Relevant Elements of the NASW *Code of Ethics***

Specific citation of standards and principles of the *Code* as they relate to your dilemma should be noted. Because the dilemma tends to be focused at the micro level, these aspects of the *Code* are more heavily represented.

**Defining Personal Values and Biases**

As with any ethical issue, we need to be able to articulate our values and the impacts they might have on your perception of the issue as well as the decision making process.

**Considering the Values of the Affected System**

All “stakeholders” values should be addressed—client, family members, if appropriate, agency, program, community and perhaps those of the broader society.

**Defining and Considering Options**

This section includes “brainstormed” solutions to the dilemma. This means that even those not feasible should be included and the rationales (costs and benefits) of the potential decisions should be addressed.

**The Option**

This section selects one of the solutions identified in the section above and is used to discuss the following section.

**Planning Implementation**

Using the option selected above, outline the facets involved in resolving the issue. This section also considers fallout from the decision. [If you find it clearer, you can create one section that addresses the option and planning implementation.]

Be sure to conclude your paper with a summary paragraph and then reference page.

*Note: This format* ***is*** *an ethical decision-making process. As such, the modified Congress (2000) model does not need to be included in the paper.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C1 (K) Dimension**  **SW 711 Discussion Rubric 1**  **(Entire assignment is used for EAA, excluding deductions)** |

**SW 711: Foundation of Social Policy**

**Discussion Posting Grading Rubrics**.

**Purpose of Assignment**: Each discussion board focuses on student demonstration of course concepts covered within the modules that discussions are assigned. The first discussion for the course will be used as an embedded assessment for the MSW Program in the domain of knowledge for Competency 1. The remaining discussions will address Competencies 1 (knowledge, skills, and cognitive affective integration), 2 (knowledge), 3 (knowledge and skills), and 5 (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive affective integration). In the description of the assigned discussions which follows, specific course objective and competency linkage is provided. All course objectives will be addressed through the instructor created discussion boards:

1. Identify how social work evolved as a profession and its leadership role in providing for human needs and influencing larger systems for change (Discussion 1, 2, & 4)
2. Articulate the ideological and cultural bases of policies and social welfare policies in the United States. (Discussion 2 & 3)
3. Articulate the process of public policy formation in the United States. (Discussion 4)
4. Assess the impact of social policy on diverse populations including but not limited to children and families, applying knowledge of the patterns, dynamics, and consequences of discrimination, economic deprivation, and oppression (Discussion 3)
5. Analyze social policy using a framework that considers the content of historical and contemporary factors that shape policy and applies the principles of social and economic justice. (Discussion 2)

Student facilitated discussions in weeks 9, 11 and 13 will address course objectives 1, 3, 4, and 5.

*Competency 1* requires us to understand how personal experiences and affective reactions influence professional judgment and behavior as well as understanding the profession’s history, its mission,

and the roles and responsibilities of the profession (knowledge).

*Competency 2* outlines understanding of the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination and

recognize the extent to which a culture’s structures and values, including social, economic, political, and cultural exclusions, may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create privilege and power (knowledge).

*Competency 3* indicates a need to understand strategies designed to eliminate oppressive

structural barriers to ensure that social goods, rights, and responsibilities are distributed equitably, and that civil, political, environmental, economic, social, and cultural human rights are protected (knowledge) and apply that knowledge to advocacy efforts (skills).

*Competency 5* understand that human rights and social justice, as well as social welfare and services, are mediated by policy and its implementation (knowledge). The application of social work value of social justice is reflected in our policy practice (values and skills).

**Tasks:** Students will be instructed to apply the concepts for the week to a case study, reflection, or otherwise link to course concepts. As part of the posting requirement, most postings will involve responding to the posts of peers as instructed in the discussion board prompt.

**Criteria for Success**: Because the course is offered on-line, participation can only be measured through the use of the discussion feature of the course. Posts must be directly submitted to the discussion board and must substantially add to the conversation. (Simply stating agreement is not acceptable; demonstration of critical thinking and analysis beyond peers’ responses is needed). Students must be self-directed to ensure that due dates for assignments are met; significant deductions are made when assigned work is late. Full grading rubrics are located below. \*Total points earned for each post is used for EAA (excluding deductions).

**Discussion 1 Grading Rubric (Singular post)**

*After reviewing the materials and reading the NASW Policy and Social Justice Briefs, answer the questions: Why should Social Worker’s care what happens at a government level? Why should we care for a stranger? No required response post but I encourage you to review the postings of your peers and comment in regard to their thoughts on the topic*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading Criteria** |  |  |  | **Points Earned** |
| Needs Improvement | Acceptable | Above Average | Exceptional |
| Demonstrates understanding of social work values and application to social welfare practice through social, economic, or environmental justice | | | |  |
| Less than 29 | 29. – 30.7 | 30.8 - 32.8 | 32.9 - 35 |  |
| Discussion not relevant to topic, lacks clear connection to the module | Inaccurate application of topic of discussion/ errors in understanding. Insufficient response to determine level of knowledge | Accurate relating of concepts to discussion topic. Writing shows clarity of understanding content of the module | Accurately incorporates concepts, addresses history, policy, and additional supporting reflection or connects to materials from earlier course modules |
| Less than 29 | 29.- 30.7 | 30.8 - 32.8 | 32.9 - 35 |  |
| Both questions addressed but no demonstration of understanding or only one of the questions addressed well in the post. | Both questions of prompt clearly addressed and but doesn’t fully demonstrate understanding of policy implications | Both questions of prompt addressed and reflect understanding of policy implications | Both questions of prompt clearly addressed and reflect advanced understanding of policy implications |
| Linkage of topic to course materials | | | |  |
| Less than 24.9 | 24.9 – 26.3 | 26.4 – 28.1 | 28.2 - 30 |  |
| No direct connection or infers connection to course materials | Narrative specifically states course content | Narrative outlines 2 course concepts/ referenced to course materials; specific linkage of at least one concept. | Narrative directly links two course concepts referenced to course materials or includes outside source |
| **Total Points Earned** | | | |  |
| Deductions | | | |  |
| Post not completed by deadline | | Subtract 10 Points | |  |
| Writing Quality (multiple errors in spelling, grammar use ) or lacks appropriate citations | | Subtract up to 10 points | |  |
| **Adjusted Points Earned** | | | |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C1 (V) Dimension**  **SW 700 Values and Assumptions Paper**  **(Components comprising EAA score noted with “\*”)** |

**SOC WORK 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work**

**Social Work Values and Assumptions Paper**

**Purpose:** As a developing professional, you will likely encounter professional social work values that conflict with your personal beliefs and others that strongly support them. Professional expectations and client characteristics can present you with personal challenges, interpersonal conflicts, and sometimes serious ethical questions. Additionally, our political environment affects the lives of our clients. Based on this reality, this assignment requires you to explore the position of **two** of the 2020 presidential candidates and consider ways their positions may affect your clients in the future. This paper is worth 10% of the final course grade and is due in Canvas by 11:59 pm on **October** **4**.

**Knowledge:** This paper provides the opportunity to research multiple perspectives of an issue, including your own values. As such, this assignment helps measure student understanding of the impact of values as they relate to competencies one (demonstrate ethical and professional behavior) and four (engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice).

**Task**: Browse these chapters from *Social Work Speaks* that are posted on Canvas.

* Civil Liberties and Social Justice
* Cultural and Linguistic Competence in the Social Work Profession
* Economic Justice
* Environmental Policy
* Immigrants and Refugees
* International Policy on Human Rights
* Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Issues
* Peace and Social Justice
* Racism
* Role of Government Social Policy and Social Work
* Sovereignty Rights and the Well-Being of Indigenous Peoples

Select an issue you feel strongly about and/or wish to explore further. Your belief about the issue need not be consistent with social work’s position, but it must be a topic you can relate to the presidential candidates. This may be easier said than done. ***Think carefully and consider the likelihood of finding a legitimate media source that covers the candidates’ positions on the topic.*** If you cannot find the candidates’ positions on the topic (or a closely related issue), you will need to select another topic.

Write a 5-7 page paper that addresses each of the following parts (the title and reference pages are included as additional pages):

**Social Work Position**

Summarize, in your own words, the social work position articulated in *Social Work Speaks*; make sure you do not reveal whether or not you support the NASW position statement. This assignment is not asking you to summarize the chapter, rather to select a particular position NASW is advocating (e.g., you do not have to summarize the history, etc.). You may summarize a narrow portion of a policy if your opposing position only addresses part of the position (e.g., you may write simply about DACA rather than the entire immigration policy).

Provide an assessment of how this position supports clients, and specifically address what groups of clients may benefit the most from the position, along with who may benefit the least. Address dimensions of identity, including race, gender identity, sexual orientation, ability, socioeconomic status, etc. in your critique. Identify which of the core social work values provide the underpinning for the position.

**Candidates’ Positions**

Review credible mainstream media sources (e.g., local or national newspapers, cnn.com, nytimes.com; public debates) for coverage of **two** presidential candidates related to the issue you selected from Social Work Speaks. Select a minimum of one article/source per candidate.

Summarize, in your own words, each candidate’s position on the issue you selected. Make sure to tie the summaries explicitly to the article from *Social Work Speaks.* It is all right to select a portion of the source to summarize if the article covers a broad range of topics (e.g., you may write simply about about DACA rather than the entire immigration policy).

Provide a brief analysis of how each candidate’s position supports and/or opposes the position presented in *Social Work Speaks;* cite specific aspects of the position presented in *Social Work Speaks.* Remember, if you cannot locate materials about the candidates’ positions on the topic you initially selected, you will need to select a different topic for your final paper.

From your analysis and research, identify which candidate’s position will more positively benefit your future clients related to this issue and explain your rationale. Make sure to incorporate the *Code of Ethics* into your discussion, specifically information related to our commitment to clients.

Select 2 of the 6 core values of the social work profession that you think best pertain to this topic. Summarize the values and describe how they can help frame a macro-level social work response to your selected topic within the context of potential election outcomes. For example, if the candidates’ positions will help clients, how do the values suggest actions to support the position? If the candidates’ position may harm clients, what actions do the values suggest to counter that impact? **Submit a copy or provide a link to the sources you use for this section of the paper.**

**Your Personal Position**

Summarize your personal position on the issue and describe how you developed your position. Here you should discuss how your culture, upbringing, and personal experience shaped your value position.

Pretend you are working with a client who is struggling with the topic you selected, but whose views differ from your own. Describe how social work values and ethics will help guide your work with this client.

**Process Message**

After you have completed and submitted your paper, enter the Canvas Discussion entitled Values and Assumptions Process Message and craft a 1-2 paragraph process message. A process message is an informal message that is designed to help students think about what they are learning in the *process* of completing an assignment (beyond the content and rubric requirements). For this process message posting, describe your personal and/or professional insights during and/or after the completion of this assignment.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Values & Assumptions Paper (10% of grade)**  **Grading Rubric**  \*indicates portion of assignment used for EAA | | | |
| **Content** (80 Points Possible)\* | | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| **Social Work Position:** Ability to summarize objectively and present in organized and logical manner. | | /25 |  |
| **Candidates’ Positions**: Ability to summarize objectively and present in organized and logical manner. | | /30 |  |
| **Own Position:** | Personal position was summarized. A description of how the position was developed including a discussion around culture, upbringing and personal experiences was included. | /10 |  |
| Apparent effort and critical thinking applied to discussion of how social work values and ethics facilitate working with clients whose beliefs differ in selected topic area. | /10 |  |
| **Process Message:** | Included and thoughtfully prepared | /5 |  |
| **Mechanics** (20 Points Possible)  **(poor) 0—10 (excellent)** | | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| The paper, including the title page and reference page, followed APA formatting guidelines. Paper included Times New Roman font and was double spaced. Original works were attached and in-text citations were included following APA guidelines. | | /10 |  |
| Sentences were complete, clear, and concise. The paper was well-constructed and organized. An introduction, headings and conclusion were included. Sentence transitions were present and maintained the flow of thought. Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. | | /10 |  |
| **Submitted by the due date? -5 points each day late** | |  |  |
| **Total Score (100 possible)** | |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C2 (K) Dimension**  **SW 707 Movie Analysis Paper**  **(Content (85%) comprises EAA score)** |

**University of Wisconsin-Green Bay MSW Program**

**Soc Work 707: Human Behavior and the Social Environment**

**Description of the Assignment from the Syllabus**

***Movie Analysis (20% of grade)***

Using the movie, Crash, students will synthesize and integrate course content. Included within the analysis should be theoretical constructs (application of course readings and **at least one peer-reviewed journal article**). Please choose at least two characters and include a narrative addressing the following for each:

* Your understanding applying theory, assessment, and intervention evident in character interactions within the film
* Discussion of cultural, ethical and social justice issues
* Relationship of the dynamics presented in the film relative to discrimination, oppression and intersectionality

Papers must meet APA 7th edition guidelines for formatting (Times New Roman, double spaced, use of headings, references and citations). Research utilized should be based on established, peer reviewed research with appropriate citations. This assignment should be at least 6 pages and no more than 10 pages in length, including the cover and reference pages.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Movie Analysis Rubric**  *Note: EAA is only a portion of the assignment. Only the content (85%) of the assignment will be assessed, not the writing mechanics (15%).* | | | |
| **Using the movie, Crash, students will synthesize and integrate course content. Included within the analysis should be theoretical constructs (application of course readings and at least one other resource). Please choose at least two characters and include a narrative addressing the following for each:  • Your understanding applying theory, assessment, and intervention evident in character interactions within the film • Discussion of cultural, ethical and social justice issues  • Relationship of the dynamics presented in the film relative to discrimination, oppression and intersectionality  Papers must meet APA guidelines for formatting (Times New Roman, double spaced, use of headings, references and citations). Research utilized should be based on established, peer reviewed research with appropriate citations. (Total 20% of grade)** | | | |
| **Content**  **85 Points Possible** | **Points Possible** | **Points Earned** | **Comments** |
| All key elements of the assignment were covered in a substantive way.  **1)** The paper outlined your understanding applying theory, assessment, and intervention evident in character interactions  **2)** The paper discussed cultural, ethical and social justice issues.  **3)** The paper discussed relationship of the dynamics presented in the film relative to discrimination, oppression, and intersectionality.  **4)** At least two characters were analyzed in the paper. | 45 |  |  |
| Major points were stated clearly and were supported by specific details, examples, and analysis. | 20 |  |  |
| Included at least three references (two from course readings and one from peer-reviewed journal article) | 20 |  |  |
| **Mechanics 15 Points Possible** | **Points Possible** | **Points Earned** |  |
| The paper, including the title page and reference page followed APA formatting guidelines. Paper included Times New Roman font, was double spaced, and included headings. Citations of original works within the body of the paper followed APA guidelines. At least 6 pages and no more than 10 pages in length, including the cover and references pages. | 9 |  |  |
| Sentences were complete, clear, and concise. The paper was well-constructed and organized. Sentence transitions were present and maintained flow of thought. | 3 |  |  |
| Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. | 3 |  |  |
| ***Completed by the Due Date? (-5 each day late)*** |  |  |  |
| **Total Points** | 100 |  |  |
| **Final Grade** | |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C2 (S) Dimension**  **SW 702 Applied Learning Canvas Discussion**  **(Content (85%) comprises EAA score)** |

**Grading Rubric Participation/Discussion Posts**

***Syllabus Description***

Students will be asked to complete the prompt identified within the *Discussions* section of the course shell. Prompts may refer to case study examples, thoughts from the readings, or implications across practice settings. Discussion timelines must be adhered to in order to promote conversations. Much like what happens in face-to-face conversations, your student peers may have questions for you, just as you may have questions for them and so the discussions will evolve! [I will be monitoring all discussion and participating whenever I feel it is necessary.]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participation/Canvas Posting Rubric**  [Total 20% of grade]  \*indicates portion of grade used for EAA | | | |
| **Content \* 85 Points Possible** | **Points Possible** | **Points Earned** | **Comments** |
| Addressed all parts of the initial question with detail. | 25 |  |  |
| Addressed all parts of the response post with detail. | 20 |  |  |
| Each post was completed in a substantial way by adding new information supported by reputable sources (course material and outside sources). | 20 |  |  |
| Demonstrated critical thinking regarding the concepts presented. Included deep analysis, comparisons, and understanding of the concepts. | 20 |  |  |
| ***Mechanics 15 Points Possible*** | **Points Possible** | **Points Earned** | **Comments** |
| Rules of grammar, usage and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. Sentences were complete, clear, concise, and error-free. | 15 |  |  |
| Completed by the due date?  -5 points each day late |  |  |  |
| ***Total Points*** | **100** |  |  |
| ***Final Grade*** | |  |  |

**Assignment Description**:

**Cultural Competence and Social Work Practice**

*Adapted from an unpublished paper by Jose Carlos Vera, MSW* as published in Rothman, J. (2013). *From the front lines: Student cases in social work ethics.* (pp. 75-76). Pearson.

“An urban, community-based organization provides services specifically targeted toward an immigrant minority population. These services include case management, [mentoring], alcohol and drug treatment, advocacy, and housing.

Another client of the agency refers Luisa for services, and she is assigned to [you as her] caseworker. She is 18 years old, currently homeless, and a person with a mental health disability. Although her family [which emigrated from Guatemala] resides in a nearby county, she refuses contact with them, preferring to live independently on the city streets. Luisa is placed in a [group] home, but she runs away, presumably returning to the unsafe neighborhood where she had been living. [You] lose contact with her.

A week later, through the client who originally referred her, [you] learn that Luisa has been sexually and physically abused. [You] are concerned about her safety, fearing further rape, murder and violence if she continues to live on the streets. [You] feel that Luisa does not have the mental capacity to look out for herself [or] take even elementary precautions to prevent harm.

When [you] contact her on the street, Luisa is adamant. She desires to remain in the neighborhood, which she has come to know [and which has a large Hispanic population]. She does not desire agency involvement, housing, or other services. All that she asks is that she be left alone to live as she wishes. She is not harming or disturbing anyone and wishes to live as she chooses. [She states that God will protect her from harm.]

1. Which points in the *Cultural Self-Inventory* (Figure 3.1, pg. 63) would you need to consider in your approach to working with Luisa? Discuss.
2. Describe what *Cultural Competence (Humility)* would look like in working with Luisa. How might you improve your multi-cultural competence to effectively work with her?
3. Identify several ethical values and principles that would apply in this scenario. How would you apply them?
4. Given that the agency works with Underrepresented immigrant populations, what multi-cultural influences might the agency employ to assure they are providing culturally competent services?

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C2 (V) Dimension**  **SW 707 Developmental Environmental Experiences Paper**  **(Content (85%) comprises EAA score)** |

**Description of the Assignment from the Syllabus**

***Developmental and Environmental Influences Paper (40% of grade)***

This assignment is intended to allow you to address the impact on your personal and professional development of various issues related to human behavior and the social environment. To complete the assignment, write a paper that includes at least the following elements. Make sure you cite the source even when you use your textbook as your source of citation.

* + 1. A general description of yourself as a bio-psycho-socio-cultural-spiritual being. Be sure to address each part of that hyphenated description! State how the overall combination of these characteristics influenced the opportunities and barriers that you have experienced so far in your life.
    2. Using 2 theories or models of individual development or identity formation (one from traditional and the other alternative) presented in class and/or the text, describe your progress through the life course to this point in time. That is, where are you now, and what phases have you passed through?
    3. A brief discussion of the values you bring with you as you progress through the phases of your life course that remain*.*
    4. Designate your family as the focal system. Sketch the significant subsystems that make up the family and show the linkage to the family of influential elements of the supra-system.
    5. Identify at least 2 groups and 2 organizations in the larger environment that have been influential in your life. (This does not include your family or individual friends.) For each one, briefly describe how it has affected your personal or professional view of the world.
    6. Identify and briefly describe at least 3 major events or factors in the larger environment, such as political or social movements or national problems that have influenced you. For each one, briefly describe how your development and worldview were affected.
    7. Diversity, discrimination, and oppression affect everyone, whether they are part of the dominant group or a subordinated group. Describe the impact of diversity, discrimination and oppression on your development and worldview (personal and professional)
    8. Taking into consideration the experiences and influences that you have discussed above, discuss briefly the strengths and limitations that they will bring to your professional development as a social worker. In this section, include a brief comparison of your personal values and those of the profession, as outlined in the NASW Code of ethics. Outline a plan for addressing limitations.

Papers must meet APA 7th edition guidelines for formation (Times New Roman, 12-point font, double spaced, one-inch margin, use of headings, references and citations). Research utilized should be based on established, peer reviewed research with appropriate citations. **At least four references should be used: at least two course readings and at least two peer-reviewed research journal articles.** This paper should be at least 8 and no more than 12 pages in length, exclusive of the cover and references pages.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Developmental & Environmental Influences Paper Rubric** | | | |
| **This assignment is intended to allow students to address the impact on their personal and professional development of various issues related to human behavior and the social environment. (Total 40% of grade)** | | | |
| **Content\* 85 Points Possible** | **Points Possible** | **Points Earned** | **Comments** |
| All key elements of the assignment were covered in a substantive way. |  |  |  |
| **1)** Included a general description of yourself as a bio-psycho-socio-cultural-spiritual being. Addressed each part of the hyphenated description. Stated how the overall combination of these characteristics influenced the opportunities and barriers that you have experienced so far in your life. | 10 |  |  |
| **2)** Used two theories/models of individual development or identity formation (one from traditional and the other alternative) presented in class and/or the text, and described your progress through the life course to this point in time. Answered the questions: where are you now, and what phases have you passed through? How do the two different theories explain your individual growth and experiences? | 20 |  |  |
| **3)** Briefly discussed the values you bring with you as you progress through the phases of your life. | 5 |  |  |
| **4)** Designated your family as the focal system. Sketched the significant subsystems that make up the family and showed the linkage to the family of influential elements of the supra-system. | 5 |  |  |
| **5)**  Identified at least 2 groups and 2 organizations in the larger environment that have been influential in your life. (This does not include your family or individual friends.) For each one, briefly described how it has affected your personal or professional view of the world. | 10 |  |  |
| **6)** Identified and briefly described at least 3 major events or factors in the larger environment, such as political or social movements or national problems that have influenced you. For each one, briefly described how your development and worldview were affected. | 10 |  |  |
| **7)** Described the impact of diversity, discrimination and oppression on your development and worldview (personal and professional) | 10 |  |  |
| **8)** Briefly addressed the strengths and limitations that the experiences and influences you have discussed will bring to your professional development as a social worker. Included a brief comparison of your personal values and those of the profession, as outlined in the NASW Code of ethics. Outlined a plan foraddressing limitations. | 5 |  |  |
| 9) Included at least four references (two peer-reviewed research journal articles and two from course readings) | 10 |  |  |
| **Mechanics 15 Points Possible** | **Points Possible** | **Points Earned** |  |
| The paper, including the title page and reference page followed APA formatting guidelines (please use the 7th edition). Paper included Times New Roman font, was double spaced, and included headings. Citations of original works within the body of the paper followed APA guidelines. It must be 8-10 pages in length, exclusive of the cover and reference pages. | 9 |  |  |
| Sentences were complete, clear, and concise. The paper was well-constructed and organized. Sentence transitions were present and maintained the flow of thought. | 3 |  |  |
| Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. | 3 |  |  |
| Emailed by the due date?  -5 points each day late |  |  |  |
| ***Total Points*** | **100** |  |  |
| ***Final Grade*** | |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C3 (K) Dimension and C3 (S) Dimension**  **SW 711 Policy Paper or Video**  **(Entire assignment before deductions comprises EAA score.)** |

**SW 711: Foundations of Social Welfare**

**Policy Analysis Paper/Video**

**Due: Per assignment schedule, last Thursday of semester**

**Purpose of Assignment**: As can be seen through the information noted below, this assignment is a capstone assignment for SW 711. The key demonstration of learning for this project relates to policy analysis. The paper or video allows students to demonstrate understanding of the dimensions of policy practice and advocacy on behalf of social justice. This assignment is used as an embedded assignment for the MSW program in the domain of knowledge for knowledge and skills for *Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice* as well as *Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice*, and knowledge domain of research in practice, *Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice*. *Competency 2: Engaging Diversity and Difference in Practice* is also assessed (knowledge). The assignment, in part, assesses student mastery of the following course objectives:

(3) Articulate the process of public policy formation in the United States.

(4) Assess the impact of social policy on diverse populations including but not limited to children and families, applying knowledge of the patterns, dynamics, and consequences of discrimination, economic deprivation, and oppression.

(5) Analyze social policy using a framework that considers the content of historical and contemporary factors that shape policy and applies the principles of social and economic justice.

To be an effective social worker, students must demonstrate aptitude in the nine competencies outlined by the Council on Social Work Education. The ability to successfully integrate research policy practice and advocacy for human rights will promote social justice for those served within your practice setting.

*Competency 2* indicates that students understand (knowledge) the different dimensions of diversity and concepts of intersectionality and recognize how diversity and difference shape life experiences in practice at the mezzo and macro levels.

*Competency 3* outlines the need to apply understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels (knowledge); and engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice (skills).

*Competency 4* requires students understand that understand evidence informs practice and be able to use and translate that research evidence to inform and improve policy practice (knowledge).

*Competency* 5 indicates that human rights and social justice are mediated by policy development across all levels of practice, micro, mezzo, and macro (knowledge). Students must demonstrate the ability to assess how social welfare and economic policies impact delivery of services and apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice (skills).

**Task:** Students have the option to produce a paper or a video of a social welfare policy and program. The paper/video must address population, problem, policy, and program using a research based rationale while also applying social work values and ethical principles. The paper/video must address:

1. Policy: Information should include wording, its inception, any revisions or additions. Discussion of policy should include points (a) – (c) below and give a good representation of the underlying perspectives and philosophies regarding the policy. (The linkage between definition and policy should be clear). This information would include using a policy analysis framework as a foundation.
   1. Population: Thoroughly describe the population the policy seeks to serve. What does the literature say about this population? Are there other state or local policies that seek to meet the needs of this population?
   2. Problem: Thoroughly describe the problem that the policy seeks to address. What does the literature say about this problem? How has this problem been historically addressed? [Note: there is some overlap between population, and problem; goal in separating the two is to help you think about the person as separate from the problem consistent with social work values.]
   3. Program: Any programs that have evolved as a direct result of the policy must be addressed thoroughly in the paper/video. Fiscal or other social advantages/disadvantages, benefits or costs of the program should be outlined.
2. Social Policy Analysis: Use one of the frameworks outlined in the text chapter 3 when discussing the outcome of the policy. For example, an implementation analysis could be applied when evaluating how the policy was developed and implemented; or an impact appraisal would evaluate the outcome of the policy itself.
3. Social Justice Framework: Discussion of components above are inclusive of discussion of social work ethical principles and obligations under the *Code of Ethics*. Include discussion of any likely or existing mechanisms of privilege, oppression, and discrimination regarding the policy and program described. Figure1.1 and fair process principles could be used in outlining social justice.
4. Conclusion and Call to Action: Considering all of the factors listed above, the conclusion to the paper should articulate a call to action for social workers. What efforts should social workers do to improve the policy, reduce negative impacts on the population, or program modifications?

**Criteria for success:** The assignment is designed to assess understanding of policy analysis. Being clear in which approach you are using to evaluate the policy (and any programs that developed from it). This assignment requires research beyond the existing course materials. Whether preparing the assignment as a written paper or visually as a video, credit must be given to sources used through the body of the work and demonstrate research from multiple peer reviewed or government sources. If using web sources, look for those ending in gov or edu. If other sources are used, research validity of the information before including.

*Papers*: All papers should follow APA format including references and citations. Paper requires cover page but no abstract or running head. Students should write clearly, covering all of the required components. As with any paper, introduction and conclusion sections should frame the discussion. There are no defined page parameters as some students are able to express their thoughts more concisely; quality is valued over quantity. Papers will be evaluated using the rubric that follows.

*Videos*: Videos using any video medium desired. Correctly submitted, the viewer should be able to progress through the video without need to interact other than to open the file. In most cases, the video should have visual and audio components. Creativity is encouraged. Credit should be given to sources throughout the video. In addition to the video, students completing this option must upload an APA formatted reference list. Videos will be evaluated using the rubric that follows.

Grading Rubric (\*entire assignment is used for EAA, excluding deductions)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading Criteria** | | | | | | **Points Earned** |
| **Needs Improvement** | **Acceptable** | **Above Average** | | **Exceptional** | |
| **Population and Problem Identification** | | | | | | |
| Less than 21 | 21 | | 23 | | 25 |  |
| Brief outline of population or problem; either component not fully defined. | Population and Problem presented with limited support but clearly identified | | Clearly identified population and problem, supported with statistics | | Clearly identified problem, supported with statistics. Historical dimensions explained |  |
| **Connection to Social Justice Perspectives** | | | | | | |
| Less than 21 | 21 | | 23 | | 25 |  |
| Social Justice implications inferred in the narrative but not specifically outlined. Does not address privilege, oppression, or discrimination clearly | Social justice perspective outlined clearly and applied correctly; Includes accurate discussion of privilege, oppression, or discrimination | | Detailed social justice perspective outlined and applied correctly; Includes accurate discussion of at least two of privilege, oppression, or discrimination | | Detailed social justice perspective outlined and applied correctly; Includes accurate discussion of the intersection of privilege, oppression, or discrimination |  |
| **Policy/Program Analysis** | | | | | | |
| Less than 25 | 25 | | 28 | | 30 |  |
| Outline of policy without specific program connections | Clear and complete policy and program analysis; discussion of method of evaluation used inferred or minimally outlined. Able to identify needed change in policy | | Program and Policy analyzed clearly using methods outlined in the text; application is accurate and fully considers impact on vulnerable populations. Needed changes with a strategy for addressing outlined. | | Program and Policy analyzed clearly using methods outlined in the text; application is accurate and considers supporting and opposing viewpoints. Strategy for social change is outlined and articulates connection to social work’s value orientation and ethical principles. |  |
| **Research Evidence** | | | | | | |
| Less than 16.5 | 16.5 | | 18 | | 20 |  |
| Lacks adequate research support for conclusions within the paper/video | Research supports conclusions and comes from reputable sources.  Connects research to topic of discussion | | Research supports conclusions and comes from reputable sources.  Connects research to topic of discussion beyond simple reporting of the findings. Call to action supported with evidence. | | Broad range of evidence noted from multiple perspectives. Able to synthesize the different perspectives to represent a full picture of policy/program issues. Strong research connection to call to action |  |
| **Total Points Earned (100 possible)** | | | | | |  |
| **Quality of work** | | | | | |  |
| **Paper:** APA format, typed in 12-point, Times New Roman font; is double-spaced with 1-inch margins; uses headings cover page, page numbers. References and in-text citations. Free from typographical, grammatical and spelling errors; and is devoid of slang and figures of speech. | | | | | Up to 10 point deduction |  |
| **Video:** (1) Submission as a video; (2) Audio and Visual clear; information presented paced well and flows naturally to assist viewer in understanding the topic. Sources cited throughout the presentation. Free from typographical, grammatical and spelling errors; and is devoid of slang and figures of speech. Reference page [Required as separate document] formatted using APA guidelines. | | | | | Up to 10 point deduction each point (1) & (2) |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C3 (K) Dimension**  **SW 701 Social Justice Project**  **(Entire assignment comprises EAA score.)** |

**Social Justice Project**

**Purpose:** This assignment is designed to have you apply social justice perspectives of the profession of social work to an area of interest whereupon social injustice is currently observed. The Social Justice Project, including both the video presentation via VoiceThread and responses to your peers, is an embedded assessment measure *for Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice* in the knowledge domain. The project also assesses the values domain of Competency 3. The Project is designed to assess, in part, the following course objectives:

1. Apply moral and ethical principles, theory, and standards to professional practice within a social justice framework.
2. Analyze societal and organizational structures and institutional practices using standards identified within the NASW *Code of Ethics* with a focus on social and economic justice and the impact of privilege, oppression, and, discrimination for vulnerable populations in practice.

This assignment has students demonstrate the ability to advocate for social justice in an area of interest which impacts vulnerable populations in terms of human rights, social, economic, or environmental justice. In preparing a poster and infographic, and then educating peers on the topic with a call to action, students demonstrate knowledge of the “how” to advocate which will be built upon in the specialized year coursework.

*Competency 3* requires understanding of fundamental human rights, global interconnections, and knowledge of theories of human needs and social justice and strategies to promote social and economic justice and human rights (knowledge). In addition, *Competency 3* requires students to recognize that every person regardless of position in society has fundamental rights (values).

**Task:** To complete this assignment, students research a topic of interest, prepare a VoiceThread that outlines the social justice issues related to that topic and includes a call to advocacy to their peers.

* Students select a social justice topic (community, societal and global issues such as any affecting human rights, economic justice or oppression).
* Students explore how these issues are addressed systemically in the U.S., and
* Identify social work responses relative to social justice and ethical practice consistent with the mission, ethical principles and Standard 6 of the *Code of Ethics*.

Each student will prepare a VoiceThread (VT) outlining review of the issue selected. Students should think of this as an “elevator speech” outlining the topic, connections to social work values and ethics, and a subsequent call to action. (Elevator speeches should be a maximum of 3-4 minutes). Communication of salient points in the VT to classmates will be evaluated.

All students will then review the VT of their peers and complete the review sheet. Review sheets are not shared with peers but are used to assist in identifying take-aways on what was contained in the VT’s.

**Criteria for Success:** VT Presentations must demonstrate clear understanding of the social justice issue with support of legitimate sources, peer-reviewed, or government sites. In narrative, connect the sources to the data you are discussing. When statistics are presented orally, round to the nearest number. Effective presentations are well-organized, highlight important facts only and make the most important ideas “stand out. Be sure to identify what social workers could do to promote social justice around the topic selected. Remember: Your audience for this presentation is social workers so call to action should be directed to them

Students are expected to post a review document using the template posted on Canvas to demonstrate review of their peers’ work and understanding of social justice issues.

***Grading Rubric:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Points possible** | **Grading Criteria** | **Points earned** |
| **Presentation of Social Justice Topic**  ***[45 points possible]*** | 15 | Clarity of social justice issue |  |
| 15 | Social work perspectives toward the issue clearly evident [Connects to Standard 6] |  |
| 15 | Interpretation of topic significance/call to action consistent with social work ethical practice |  |
| **Reviews**  ***[30 points possible]*** | 30 | Reviews articulate learning, raise appropriate questions and reflect consistently with the VT created by peers.  Demonstrate reflection on content of social justice topic |  |
| **Professionalism Displayed in Presentation** | 25 | Well organized and topic components clearly evident in verbal presentation.  Visual as support for verbal presentation  Able to present ideas within the 3-4-minute timeframe. |
| **Total Points** | **100** |  |  |

[*Entire assignment used for EAA assessment of Competency 3-Knowledge domain*.]

GPA to Points Conversion

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 94 | 88 | 83 |
| 15 | 14.1 | 13.2 | 12.45 |
| 25 | 23.5 | 22 | 20.75 |
| 30 | 28.2 | 26.4 | 24.9 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C3 (V) Dimension**  **SW 711 Policy Values Quiz and Reflection**  **(Content before deductions comprises EAA score.)** |

**SW 711: Foundations of Social Welfare**

**Policy Values Quiz and Reflection**

**Due: Week 3**

**Purpose of Assignment:** This assignment is designed to aid students in examining the difference between facts, myths, and values when discussing policy and the implications for policy. Students will gain understanding of their own understanding of the differences as they reflect on their responses to the quiz as relate to the answers provided by the quiz’s creator. This activity is an embedded assessment for the MSW program in the domain of values for *Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice.* The assignment also assesses *Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice*, in the domains of knowledge and values. The assignment is used to assess mastery of the following course objectives:

1. Articulate the ideological and cultural bases of policies and social welfare policies in the United States.
2. Articulate the process of public policy formation in the United States.

*Competency 3* notes understanding that every person had fundamental human rights and recognition of oppressive structural barriers to ensure those rights are protected (values).

Competency 5 indicates that human rights and social justice are mediated by policy development across all levels of practice, micro, mezzo, and macro (knowledge). In addition, the competency highlights the understanding of human rights and their mediation by policy (values) through influences that affect social policy.

**Task:** Students must first complete the Policy Values Quiz which is located in the module on the course shell. After taking the s quiz and reviewing the answers for the quiz, students will then write 1-2-page minimum (single spaced/APA not required) reflection on what you learned about yourself and policy foundations in the US as a result of the activity.

**Criteria for Success:** Students will perform better on this assignment when they have taken time to carefully review their outcomes from taking the values quiz and holistically examining the implications of differences between myths, facts, and opinions. Use of materials presented in the first three weeks of the course can be helpful in considering this assignment. Assignment will be graded according to the rubric identified below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Values Quiz Reflection** (\*entire assignment is used for EAA, excluding deductions) | | | | |
| Needs Improvement | Satisfactory/Meets Expectations | Above Expectations | Exceptional | Points Earned |
| Completion of Values Quiz. | | | |  |
| Using Canvas data, students automatically earn 10 points for completion of Policy Values Quiz. | | | |  |
| Demonstrates Understanding of Concepts | | | |  |
| Less than 24.9 | 24.9 – 26.3 | 26.4 – 28.1 | 28.2 - 30 |  |
| Discussion not relevant to topic, lacks clear connection to the module. Unable to ascertain understanding of concepts. | Application of topic of discussion but with some errors in understanding. Response demonstrates a minimal level of knowledge | Accurate relating of concepts to discussion topic. Writing shows clarity of understanding content of the module | Accurately incorporates concepts with additional supporting reflection or connects to materials from earlier course modules |
| Synthesis | | | |  |
| Less than 24.9 | 24.9 – 26.3 | 26.4 – 28.1 | 28.2 - 30 |  |
| Reports without integrating information across concepts. | Able to synthesis content within the module to the activity outcome. | Clearly connects this module’s content with at least one concept from prior modules. | Clearly connects this module’s content with multiple concepts from prior modules. |
| Critical Thinking | | | |  |
| Less than 24.9 | 24.9 – 26.3 | 26.4 – 28.1 | 28.2 - 30 |  |
| Repeats information without deeper analysis | Presents opinions supported by additional course materials | Accurately applies concepts to the topic of discussion beyond personal opinion. Opinions supported by course materials. | Evaluates/  Analyzes concepts from multiple perspectives or accurately  Synthesizes information in rationale |
| **Total Score (Points Possible = 100)** | | | |  |
| Deductions | | | |  |
| Writing Quality: Writing Quality (multiple errors in spelling, grammar use) or lacks appropriate citations | | Subtract up to 10 points | |  |
| Timeliness of Submission | | Subtract 10 points | |  |
| **Adjusted Score (Total less Deductions)** | | | |  |

***Note:*** assignment will not be accepted after the time next assignment is due.

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C4 (K) Dimension**  **SW 700 Groups Statute Presentation**  **(Components comprising EAA score noted with “\*”)** |

**UW-Green Bay MSW Program**

**SOC WORK 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work**

**Group Statute Presentation Assignment**

**PURPOSE:** This assignment requires students to work in small groups to research, analyze, and present pertinent information on a state statute relevant to the field of Social Work. The goal of this assignment is to introduce generalist students to statutes that cut across several areas of practice and to which most social workers are exposed at some point in their careers.

**KNOWLEDGE:** This assignment measures students’ understanding of Competency 4: *Evidence that informs practice derives from multi-disciplinary sources and multiple ways of knowing*. Furthermore, as part of credentialing, the Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services (DSPS) requires a jurisprudence exam which consists of material taken from the specific statutes and professional codes covered in this assignment.

**SKILLS:** Working with groups such as task forces, coalitions, or interdisciplinary teams is commonplace in social work practice. Yet, it can be challenging to merge different workstyles and perspectives when working with others. This assignment provides a structure for organizing people and tasks to prepare and present a group topic. The tools shared in this assignment can be applied to any project that requires group interaction and outcomes.

**TASK:** Working in small groups, students are assigned to research, understand, and educate others on one of the following key state statutes:

**Chapter 48: Children’s Code**

[**http://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/48.pdf**](http://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/48.pdf)

**Chapter 51: State Alcohol, Drug Abuse, Developmental Disabilities, and Mental Health Act** [**http://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/51.pdf**](http://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/51.pdf)

**Chapter 55: Protective Service System** [**http://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/55.pdf**](http://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/55.pdf)

**Chapter 938: Juvenile Justice Code**

[**https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/938**](https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/938)

Educating others will occur in a formal, 25-minute, in-class presentation which includes the following elements:

* A clear explanation of the intent of the statute. Who does it apply to? Who does it protect? What practice areas most rely on this statute?
* Concise review of the literature regarding the instigation and implementation of the statute. What historical events prompted the development of the statute?
* Use of case study or similar class activity to involve the class in understanding how the statute impacts social work practice.
* Concise review of the literature regarding the future of this statute. What does current research say about the reality or need for this statute? Are there changes being suggested or implemented?

All groups must submit an outline prior to the presentation date that details their plan for the oral presentation. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is acceptable. This written document is due in Canvas by 11:59pm on Sunday, October 18, 2020.

An additional component of this assignment assesses students’ engagement in the team process via peer and instructor feedback. This will be explained more thoroughly in class.

The full assignment is worth 30% of the final course grade, 20% from the group presentation and 10% from self-evaluation/team feedback.

**Group Members:** **Statute:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Statute Presentation Rubric**  \*indicates portion of assignment used for EAA | | |
| **Content** (90 Points Possible)\* | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| **Description of the statute:** Clear explanation of the intent of the statute, who it applies to, who it protects, what practice areas most rely on this statute | /25 |  |
| **History context:** Concise review of past literature regarding the instigation and implementation of the statute | /20 |  |
| **Application to practice:** Use of case study or similar class activity | /25 |  |
| **Debates/Discussions:** Concise review of current literature regarding the future of this statute | /20 |  |
| **Mechanics** (10 Points Possible) | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| Delivery of content was clear, concise, well-timed, shared involvement of all team members; sources were cited as appropriate | /10 |  |
| **Submitted by the due date -5 points each day late** |  |  |
| **Total Group Score (100 possible)**  All group members receive the same grade for this portion of the assignment | /100 |  |
| **Team Engagement Score \***  This is an individual grade based on feedback from team members and instructor assessment | /100 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C4 (K) Dimension**  **SW 711 Policy Paper or Video**  **(Entire Assignment before deductions comprises EAA score.)** |

**SW 711: Foundations of Social Welfare**

**Policy Analysis Paper/Video**

**Due: Per assignment schedule, last Thursday of semester**

**Purpose of Assignment**: As can be seen through the information noted below, this assignment is a capstone assignment for SW 711. The key demonstration of learning for this project relates to policy analysis. The paper or video allows students to demonstrate understanding of the dimensions of policy practice and advocacy on behalf of social justice. This assignment is used as an embedded assignment for the MSW program in the domain of knowledge for knowledge and skills for *Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice* as well as *Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice*, and knowledge domain of research in practice, *Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice*. *Competency 2: Engaging Diversity and Difference in Practice* is also assessed (knowledge). The assignment, in part, assesses student mastery of the following course objectives:

(3) Articulate the process of public policy formation in the United States.

(4) Assess the impact of social policy on diverse populations including but not limited to children and families, applying knowledge of the patterns, dynamics, and consequences of discrimination, economic deprivation, and oppression.

(5) Analyze social policy using a framework that considers the content of historical and contemporary factors that shape policy and applies the principles of social and economic justice.

To be an effective social worker, students must demonstrate aptitude in the nine competencies outlined by the Council on Social Work Education. The ability to successfully integrate research policy practice and advocacy for human rights will promote social justice for those served within your practice setting.

*Competency 2* indicates that students understand (knowledge) the different dimensions of diversity and concepts of intersectionality and recognize how diversity and difference shape life experiences in practice at the mezzo and macro levels.

*Competency 3* outlines the need to apply understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels (knowledge); and engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice (skills).

*Competency 4* requires students understand that understand evidence informs practice and be able to use and translate that research evidence to inform and improve policy practice (knowledge).

*Competency* 5 indicates that human rights and social justice are mediated by policy development across all levels of practice, micro, mezzo, and macro (knowledge). Students must demonstrate the ability to assess how social welfare and economic policies impact delivery of services and apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice (skills).

**Task:** Students have the option to produce a paper or a video of a social welfare policy and program. The paper/video must address population, problem, policy, and program using a research based rationale while also applying social work values and ethical principles. The paper/video must address:

1. Policy: Information should include wording, its inception, any revisions or additions. Discussion of policy should include points (a) – (c) below and give a good representation of the underlying perspectives and philosophies regarding the policy. (The linkage between definition and policy should be clear). This information would include using a policy analysis framework as a foundation.
   1. Population: Thoroughly describe the population the policy seeks to serve. What does the literature say about this population? Are there other state or local policies that seek to meet the needs of this population?
   2. Problem: Thoroughly describe the problem that the policy seeks to address. What does the literature say about this problem? How has this problem been historically addressed? [Note: there is some overlap between population, and problem; goal in separating the two is to help you think about the person as separate from the problem consistent with social work values.]
   3. Program: Any programs that have evolved as a direct result of the policy must be addressed thoroughly in the paper/video. Fiscal or other social advantages/disadvantages, benefits or costs of the program should be outlined.
2. Social Policy Analysis: Use one of the frameworks outlined in the text chapter 3 when discussing the outcome of the policy. For example, an implementation analysis could be applied when evaluating how the policy was developed and implemented; or an impact appraisal would evaluate the outcome of the policy itself.
3. Social Justice Framework: Discussion of components above are inclusive of discussion of social work ethical principles and obligations under the *Code of Ethics*. Include discussion of any likely or existing mechanisms of privilege, oppression, and discrimination regarding the policy and program described. Figure1.1 and fair process principles could be used in outlining social justice.
4. Conclusion and Call to Action: Considering all of the factors listed above, the conclusion to the paper should articulate a call to action for social workers. What efforts should social workers do to improve the policy, reduce negative impacts on the population, or program modifications?

**Criteria for success:** The assignment is designed to assess understanding of policy analysis. Being clear in which approach you are using to evaluate the policy (and any programs that developed from it). This assignment requires research beyond the existing course materials. Whether preparing the assignment as a written paper or visually as a video, credit must be given to sources used through the body of the work and demonstrate research from multiple peer reviewed or government sources. If using web sources, look for those ending in gov or edu. If other sources are used, research validity of the information before including.

*Papers*: All papers should follow APA format including references and citations. Paper requires cover page but no abstract or running head. Students should write clearly, covering all of the required components. As with any paper, introduction and conclusion sections should frame the discussion. There are no defined page parameters as some students are able to express their thoughts more concisely; quality is valued over quantity. Papers will be evaluated using the rubric that follows.

*Videos*: Videos using any video medium desired. Correctly submitted, the viewer should be able to progress through the video without need to interact other than to open the file. In most cases, the video should have visual and audio components. Creativity is encouraged. Credit should be given to sources throughout the video. In addition to the video, students completing this option must upload an APA formatted reference list. Videos will be evaluated using the rubric that follows.

Grading Rubric (\*entire assignment is used for EAA, excluding deductions)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading Criteria** | | | | | | **Points Earned** |
| **Needs Improvement** | **Acceptable** | **Above Average** | | **Exceptional** | |
| **Population and Problem Identification** | | | | | | |
| Less than 21 | 21 | | 23 | | 25 |  |
| Brief outline of population or problem; either component not fully defined. | Population and Problem presented with limited support but clearly identified | | Clearly identified population and problem, supported with statistics | | Clearly identified problem, supported with statistics. Historical dimensions explained |  |
| **Connection to Social Justice Perspectives** | | | | | | |
| Less than 21 | 21 | | 23 | | 25 |  |
| Social Justice implications inferred in the narrative but not specifically outlined. Does not address privilege, oppression, or discrimination clearly | Social justice perspective outlined clearly and applied correctly; Includes accurate discussion of privilege, oppression, or discrimination | | Detailed social justice perspective outlined and applied correctly; Includes accurate discussion of at least two of privilege, oppression, or discrimination | | Detailed social justice perspective outlined and applied correctly; Includes accurate discussion of the intersection of privilege, oppression, or discrimination |  |
| **Policy/Program Analysis** | | | | | | |
| Less than 25 | 25 | | 28 | | 30 |  |
| Outline of policy without specific program connections | Clear and complete policy and program analysis; discussion of method of evaluation used inferred or minimally outlined. Able to identify needed change in policy | | Program and Policy analyzed clearly using methods outlined in the text; application is accurate and fully considers impact on vulnerable populations. Needed changes with a strategy for addressing outlined. | | Program and Policy analyzed clearly using methods outlined in the text; application is accurate and considers supporting and opposing viewpoints. Strategy for social change is outlined and articulates connection to social work’s value orientation and ethical principles. |  |
| **Research Evidence** | | | | | | |
| Less than 16.5 | 16.5 | | 18 | | 20 |  |
| Lacks adequate research support for conclusions within the paper/video | Research supports conclusions and comes from reputable sources.  Connects research to topic of discussion | | Research supports conclusions and comes from reputable sources.  Connects research to topic of discussion beyond simple reporting of the findings. Call to action supported with evidence. | | Broad range of evidence noted from multiple perspectives. Able to synthesize the different perspectives to represent a full picture of policy/program issues. Strong research connection to call to action |  |
| **Total Points Earned (100 possible)** | | | | | |  |
| **Quality of work** | | | | | |  |
| **Paper:** APA format, typed in 12-point, Times New Roman font; is double-spaced with 1-inch margins; uses headings cover page, page numbers. References and in-text citations. Free from typographical, grammatical and spelling errors; and is devoid of slang and figures of speech. | | | | | Up to 10 point deduction |  |
| **Video:** (1) Submission as a video; (2) Audio and Visual clear; information presented paced well and flows naturally to assist viewer in understanding the topic. Sources cited throughout the presentation. Free from typographical, grammatical and spelling errors; and is devoid of slang and figures of speech. Reference page [Required as separate document] formatted using APA guidelines. | | | | | Up to 10 point deduction each point (1) & (2) |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C4 (S) Dimension**  **SW 702 Applied Learning Canvas Discussion**  **(Content (85%) comprises EAA score)** |

**Grading Rubric Participation/Discussion Posts**

***Syllabus Description***

Students will be asked to complete the prompt identified within the *Discussions* section of the course shell. Prompts may refer to case study examples, thoughts from the readings, or implications across practice settings. Discussion timelines must be adhered to in order to promote conversations. Much like what happens in face-to-face conversations, your student peers may have questions for you, just as you may have questions for them and so the discussions will evolve! [I will be monitoring all discussion and participating whenever I feel it is necessary.]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participation/Canvas Posting Rubric**  [Total 20% of grade]  \*indicates portion of grade used for EAA | | | |
| **Content \* 85 Points Possible** | **Points Possible** | **Points Earned** | **Comments** |
| Addressed all parts of the initial question with detail. | 25 |  |  |
| Addressed all parts of the response post with detail. | 20 |  |  |
| Each post was completed in a substantial way by adding new information supported by reputable sources (course material and outside sources). | 20 |  |  |
| Demonstrated critical thinking regarding the concepts presented. Included deep analysis, comparisons, and understanding of the concepts. | 20 |  |  |
| ***Mechanics 15 Points Possible*** | **Points Possible** | **Points Earned** | **Comments** |
| Rules of grammar, usage and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. Sentences were complete, clear, concise, and error-free. | 15 |  |  |
| Completed by the due date?  -5 points each day late |  |  |  |
| ***Total Points*** | **100** |  |  |
| ***Final Grade*** | |  |  |

**Assignment Information:**

**Discussion 4**

Evidence Based Practice

Please refer to the California Evidence Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare [https://www.cebc4cw.org/ (Links to an external site.)](https://www.cebc4cw.org/) and links posted on Canvas to complete this discussion. The links and website will provide you with information about rating scales.

Step 1

For initial post, please choose one model which could be implemented in your field placement or in a social work setting/population that interests you (look under program registry on the website).

* Describe the model and rational for choosing this.
* Why do you think this model is or would be appropriate for your agency population?
* Using the ratings guide below, describe the rating.

[CEBC Scientific Rating Scale (Links to an external site.)](https://www.cebc4cw.org/files/OverviewOfTheCEBCScientificRatingScale.pdf)

* What types of scientific research has been done? (see the Relevant Published Peer Reviewed Research in the website).

*\*This website will give you more info about the various types of studies or research.*[*CBEC Types of Research Evidence (Links to an external site.)*](http://www.cebc4cw.org/files/CEBCTypesOfResearchEvidence.pdf)

Step 2

Please respond to at least one peer discussing helpful tips to implementing this model in their agency based on information from the website.

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C4 (V) Dimension**  **SW 700 Values and Assumptions Paper**  **(Content (85%) comprises EAA score)** |

**SOC WORK 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work**

**Social Work Values and Assumptions Paper**

**Purpose:** As a developing professional, you will likely encounter professional social work values that conflict with your personal beliefs and others that strongly support them. Professional expectations and client characteristics can present you with personal challenges, interpersonal conflicts, and sometimes serious ethical questions. Additionally, our political environment affects the lives of our clients. Based on this reality, this assignment requires you to explore the position of **two** of the 2020 presidential candidates and consider ways their positions may affect your clients in the future. This paper is worth 10% of the final course grade and is due in Canvas by 11:59 pm on **October** **4**.

**Knowledge:** This paper provides the opportunity to research multiple perspectives of an issue, including your own values. As such, this assignment helps measure student understanding of the impact of values as they relate to competencies one (demonstrate ethical and professional behavior) and four (engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice).

**Task**: Browse these chapters from *Social Work Speaks* that are posted on Canvas.

* Civil Liberties and Social Justice
* Cultural and Linguistic Competence in the Social Work Profession
* Economic Justice
* Environmental Policy
* Immigrants and Refugees
* International Policy on Human Rights
* Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Issues
* Peace and Social Justice
* Racism
* Role of Government Social Policy and Social Work
* Sovereignty Rights and the Well-Being of Indigenous Peoples

Select an issue you feel strongly about and/or wish to explore further. Your belief about the issue need not be consistent with social work’s position, but it must be a topic you can relate to the presidential candidates. This may be easier said than done. ***Think carefully and consider the likelihood of finding a legitimate media source that covers the candidates’ positions on the topic.*** If you cannot find the candidates’ positions on the topic (or a closely related issue), you will need to select another topic.

Write a 5-7 page paper that addresses each of the following parts (the title and reference pages are included as additional pages):

**Social Work Position**

Summarize, in your own words, the social work position articulated in *Social Work Speaks*; make sure you do not reveal whether or not you support the NASW position statement. This assignment is not asking you to summarize the chapter, rather to select a particular position NASW is advocating (e.g., you do not have to summarize the history, etc.). You may summarize a narrow portion of a policy if your opposing position only addresses part of the position (e.g., you may write simply about DACA rather than the entire immigration policy).

Provide an assessment of how this position supports clients, and specifically address what groups of clients may benefit the most from the position, along with who may benefit the least. Address dimensions of identity, including race, gender identity, sexual orientation, ability, socioeconomic status, etc. in your critique. Identify which of the core social work values provide the underpinning for the position.

**Candidates’ Positions**

Review credible mainstream media sources (e.g., local or national newspapers, cnn.com, nytimes.com; public debates) for coverage of **two** presidential candidates related to the issue you selected from Social Work Speaks. Select a minimum of one article/source per candidate.

Summarize, in your own words, each candidate’s position on the issue you selected. Make sure to tie the summaries explicitly to the article from *Social Work Speaks.* It is all right to select a portion of the source to summarize if the article covers a broad range of topics (e.g., you may write simply about about DACA rather than the entire immigration policy).

Provide a brief analysis of how each candidate’s position supports and/or opposes the position presented in *Social Work Speaks;* cite specific aspects of the position presented in *Social Work Speaks.* Remember, if you cannot locate materials about the candidates’ positions on the topic you initially selected, you will need to select a different topic for your final paper.

From your analysis and research, identify which candidate’s position will more positively benefit your future clients related to this issue and explain your rationale. Make sure to incorporate the *Code of Ethics* into your discussion, specifically information related to our commitment to clients.

Select 2 of the 6 core values of the social work profession that you think best pertain to this topic. Summarize the values and describe how they can help frame a macro-level social work response to your selected topic within the context of potential election outcomes. For example, if the candidates’ positions will help clients, how do the values suggest actions to support the position? If the candidates’ position may harm clients, what actions do the values suggest to counter that impact? **Submit a copy or provide a link to the sources you use for this section of the paper.**

**Your Personal Position**

Summarize your personal position on the issue and describe how you developed your position. Here you should discuss how your culture, upbringing, and personal experience shaped your value position.

Pretend you are working with a client who is struggling with the topic you selected, but whose views differ from your own. Describe how social work values and ethics will help guide your work with this client.

**Process Message**

After you have completed and submitted your paper, enter the Canvas Discussion entitled Values and Assumptions Process Message and craft a 1-2 paragraph process message. A process message is an informal message that is designed to help students think about what they are learning in the *process* of completing an assignment (beyond the content and rubric requirements). For this process message posting, describe your personal and/or professional insights during and/or after the completion of this assignment.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Values & Assumptions Paper (10% of grade)**  **Grading Rubric**  \*indicates portion of assignment used for EAA | | | |
| **Content** (80 Points Possible)\* | | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| **Social Work Position:** Ability to summarize objectively and present in organized and logical manner. | | /25 |  |
| **Candidates’ Positions**: Ability to summarize objectively and present in organized and logical manner. | | /30 |  |
| **Own Position:** | Personal position was summarized. A description of how the position was developed including a discussion around culture, upbringing and personal experiences was included. | /10 |  |
| Apparent effort and critical thinking applied to discussion of how social work values and ethics facilitate working with clients whose beliefs differ in selected topic area. | /10 |  |
| **Process Message:** | Included and thoughtfully prepared | /5 |  |
| **Mechanics** (20 Points Possible)  **(poor) 0—10 (excellent)** | | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| The paper, including the title page and reference page, followed APA formatting guidelines. Paper included Times New Roman font and was double spaced. Original works were attached and in-text citations were included following APA guidelines. | | /10 |  |
| Sentences were complete, clear, and concise. The paper was well-constructed and organized. An introduction, headings and conclusion were included. Sentence transitions were present and maintained the flow of thought. Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. | | /10 |  |
| **Submitted by the due date? -5 points each day late** | |  |  |
| **Total Score (100 possible)** | |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C4 (V) Dimension**  **SW 700 Values and Assumptions Paper**  **(Components comprising EAA score noted with “\*”)** |

**SOC WORK 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work**

**Social Work Values and Assumptions Paper**

**Purpose:** As a developing professional, you will likely encounter professional social work values that conflict with your personal beliefs and others that strongly support them. Professional expectations and client characteristics can present you with personal challenges, interpersonal conflicts, and sometimes serious ethical questions. Additionally, our political environment affects the lives of our clients. Based on this reality, this assignment requires you to explore the position of **two** of the 2020 presidential candidates and consider ways their positions may affect your clients in the future. This paper is worth 10% of the final course grade and is due in Canvas by 11:59 pm on **October** **4**.

**Knowledge:** This paper provides the opportunity to research multiple perspectives of an issue, including your own values. As such, this assignment helps measure student understanding of the impact of values as they relate to competencies one (demonstrate ethical and professional behavior) and four (engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice).

**Task**: Browse these chapters from *Social Work Speaks* that are posted on Canvas.

* Civil Liberties and Social Justice
* Cultural and Linguistic Competence in the Social Work Profession
* Economic Justice
* Environmental Policy
* Immigrants and Refugees
* International Policy on Human Rights
* Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Issues
* Peace and Social Justice
* Racism
* Role of Government Social Policy and Social Work
* Sovereignty Rights and the Well-Being of Indigenous Peoples

Select an issue you feel strongly about and/or wish to explore further. Your belief about the issue need not be consistent with social work’s position, but it must be a topic you can relate to the presidential candidates. This may be easier said than done. ***Think carefully and consider the likelihood of finding a legitimate media source that covers the candidates’ positions on the topic.*** If you cannot find the candidates’ positions on the topic (or a closely related issue), you will need to select another topic.

Write a 5-7 page paper that addresses each of the following parts (the title and reference pages are included as additional pages):

**Social Work Position**

Summarize, in your own words, the social work position articulated in *Social Work Speaks*; make sure you do not reveal whether or not you support the NASW position statement. This assignment is not asking you to summarize the chapter, rather to select a particular position NASW is advocating (e.g., you do not have to summarize the history, etc.). You may summarize a narrow portion of a policy if your opposing position only addresses part of the position (e.g., you may write simply about DACA rather than the entire immigration policy).

Provide an assessment of how this position supports clients, and specifically address what groups of clients may benefit the most from the position, along with who may benefit the least. Address dimensions of identity, including race, gender identity, sexual orientation, ability, socioeconomic status, etc. in your critique. Identify which of the core social work values provide the underpinning for the position.

**Candidates’ Positions**

Review credible mainstream media sources (e.g., local or national newspapers, cnn.com, nytimes.com; public debates) for coverage of **two** presidential candidates related to the issue you selected from Social Work Speaks. Select a minimum of one article/source per candidate.

Summarize, in your own words, each candidate’s position on the issue you selected. Make sure to tie the summaries explicitly to the article from *Social Work Speaks.* It is all right to select a portion of the source to summarize if the article covers a broad range of topics (e.g., you may write simply about about DACA rather than the entire immigration policy).

Provide a brief analysis of how each candidate’s position supports and/or opposes the position presented in *Social Work Speaks;* cite specific aspects of the position presented in *Social Work Speaks.* Remember, if you cannot locate materials about the candidates’ positions on the topic you initially selected, you will need to select a different topic for your final paper.

From your analysis and research, identify which candidate’s position will more positively benefit your future clients related to this issue and explain your rationale. Make sure to incorporate the *Code of Ethics* into your discussion, specifically information related to our commitment to clients.

Select 2 of the 6 core values of the social work profession that you think best pertain to this topic. Summarize the values and describe how they can help frame a macro-level social work response to your selected topic within the context of potential election outcomes. For example, if the candidates’ positions will help clients, how do the values suggest actions to support the position? If the candidates’ position may harm clients, what actions do the values suggest to counter that impact? **Submit a copy or provide a link to the sources you use for this section of the paper.**

**Your Personal Position**

Summarize your personal position on the issue and describe how you developed your position. Here you should discuss how your culture, upbringing, and personal experience shaped your value position.

Pretend you are working with a client who is struggling with the topic you selected, but whose views differ from your own. Describe how social work values and ethics will help guide your work with this client.

**Process Message**

After you have completed and submitted your paper, enter the Canvas Discussion entitled Values and Assumptions Process Message and craft a 1-2 paragraph process message. A process message is an informal message that is designed to help students think about what they are learning in the *process* of completing an assignment (beyond the content and rubric requirements). For this process message posting, describe your personal and/or professional insights during and/or after the completion of this assignment.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Values & Assumptions Paper (10% of grade)**  **Grading Rubric**  \*indicates portion of assignment used for EAA | | | |
| **Content** (80 Points Possible)\* | | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| **Social Work Position:** Ability to summarize objectively and present in organized and logical manner. | | /25 |  |
| **Candidates’ Positions**: Ability to summarize objectively and present in organized and logical manner. | | /30 |  |
| **Own Position:** | Personal position was summarized. A description of how the position was developed including a discussion around culture, upbringing and personal experiences was included. | /10 |  |
| Apparent effort and critical thinking applied to discussion of how social work values and ethics facilitate working with clients whose beliefs differ in selected topic area. | /10 |  |
| **Process Message:** | Included and thoughtfully prepared | /5 |  |
| **Mechanics** (20 Points Possible)  **(poor) 0—10 (excellent)** | | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| The paper, including the title page and reference page, followed APA formatting guidelines. Paper included Times New Roman font and was double spaced. Original works were attached and in-text citations were included following APA guidelines. | | /10 |  |
| Sentences were complete, clear, and concise. The paper was well-constructed and organized. An introduction, headings and conclusion were included. Sentence transitions were present and maintained the flow of thought. Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. | | /10 |  |
| **Submitted by the due date? -5 points each day late** | |  |  |
| **Total Score (100 possible)** | |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C5 (K) Dimension and C5 (S) Dimension**  **SW 711 Policy Paper or Video**  **(Entire assignment before deductions comprises EAA score.)** |

**SW 711: Foundations of Social Welfare**

**Policy Analysis Paper/Video**

**Due: Per assignment schedule, last Thursday of semester**

**Purpose of Assignment**: As can be seen through the information noted below, this assignment is a capstone assignment for SW 711. The key demonstration of learning for this project relates to policy analysis. The paper or video allows students to demonstrate understanding of the dimensions of policy practice and advocacy on behalf of social justice. This assignment is used as an embedded assignment for the MSW program in the domain of knowledge for knowledge and skills for *Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice* as well as *Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice*, and knowledge domain of research in practice, *Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice*. *Competency 2: Engaging Diversity and Difference in Practice* is also assessed (knowledge). The assignment, in part, assesses student mastery of the following course objectives:

(3) Articulate the process of public policy formation in the United States.

(4) Assess the impact of social policy on diverse populations including but not limited to children and families, applying knowledge of the patterns, dynamics, and consequences of discrimination, economic deprivation, and oppression.

(5) Analyze social policy using a framework that considers the content of historical and contemporary factors that shape policy and applies the principles of social and economic justice.

To be an effective social worker, students must demonstrate aptitude in the nine competencies outlined by the Council on Social Work Education. The ability to successfully integrate research policy practice and advocacy for human rights will promote social justice for those served within your practice setting.

*Competency 2* indicates that students understand (knowledge) the different dimensions of diversity and concepts of intersectionality and recognize how diversity and difference shape life experiences in practice at the mezzo and macro levels.

*Competency 3* outlines the need to apply understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels (knowledge); and engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice (skills).

*Competency 4* requires students understand that understand evidence informs practice and be able to use and translate that research evidence to inform and improve policy practice (knowledge).

*Competency* 5 indicates that human rights and social justice are mediated by policy development across all levels of practice, micro, mezzo, and macro (knowledge). Students must demonstrate the ability to assess how social welfare and economic policies impact delivery of services and apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice (skills).

**Task:** Students have the option to produce a paper or a video of a social welfare policy and program. The paper/video must address population, problem, policy, and program using a research based rationale while also applying social work values and ethical principles. The paper/video must address:

* 1. Policy: Information should include wording, its inception, any revisions or additions. Discussion of policy should include points (a) – (c) below and give a good representation of the underlying perspectives and philosophies regarding the policy. (The linkage between definition and policy should be clear). This information would include using a policy analysis framework as a foundation.
  2. Population: Thoroughly describe the population the policy seeks to serve. What does the literature say about this population? Are there other state or local policies that seek to meet the needs of this population?
  3. Problem: Thoroughly describe the problem that the policy seeks to address. What does the literature say about this problem? How has this problem been historically addressed? [Note: there is some overlap between population, and problem; goal in separating the two is to help you think about the person as separate from the problem consistent with social work values.]
  4. Program: Any programs that have evolved as a direct result of the policy must be addressed thoroughly in the paper/video. Fiscal or other social advantages/disadvantages, benefits or costs of the program should be outlined.
  5. Social Policy Analysis: Use one of the frameworks outlined in the text chapter 3 when discussing the outcome of the policy. For example, an implementation analysis could be applied when evaluating how the policy was developed and implemented; or an impact appraisal would evaluate the outcome of the policy itself.
  6. Social Justice Framework: Discussion of components above are inclusive of discussion of social work ethical principles and obligations under the *Code of Ethics*. Include discussion of any likely or existing mechanisms of privilege, oppression, and discrimination regarding the policy and program described. Figure1.1 and fair process principles could be used in outlining social justice.
  7. Conclusion and Call to Action: Considering all of the factors listed above, the conclusion to the paper should articulate a call to action for social workers. What efforts should social workers do to improve the policy, reduce negative impacts on the population, or program modifications?

**Criteria for success:** The assignment is designed to assess understanding of policy analysis. Being clear in which approach you are using to evaluate the policy (and any programs that developed from it). This assignment requires research beyond the existing course materials. Whether preparing the assignment as a written paper or visually as a video, credit must be given to sources used through the body of the work and demonstrate research from multiple peer reviewed or government sources. If using web sources, look for those ending in gov or edu. If other sources are used, research validity of the information before including.

*Papers*: All papers should follow APA format including references and citations. Paper requires cover page but no abstract or running head. Students should write clearly, covering all of the required components. As with any paper, introduction and conclusion sections should frame the discussion. There are no defined page parameters as some students are able to express their thoughts more concisely; quality is valued over quantity. Papers will be evaluated using the rubric that follows.

*Videos*: Videos using any video medium desired. Correctly submitted, the viewer should be able to progress through the video without need to interact other than to open the file. In most cases, the video should have visual and audio components. Creativity is encouraged. Credit should be given to sources throughout the video. In addition to the video, students completing this option must upload an APA formatted reference list. Videos will be evaluated using the rubric that follows.

Grading Rubric (\*entire assignment is used for EAA, excluding deductions)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading Criteria** | | | | | | **Points Earned** |
| **Needs Improvement** | **Acceptable** | **Above Average** | | **Exceptional** | |
| **Population and Problem Identification** | | | | | | |
| Less than 21 | 21 | | 23 | | 25 |  |
| Brief outline of population or problem; either component not fully defined. | Population and Problem presented with limited support but clearly identified | | Clearly identified population and problem, supported with statistics | | Clearly identified problem, supported with statistics. Historical dimensions explained |  |
| **Connection to Social Justice Perspectives** | | | | | | |
| Less than 21 | 21 | | 23 | | 25 |  |
| Social Justice implications inferred in the narrative but not specifically outlined. Does not address privilege, oppression, or discrimination clearly | Social justice perspective outlined clearly and applied correctly; Includes accurate discussion of privilege, oppression, or discrimination | | Detailed social justice perspective outlined and applied correctly; Includes accurate discussion of at least two of privilege, oppression, or discrimination | | Detailed social justice perspective outlined and applied correctly; Includes accurate discussion of the intersection of privilege, oppression, or discrimination |  |
| **Policy/Program Analysis** | | | | | | |
| Less than 25 | 25 | | 28 | | 30 |  |
| Outline of policy without specific program connections | Clear and complete policy and program analysis; discussion of method of evaluation used inferred or minimally outlined. Able to identify needed change in policy | | Program and Policy analyzed clearly using methods outlined in the text; application is accurate and fully considers impact on vulnerable populations. Needed changes with a strategy for addressing outlined. | | Program and Policy analyzed clearly using methods outlined in the text; application is accurate and considers supporting and opposing viewpoints. Strategy for social change is outlined and articulates connection to social work’s value orientation and ethical principles. |  |
| **Research Evidence** | | | | | | |
| Less than 16.5 | 16.5 | | 18 | | 20 |  |
| Lacks adequate research support for conclusions within the paper/video | Research supports conclusions and comes from reputable sources.  Connects research to topic of discussion | | Research supports conclusions and comes from reputable sources.  Connects research to topic of discussion beyond simple reporting of the findings. Call to action supported with evidence. | | Broad range of evidence noted from multiple perspectives. Able to synthesize the different perspectives to represent a full picture of policy/program issues. Strong research connection to call to action |  |
| **Total Points Earned (100 possible)** | | | | | |  |
| **Quality of work** | | | | | |  |
| **Paper:** APA format, typed in 12-point, Times New Roman font; is double-spaced with 1-inch margins; uses headings cover page, page numbers. References and in-text citations. Free from typographical, grammatical and spelling errors; and is devoid of slang and figures of speech. | | | | | Up to 10 point deduction |  |
| **Video:** (1) Submission as a video; (2) Audio and Visual clear; information presented paced well and flows naturally to assist viewer in understanding the topic. Sources cited throughout the presentation. Free from typographical, grammatical and spelling errors; and is devoid of slang and figures of speech. Reference page [Required as separate document] formatted using APA guidelines. | | | | | Up to 10 point deduction each point (1) & (2) |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C5 (V) Dimension**  **SW 711 Exam**  **(Assignment before deductions comprises EAA score.)** |

**SW 711: Foundation of Social Welfare**

**Exam**

This assignment is designed as an embed assessment for the MSW Program examining the values domain for *Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice*. Social workers understand the history and current structures impacts on vulnerable populations and advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exam** (\*entire exam is used for EAA, excluding deductions) | | | | |
| Needs Improvement | Satisfactory/Meets Expectations | Above Expectations | Exceptional | Points Earned |
| Demonstrates Understanding of Concepts | | | |  |
| Less than 24.9 | 24.9 – 26.3 | 26.4 – 28.1 | 28.2 - 30 |  |
| Discussion not relevant to topic, lacks clear connection to the module. Unable to ascertain understanding of concepts. | Application of topic of discussion but with some errors in understanding. Response demonstrates a minimal level of knowledge | Accurate relating of concepts to discussion topic. Writing shows clarity of understanding content of the module | Accurately incorporates concepts with additional supporting reflection or connects to materials from earlier course modules |
| Application to Social Work Practice | | | |  |
| Less than 24.9 | 24.9 – 26.3 | 26.4 – 28.1 | 28.2 - 30 |  |
|  | Considers how policies and history impact argument as a  professional | Clearly outlines how policies and history impact argument as a  Professional; Clear connection to social work ethics and competencies | Synthesis of policies and history impact argument as a  Professional; Clear connection to social work ethics, standards and competencies |  |
| Synthesis/Critical Thinking | | | |  |
| Less than 29 | 29. – 30.7 | 30.8 - 32.8 | 32.9 - 35 |  |
| Reports without integrating information across concepts. | Presents opinions supported by additional course materials | Accurately applies concepts to the topic of discussion beyond personal opinion. Opinions supported by course materials.. | Evaluates/  Analyzes concepts from multiple perspectives; accurately  Synthesizes course information in rationale. |
| **Total Score (Points Possible = 100)** | | | |  |
| Deductions | | | |  |
| Writing Quality: Writing Quality (multiple errors in spelling, grammar use) or lacks appropriate citations | | Subtract up to 10 points | |  |
| Timeliness of Submission | | Subtract 10 points | |  |
| **Adjusted Score (Total less Deductions)** | | | |  |

Exam:

Essay exam responds to the sole question below:

**As a social worker, I contend that oppression is not inevitable, and a just society is achievable. True or False?**

In your response:

State your position and argue your response accordingly with critical thought. Apply reference to your readings, discussions, and other course materials. Apply reference applicable to EPAS Nine Core Competencies of Social Work Education, the NASW Social Work Code of Ethics, and UN Declaration of Human Rights.

Present a professional argument defending your position with the material noted above, along with any professionally applicable experience relating to the defense of your position and response. Stay away from emotionally charged assumptions and personal statements not backed by critical thought and defendable argument.

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C6 – C9 (K) Dimension**  **SW 704 Community Assessment**  **(Assignment before deductions comprises EAA score.)** |

**SOC WORK 704: Gen Practice II**

**Community Assessment Grading Rubric** (\*indicates portion of assignment for EAA)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Full marks** | **Points earned** | **Comments** |
| \*Problem description:  Issue/problem is clearly stated and described comprehensively. | 2 |  |  |
| \*Population:  The writing demonstrates that the student has a thorough knowledge of the population to provide a well -balanced assessment of the population characteristics using critical thinking and analytical skills. |  |  |  |
| \*Community Characteristics: The writing reflects critical and thoughtful assessment of community’s internal characteristics-based variables identified in the *Framework for Assessing a Community* in Netting, et al., (2017). Review Chapter 6. | 5 |  |  |
| \*Community Structure:  The writing reflects critical and thoughtful assessment of community’s internal structure. Variables are identified in the *Framework for Assessing a Community* in Netting, et al., (2017). Review Chapter | 5 |  |  |
| Writing:  Writing is clear and concise, and fluid without spelling and grammatical errors. Appropriate literature is cited and referenced following APA 7th style. No more than 10 pages (not including the cover page, reference page/s) | 3 |  |  |
| **Total Points** | **20** |  |  |

**Knowledge and Skills**: This assignment provides students the opportunity effectively work provide communities (3, 6, 7, 8, 9)

**Knowledge**

**Objective** 1: Apply the change process within macro-level practice.

Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

**Skills**

Objective 2: Outline social work strategies for advocacy efforts with groups, organizations, and communities.

Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C6 – C9 (S) Dimension**  **SW 702 Generalist Practice Video and Assessment**  **(Components comprising EAA score noted with “\*”)** |

**Guidelines for Videotaped Demonstration of Skills**

**and Discussion**

This demonstration of skill attainment will have **two parts**: a videotaped enactment of an interview with a ‘client’ and a small group discussion in Canvas.

**Plan the interview:**

1. Make arrangements for the structure of the video according to needs and comfort level (in-person vs virtual recording). Assure there are no distractions during recording and also assure audio quality is good.

2. Arrange with an acquaintance to role-play a 10-minute interview, with you as the interviewer. You will use the **Informed Consent for Video Recording** document, explaining the purpose of the interview and how the video will be used in the class and by the instructor. Use only adults (over age 18) for this video. The individual must be capable of giving informed consent. NOTE: This document is to be turned in on the video due date.

3. Be sure **your appearance** in the video is consistent with the context of your service setting. This includes wardrobe, posture, etc.

4. The **situation enacted may be fictitious or real.** Use situations that are not obviously controversial or intensely personal. The idea is to demonstrate interviewing skills in action, not to show how to work with a very complex situation or with a challenging ‘client’. Plan the specifics of the character, such as their age, the issue to be addressed, and the purpose of the interview. However, do not script the session’s dialogue. Be sure to include one diversity difference between the interviewer and the client, which must be addressed during the video session.

5. The interview must depict **Engagement and Assessment** **skills** outlined in the rubric.

**Plan the Discussion:**

Students are randomly assigned small groups of 5-6 in Canvas under **Discussions>Video Discussion**. Once you find your group please upload your video into Canvas by 11/30 at 11:59 pm under your assigned group (these can be found under people and in our Canvas discussion).

* The first part of the discussion is self-reflection on the process addressing the following questions:

1. What is your opinion of your strengths in the interview with your client?
2. What was the most challenging aspect of this interview? How did you address this challenge?
3. What did you learn from the role-play? How might this experience impact your work with future clients?

* The second part of the discussion includes watching four videos in your small group and providing feedback for each. Please include two strengths and one area for improvement as you reflect on each video. Due Monday 12/7 at 11:59 pm

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Final Video (30% of grade)**  **Grading Rubric**  **\*Indicates portion of assignment used for EAA** | | | | |
|  | | | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| **Engagement \*** | Interview reflects listening and attending skills with the client   * Eye Contact * Vocal Quality * Body Language | | /2 |  |
| Addressed diversity differences and confidentiality | | /2 |  |
| Interview includes questions (closed and open) asked to the client | | /3 |  |
| Interview includes encouraging (single word responses, head nods) paraphrasing (clarification) and summarizing (at least one summary is included) | | /3 |  |
| Interview includes reflection of feelings | | /2 |  |
| **Assessment \*** | Identified strengths | | /2 |  |
| Discussed goals and objectives, encouraging the client to establish these | | /3 |  |
| Video demonstrated visual and audio quality | | | /1 |  |
| Video was 8-12 minutes long | | | /1 |  |
| Submitted signed consent form on the video due date | | | /1 |  |
| **Video Discussion \* (In Canvas)** | | **Self-analysis** addressing the following questions:   1. What is your opinion of your strengths in the interview with your client? 2. What was the most challenging aspect of this interview? How did you address this challenge? 3. What did you learn from the role-play? How might this experience impact your work with future clients? | /3 |  |
| **Feedback to Peers:** Watched four videos. Included feedback to four group members outlining two strengths and one area for improvement for each. | /7 |  |
| **Submitted by the due date? -5 points each day late** | | |  |  |
| **Total Score (30 possible)** | | |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C6 – C9 (V) Dimension**  **SW 700 Multicultural Paper**  **(Components comprising EAA score noted with “\*”)** |

**Social Work 700: Gateway to the Profession of Social Work**

**Multicultural Practice Paper**

**Purpose:** The purpose of the assignment is to help students recognize the importance of values as they relate to the change process (i.e., competencies six, seven, eight, and nine.) This paper has two parts: the first is about you as a self-aware, diverse, multicultural individual. The second is about how you would manage client diversity factors in your professional life.

**Knowledge and Skills:** This assignment focuses on multicultural knowledge and developing skills to manage differences between oneself and one’s clients. Culture, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, spirituality, religion, life stage, family of origin, ability, disability, and trauma are key diversity factors. Each of these constitutes a difference from others. Some differences can be directly seen or heard (observable), while others are revealed through transactions. Both the observer and the observed develop coping strategies to manage daily interactions between self and other. This approach builds upon the concept of cultural humility discussed earlier in the semester.

To practice cultural humility is to maintain a willingness to suspend what you know, or what you think you know, about a person based on generalizations about their culture. Rather, what you learn about your clients’ culture stems from being open to what they themselves have determined is their personal expression of their heritage and culture (Moncho, 2013, para 4).

**Task:** This assignment asks you to use the **RESPECTFUL** model (Ivey, D’Andrea, Ivey & Simek-Morgan, 2001) to identify your own diversity and multicultural being.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **R** | Religion/spirituality |
| **E** | Economic/class background |
| **S** | Sexual orientation and/or gender identity |
| **P** | Personal style and education |
| **E** | Ethnic/racial identity |
| **C** | Chronological/lifespan challenges |
| **T** | Trauma |
| **F** | Family background |
| **U** | Unique physical characteristics |
| **L** | Location of residence & language differences |

1. Choose three identities from the model that you believe have had the most profound influences on your character, sense of self, and worldview (how you see humanity). In narrative form, explain how these identities have forged the lens through which you view the world. How have they shaped your personal preferences, values, and biases? Describe a real or existential challenge that you have experienced due to each of these three diversity factors.

2. Provide two examples of identities from the **RESPECTFUL** model that another person might have which would be most challenging for you to work with in a social worker/client relationship. Reflect on challenges that would occur at each step in the change process (engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation). Explain why these identities would be challenging for you in each step and how you would manage your biases.

Using APA format, write a 5-7 page paper that addresses each section found in the rubric (excluding the cover page and reference page). Please be sure to cite the Ivey, Ivey & Simek-Morgan and Moncho readings as well as the NASW Code of Ethics at least once. Include a cover page, an introduction, a conclusion, headings, and a reference page. This paper is worth 10% of the final course grade and is due in Canvas by 11:59 pm on **Sunday, October 11, 2020**.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Multicultural Paper (10% of grade)**  **Grading Rubric**  \*indicates portion of assignment for EAA | | | |
| **Content** (80 Points Possible) | | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| **Personal Diversity Factors** | At least three diversity factors were addressed. A clear description of impact on character, sense of self, worldview, personal preference, values, and biases explained. | /15 |  |
| Clearly described a challenge experienced due to **each** of these diversity factors. | /15 |  |
| **Identities in Others\*** | At least two examples of potential challenging diversity experiences in professional practice were identified. Described challenges in **each** step of the change process (engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation). An explanation around why these are challenges was included. | /15 |  |
| Clearly explained how to manage personal bias for each challenging diversity experience. | /15 |  |
| Demonstrated deep understanding of concepts and applied critical thinking throughout the paper. | | /10 |  |
| Used citations from the reading and NASW Code of Ethics. | | /10 |  |
| **Mechanics** (20 Points Possible)  **(poor) 0—10 (excellent)** | | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| The paper was 5-7 pages. The paper, including the title page and reference page, followed APA formatting guidelines. Paper included Times New Roman font and was double-spaced. Citations of original works were included including in-text citations following APA guidelines. | | /10 |  |
| Sentences were complete, clear, and concise. The paper was well-constructed and organized. An introduction, headings, and conclusion were included. Sentence transitions were present and maintained the flow of thought. Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. | | /10 |  |
| **Submitted by the due date? -5 points each day late** | |  |  |
| **Total Score (100 possible)** | |  |  |
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| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C6 (K) Dimension**  **SW 702 Case Study 1**  **(Entire Assignment comprises EAA score)** |

**Case Study:**

**Part 1: Social Work Practice Perspectives**

Things had been tough for Niki Lindstrom most of her life. Not long ago, Niki’s mother Marie had kicked her out when she found out that the 17-year-old was pregnant. Marie even forbade Niki’s 15-year-old sister Liza to have any contact with Niki. Niki hadn’t heard from her own father Mark since her parents’ divorce 8 years before. To complicate things, Niki had lost contact with most of her friends when she left high school and completed her GED. With her mother’s edict to move out and no other support from friends or family, Niki felt she had no alternative except to move into her own apartment.

A few months after the move, Jared was born. Caring for an infant, Niki found herself even more isolated and lonely. It was only natural that she would begin to depend more and more emotionally on 22-year-old Andrew. After all, Andrew was Jared’s father! Sometimes during his frequent visits, Andrew was loving and helpful, leaving Niki hopeful that things might work out between them. Other times, Andrew seemed angry and demanding. Niki recalls her “mixed feelings” when Andrew informed her that he had decided to move in, but she felt the decision was out of her hands.

Despite Niki’s attempts to please Andrew, the relationship deteriorated quickly as Andrew smoked crack more frequently. Andrew’s crack habit led to unpredictable outbursts of anger and paranoia—times during which Andrew would belittle Niki, criticize her mothering, and accuse her of being unfaithful to him. Andrew would also bully her into giving him money, money from Niki’s TANF benefits that she was trying to stretch to meet household expenses. Niki grew increasingly depressed as the bills piled up and Andrew’s behavior remained erratic. She felt powerless and increasingly hopeless.

It was only a public service announcement on TV, but it launched Niki into a whole new direction. She had never really seen herself as an abuse victim before—after all, Andrew had never actually hit her, even though he had threatened to at times. But as the people on the TV described the symptoms of an abusive relationship, Niki could actually feel what they were saying. She was experiencing the recurring cycle of control and abuse that trapped her with Andrew. That day, Niki called the Family Violence Prevention & Advocacy Program and talked with social worker Sandy Weber.

Talking with Sandy helped Niki to clarify her thinking about the situation with Andrew. Niki concluded that she needed to get away from him. She also felt afraid about doing so, wondering how Andrew might respond. This dilemma was something that Sandy Weber had seen before, and she carefully helped Niki consider her ambivalent thoughts and feelings about the situation. Sandy also shared relevant legal information and described community services that might be able to provide assistance to someone in Niki’s situation.

Together, Niki and Sandy developed a plan to maximize Niki’s feelings of safety and give her support as she left Andrew. Sandy accompanied Niki to the courthouse to get a no-contact order. She provided transportation, direct assistance, and police protection to help Niki safely pack up items that she and Jared would need after leaving the apartment. Sandy also arranged for Niki to stay at an emergency shelter run by the Family Violence Prevention & Advocacy Program. The move out of her own apartment gave Niki the chance to break the pattern of Andrew dropping over at will, to prevent Andrew’s extortion of money from her, and to ensure Niki’s safety as she extricated herself from the relationship. Niki remained at the shelter until an apartment in one of Northside’s transitional housing programs, the Transit Program, became available.

That was 4 months ago, and things had gotten better for 19-year-old Niki ever since. Her individual consultations with Transit Program social worker Evelyn Mackey had helped Niki feel good about herself again. She had changed from thinking about herself as a victim and began to experience the new identity of “survivor.” What Evelyn said was true. Niki had taken charge to resolve her situation with Andrew. It reinforced what Niki had already learned about herself from her achievements at school—she was a smart woman who was coping with her situation rather than becoming a victim of it. Evelyn Mackey had also connected Niki to an academic counselor to discuss plans for continuing her education and arranged child care while Niki attended her various appointments. From Evelyn, Niki was also learning about proper nutrition for Jared and had picked up some new skills in parenting.

As part of the Transit Program, Niki met weekly with other women in a support group that Evelyn Mackey facilitated. During these meetings, Niki began to see herself differently. She experienced how her situation was not unique but similar to other women. Each woman in the group shared stories of oppression in intimate relationships complicated by limited opportunities in employment, low wages, and short-circuited educational attainment. Niki saw the need to take care of her own needs emotionally and financially to avoid falling back into another dependent relationship, such as her life with Andrew.

As a result of her discussions with the academic counselor, Niki applied to school to become a registered nurse (RN), a position with job opportunities, mobility, and a decent salary. Her acceptance to nursing school had arrived the same day as a scheduled meeting with her TANF worker. Niki had found out that she could start the RN program in 2 months. However, when Niki discussed her educational plans at the meeting, the TANF worker patiently explained that the state no longer saw itself as a “scholarship program.” Going to school was fine, but first and foremost, Niki needed to get a job. Obtaining employment had to happen quickly because Niki’s benefits would be coming to an end. The TANF worker suggested it might be more realistic for Niki to enroll in a certification program to become a Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA)—a 10-week program that Niki could even complete on-line. Despite Niki’s protests, the TANF worker simply repeated that “policy is policy, and you need to get a job.” The worker wrapped up the meeting by informing Niki that she was being referred to the Northside Employment and Training Program (NET) for assistance in gaining immediate employment.

The appointment with the TANF worker left Niki angry. A job as a CNA would not hold the benefits that a position as an RN promised. Working enough hours to pay for nursing school on her own while also caring for Jared could make it impossible to succeed in school. She shared her frustration with other support-group members. They agreed it was just another way that the system worked to get in your way rather than actually help you become self-sufficient. Niki was a “welfare mother,” an identity that stigmatized her and left her trapped in a vicious cycle of poverty and dependence. She felt determined to assert her opinion when she met with the counselor at the employment program.

Niki was initially thrown off balance when she met NET counselor Gabe Thomas. How possibly could this man—a middle-aged African American social worker dressed in a coat and tie—ever understand her, a young Caucasian mother who was young enough to be his daughter?

**Questions for Part 1**

**Referencing the text and the NASW Code of Ethics, information from class, and our readings, use critical thinking processes to respond to the following prompts.**

1. Apply the *ecosystems perspective* to describe Niki’s situation at the time of her emotional abuse by Andrew. Using the household of Niki and her son Jared as the focal system, describe what is happening inside this system, how this system is relating to its environment, and how it is progressing through time.

2. Focus on Niki’s situation at the present time. What has changed since she entered the Transit program? Explain these changes in terms of empowerment. Consider personal, interpersonal and sociopolitical dimensions of empowerment. Which situations have increased Niki’s senses of power, control and self-efficacy?

3. The strengths perspective recognized that all people have strengths and resources. How are these evident in Niki’s life?

4. The core values of “human dignity and worth” and “social justice” guide all social work practice. Apply these value concepts to consider the policy that will pay for Niki to become a CNA but not fund her efforts to become an RN**.**

5. Analyze the cultural characteristics of the upcoming relationship between Niki and the NET counselor Gabe Thomas. What elements may inhibit the development of a productive partnership? What aspects of an empowering approach to social work practice will facilitate the successful accomplishment of their work together?

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C7 (K) Dimension**  **SW 702 Case Study 2**  **(Entire Assignment comprises EAA score)** |

**Case Study:**

**Part 2: The Dialogue Phase:**

**Building Relationships and Assessing Challenges**

Although Niki Lindstrom was prepared to give Gabe Thomas a “piece of her mind” about the unfairness of the system in which she felt trapped, Gabe’s wide smile and friendly demeanor softened her attitude. Gabe began the meeting by describing who he was, the purpose of the NET Program, and Niki’s rights and responsibilities as a participant. Gabe explained that it was his task to guide Niki toward self-sufficiency to prepare her for the termination of her TANF benefits, which would occur 6 months from now.

The NET Program could offer counseling support, planning, referral services, child care assistance, and funds for short-term training. As Gabe explained, Niki didn’t actually have to cooperate with him—she could find her own means of support. But if Niki refused to cooperate with NET or find a job on her own, Gabe would be obligated to report this to her TANF worker, an action that could result in an immediate reduction of benefits. Although Gabe’s work with Niki would be “pretty much confidential,” Niki’s TANF caseworker would have open access to all information exchanged and any case records kept during the process of working with Gabe.

Gabe’s remark “Do you have any questions about what we are doing here today?” shifted the focus of the conversation to Niki.

*Niki:* Let me get this right. What you are saying is that you are cutting off my benefits. I have to get a job either through you or on my own.

*Gabe:* Basically that’s it. The goal is to move you from TANF assistance to a work situation where you will no longer need financial support.

*Niki:* Do I have anything to say about this?

*Gabe:* About what part specifically?

*Niki:* About you cutting off my benefits?

*Gabe:* The policy limits the time you can collect benefits. The goal is to move you toward self-sufficiency through work.

*Niki:* Just like that—you’re going to cut me off—just when I was starting to pull my life together.

*Gabe:* Pulling your life together?

*Niki:* Yes! Before you and your policy so rudely interrupted, I was accepted and about ready to go to nursing school. I want to be an RN.

*Gabe:* Congratulations on getting into nursing school. That’s a big step toward self-sufficiency. Tell me more about your plan.

*Niki:* My “plan,” as you put it, was to keep getting assistance until I get my nursing license, get a decent-paying job, and then get you people off my back once and for all.

*Gabe:* Seems like you and I have the same goal.

*Niki:* Not exactly. I want to be an RN, but my caseworker already told me that I should think about getting training to be a CNA.

*Gabe:* That’s true—there are no NET funds available for nursing school nor will your benefits last long enough for you to complete training to be an RN. It’s also true that we recommend short-term vocational training that results in quicker employment, such as the CNA program. But, I’m hearing that you’re not interested in certification as a CNA.

*Niki:* You’ve got that right. I don’t want to be stuck as a CNA for the rest of my life.

*Gabe:* Becoming a CNA feels more like a dead end to you than a career opportunity.

*Niki:* Like my opinion really matters. You’re going to tell me that’s the only choice I’ve got.

*Gabe:* Seems like you’re feeling somewhat powerless to make your own decisions. But let me clarify that I’m not here to tell you what to do. That choice is yours. I’m here to discuss options that the NET program offers to see if there is any way that we can help you get where you want to go. And from what I’ve heard so far, you want to go to nursing school to be an RN.

*Niki:* Right! So how can you help me?

*Gabe:* What kind of help do you need?

*Niki:* Right now I have a decent place to live and someone to take care of my son Jared.

*Gabe:* So, you’ve got housing and child care covered.

*Niki:* What I need is a regular income for a couple of more years and some money for nursing school. It’ll take me that long to get through the RN program and by that time, you can cut off my benefits. I know I’d make a great nurse. Couldn’t you people bend the rules a little?

*Gabe:* I’m not really in a position to bend the rules, but that might not be the only way for you to get what you want. Let me make sure I’m understanding you. You have a clear direction—to become an RN. You’ve been accepted into a nursing program. You have housing and someone to take care of Jared. And what you want from me is to help you figure out a way that you can afford to get through nursing school.

*Niki:* You’ve got it. Where do we go from here?

**Questions for Part 2**

**Referencing the text and the NASW Code of Ethics and other assigned readings, use critical thinking processes to respond to the following prompts.**

1. Social worker/client relationships combine professional and personal qualities.

A. Identify the ways in which Gabe negotiates a professional partnership.

B. What contributes to the personal side of the relationship?

2. The case example does not address the cultural differences that are present in the partnership between Niki Lindstrom and Gabe Thomas.

A. Should these differences be addressed? If so, when and how?

B. Are there any ways in which Niki and Gabe are culturally similar?

3. To discuss an issue from a “challenge” rather than a “problem” perspective, workers implement a three-pronged approach to define: (1) what is currently happening, (2) where the client wants to go, and (3) what strengths and resources are available to get there. Analyze the dialogue between Niki and Gabe to identify these three elements. What methods does Gabe used to steer the dialogue in this way?

4. Empowering social work dialogue maintains a responding rather than initiating stance. Identify three responses from the response continuum (as described in Chapter 7) that Gabe uses to leave Niki in charge of the direction of the conversation.

5. Through dialogue social workers validate feelings as well as clarify what clients are saying. Note an example in which Gabe identifies and accepts what Niki is feeling.

6. Niki’s participation with the NET program is involuntary, which may lead her to resist Gabe’s efforts. What actions does Gabe take to build a more collaborative working relationship and move away from a resistant style of interaction? What is the key to maintaining Niki’s motivation to work toward the mandated goal of economic self-sufficiency?

7. Social work values, principles and standards are evident in effective social work practice. Examine the dialogue to identify examples of the principles of acceptance, individuation, non-judgmentalism, objectivity, self-determination, and confidentiality.

8. A key component in the initial dialogue between worker and client is to establish a mutual direction. Clearly state the direction that Niki and Gabe establish to guide the upcoming work.

\*Entire assignment used for EAA

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C8 (K) Dimension**  **SW 702 Case Study 3**  **(Entire Assignment comprises EAA score)** |

**Case Study:**

**Part 3: The Discovery Phase:**

**Assessing, Analyzing, and Planning**

*Gabe Thomas:* You want to know where we go from here? Well, it seems to me that we are at the point of deciding how we can get you through nursing school. We are stuck with two roadblocks, though—you only have a maximum of 6 months of eligibility left on TANF, and the NET program has no funding for becoming an RN. But, as my mother always says “there’s more than one way to get to heaven.”

*Niki Lindstrom:* OK. What should I do?

*Gabe:* I’m not exactly sure, but I’m wondering if you’d feel comfortable telling me some more about your situation to see what plan we can develop that is a good fit for you.

*Niki*: What do you need to know?

*Gabe:* Let’s start with the things about you that you think are important for me to know.

Niki began to relate her story. She described her relationship with Jerome, the unexpected pregnancy, her estrangement from her parents, and the birth of Jared. Gabe encouraged her sharing through his attentive posture, selective responses, and accepting tone. Niki grew visibly depressed as she described the problems with Jerome. Gabe’s response of “Why did you stay with him for so long?” brought Niki’s anger and resistance to the forefront. Gabe was reminded by Niki’s response that “why questions” frequently activate a client’s resistance, reorienting him to examine instead how Niki survived and where she intended to go from here.

*Niki:* Are you saying that I should have done something different? I had Jared to think about, you know. I had no one to turn to, nowhere to go.

*Gabe:* I see what you mean—must have been tough to feel trapped in the relationship with Jerome out of your love for Jared. Where did you find the strength to endure that situation?

*Niki:* I knew I was better than that. At first, I thought that Jerome would change, but later I started to plan my own way out. I would have gotten rid of him eventually I think, but when I saw that ad, it moved my plans up.

*Gabe:* How were you able to get out?

Niki relaxed again as she continued her story of the involvement with Sandy Weber at the Family Violence Prevention & Advocacy Program, staying at the shelter, her move into the Transit program, the help that Evelyn Mackey had been, and how much she benefited from the support group. Gabe’s enthusiastic responses showed that he was genuinely impressed.

*Gabe:* I see that you’re right! You certainly do deserve better than you were getting with Jerome. And it seems like you’re on the way toward getting it. You have a lot of personal strengths, and you seem to be building a strong base of social support. I’d like to look more carefully at that support if you don’t mind.

*Niki:* What do you mean?

*Gabe:* I’d like to draw a genogram and eco-map.

*Niki:* I don’t know what you’re talking about.

*Gabe:* Genograms and eco-maps are diagrams that illustrate information about your life. A genogram looks at family relationships. An eco-map looks at relationships you have with other people, social services, and environmental resources. It might help us to identify what in your life can help you reach your goals and also target roadblocks that might get in the way.

*Niki:* OK. Go for it.

Gabe rose from his chair and moved to a marker board that hung in his office. He began with the genogram, carefully discussing each member of Niki’s family, including her parents, sister, Jared, and even Jerome. As he learned about Niki’s family, Gabe drew them out on the board. He concluded the genogram by drawing a circle around Niki and Jared before seeking information to complete the eco-map that would describe Niki’s relationships with other people and systems outside of this two-person household.

Niki found herself more and more intrigued with this process. Although the diagrams contained only information with which she was very familiar, looking at them in this way gave her a new perspective. She felt lonely when she saw her lack of familial support as indicated by the genogram. But she was comforted by the eco-map showing her current connections to Evelyn Mackey, her support group, and other resources available to her via the Transit program.

With the genogram and eco-map complete, Gabe drew a chart next to them. He titled the chart “Niki Lindstrom, RN” and then drew two columns underneath. He labeled the first column “needs” and the second one “resources.” Together Niki and Gabe reflected on the information they had gathered to fill in the columns. Organizing the information in this way revealed important facts about Niki’s quest to become an RN. The needs for housing, child care, and transportation were currently met through her participation in the Transit program. Niki’s recent acceptance into the RN program also was in the resources column. Money for living expenses and tuition for nursing school loomed large in the needs column.

This analysis also revealed several unanswered questions. If Niki decided to go to nursing school instead of directly to work, would the TANF program reduce her benefits immediately or let her collect payments for the remaining 6-month period? How much did nursing school cost? Were scholarships or loans available? What about the dormant resources of her family relationships? Niki’s connections to her mother, father, sister, and Jerome were clearly not working, but was there any potential for them to help Niki reach her goals?

As their discussion continued, a plan begin to evolve. Gabe pulled out a required NET form entitled “Plan for Self-sufficiency” and worked with Niki to fill in the blanks.

**Self-sufficiency Goal: Obtain licensure as an RN.**

**Objective #1:** Niki will acquire sufficient funds to pay for nursing school tuition within 2 months.

**Objective #2:** Niki will maintain her current level of income to meet living expenses during the 2 years necessary to complete the RN program.

**Objective #3:** Niki will access additional resources to provide child care, transportation, and social support to decrease her dependence on those available through the Transit Program within 6 months.

To continue planning, Gabe and Niki teamed to brainstorm possible activities and select strategies to meet each objective. They ended their meeting with an agreement or “contract” to implement the plan, decided what actions each needed to accomplish before their next meeting, and set a time to meet again.

**Questions for Part 3**

**Referencing the text and the NASW Code of Ethics, use critical thinking processes to respond to the following prompts. Be sure to cite both resources several times.**

1. Gabe uses a strength-oriented approach. Examine the conversation to identify examples of this approach. Now, identify the one deficit-oriented response that Gabe uses. Compare the effects of strengths- versus deficit-oriented responses. What is the impact on the dialogue and on the relationship between Niki and Gabe?
2. Draw an eco-map that fits the information offered about Niki’s household and its relationships with environmental resources. Include all information available throughout the entire case study in your eco-map. Annotate the eco-map to indicate the flow of resources in and out of this household. Since you construct an eco-map that visually represents Niki and her relationships with her systems with clear annotations, you don’t have to write a paragraph to explain the ecomap in this section. You can draw an eco-map manually or electronically. If you draw an eco-map manually, you can scan and attach it to your assignment and place it in dropbox. Under Question 2 heading, you can indicate that your manual ecomap will be attached to the end of the assignment.
3. Apply the ecosystemic framework described in Chapter 10 of the text to analyze what’s happening inside this system, what’s happening outside of this system, how the inside and outside relate, and how the system is progressing through time.
4. Brainstorm possible activities that may work to reach each of the objectives identified by Gabe and Nicki. Think broadly like a generalist practitioner by including activities that target changes in the client, the client’s transactions with others, the helping system, and the social environment.
5. Niki and Gabe agree to a “contract” to implement their plan. List the key elements of their agreement that should be included in such a contract. In what ways does the process of contracting affect the relationship of social worker Gabe with his client Niki?

\*Entire assignment used for EAA

|  |
| --- |
| **Generalist Curriculum**  **C9 (K) Dimension**  **SW 702 Case Study 4**  **(Entire Assignment comprises EAA score)** |

**Case Study:**

**Case Study Part 4: THE DEVELOPMENT PHASE:**

**IMPLEMENTING, EVALUATING, AND STABILIZING CHANGE**

When the next meeting began, Gabe Thomas could sense Niki Lindstrom’s excitement. Niki had completed her task of visiting the nursing school to find out how much it would cost and talked with an admissions counselor about financial assistance. She had already applied for a student loan and was considering applying for a scholarship offered by an area hospital in exchange for an agreement to work for a period of time after graduation. Gabe congratulated Niki on her initiative, pointed out her abilities to get things done fast, and noted her particular strength in activating people on her behalf. Niki was clearly taking steps toward meeting her first objective to secure funds for school.

Gabe also reported on his activities since their last meeting. He had checked to see how long Niki could continue to receive TANF benefits if she chose to enter nursing school rather than cooperate with efforts to obtain immediate employment. The news here was not so good. The TANF Program supervisor Gabe had consulted interpreted the rules rigidly, saying that Niki needed to make efforts to get a job now. A 2-year training program did not represent immediate progress toward employment. Unless Niki looked for a job, her benefits would likely be reduced immediately and completely eliminated before the end of 6 months. Meeting the objective of maintaining a livable income while attending nursing school was obviously going to be difficult.

Gabe and Niki discussed her possible choices. Niki could change her plans to be an RN, enter short-term training leading to immediate employment, or try to combine work and nursing school. Another option was to look for other sources of income, go off TANF, and do whatever she wanted. Or, she could fight the unfair policy either by appealing the individual decision about her own case or by addressing the policy itself at another level—yet neither she nor Gabe was hopeful about those ideas. Having clarified these possibilities, Niki wanted to think it about for a week before moving in any direction.

At the next week’s meeting, Niki told Gabe that she had made her choice to go to nursing school one way or the other. Niki also decided not to file an appeal about the cut-off of her benefits, saying that she “could see the handwriting on the wall,” and it was time to get ready to support herself. She accepted Gabe’s offer to assist her to find part-time employment, saying that a part-time job would still allow her to enter the nursing school’s part-time program. Niki left Gabe’s office with a list of job possibilities and instructions to bring back proof of the applications she submitted to meet TANF rules documenting job-seeking attempts.

During that week of decision, Niki had also shared her frustrations with the other women in the support group at the Transit Program. Each of them reported similar roadblocks on their journeys out of violent intimate relationships and toward self-sufficiency. Some reported difficulties in dealing with courts that seemed more responsive to protecting the rights of violence perpetrators than to ensuring the safety of victims. Others recounted their feelings of helplessness as their own voices and preferences were subdued by legal processes that seemed to be beyond their control. Still others described the lack of support they had received from their own extended families, who seemed to blame the women themselves for their own victimization. They all agreed that public ignorance about family and intimate partner violence was the norm, and this lack of awareness contributed to social policy ineffective in meeting the needs of survivors.

Fueled by indignation, Niki functioned as a catalyst in the support group. She worked closely with group facilitator Evelyn Mackey to shift the group’s focus from social support to social action. The group discussion helped members develop a critical consciousness connecting social forces to individual experience – a necessary prelude to taking social action. At Evelyn’s suggestion, Niki contacted similar groups operating in other transitional housing programs, and Niki began to develop a larger coalition to raise consciousness about family violence and the need for progressive social policy to assist survivors toward independence. In this way, the Women’s Political Action Coalition (WOPAC) was born.

So many women became involved that WOPAC had resources to work in several directions at once. One committee coordinated a public information campaign, teaming with the Family Violence Prevention & Advocacy Program to establish a speaker’s bureau for survivors to share their stories at area schools and social organizations. A second subgroup launched a letter writing campaign targeting local legislators to increase funds for extended stays in transitional housing to accommodate those pursuing higher education and for evening child care to allow parents to attend night classes. A third committee submitted a grant proposal to a local foundation interested in women’s issues to fund WOPAC’s efforts. Niki herself testified at a legislative forum evaluating the impact of the state’s mandatory arrest statute in domestic violence situations, working to carve out ways that victims would maintain more influence on the disposition of their cases.

Meanwhile, Niki continued her regular meetings with Gabe focused on securing Niki a part-time job that would allow her to continue her TANF benefits for her remaining 6 months of eligibility. In each meeting, they would discuss how the job search was going. She also reported that she had entered nursing school financed by a combination of scholarships and student loans. Niki would also talk about her activities with WOPAC. In response, Gabe would highlight her successes, encourage her efforts, and normalize brief setbacks as a natural occurrence in any change process. At times, Niki mentioned how proud she thought her mother would be if she knew what Niki was accomplishing. Sensing Niki’s need for familial support, Gabe suggested that this might be a time for reconciliation with her mother. With Niki’s consent, Gabe referred her to a Northside Family Services family counselor to discuss ways to reconnect with her mother.

Gabe maintained a consistent focus on Niki’s objectives to guide the content of their meetings and to monitor and evaluate Niki’s progress. One meeting in particular, he helped Niki stop and look at how far she had progressed. He chose the third objective as an example and drew a graph illustrating the dramatic increase in Niki’s social support since they had begun their work together. Niki also described her progress in meeting the other objectives.

Niki and Gabe were accomplishing what they set out to achieve. Even though Niki was not yet an RN, she had secured a part-time job, and that meant her professional relationship with Gabe must end. Gabe and Niki discussed their progress, reviewed their accomplishments, and decided to wrap up their work together. Gabe emphasized the positive things that had happened and thanked Niki for teaching him to work with “stubborn young women.” They both laughed about that, Niki knowing that Gabe appreciated her dogged determination. Gabe’s warm handshake that wrapped up the session was accompanied by the invitation to “give me a call sometime to let me know how you’re doing.” Niki assured him that she would.

**Questions that Focus on Part 4. Apply your knowledge and skills learned from concepts, content, examples, and/or analyses in our readings.**

1. Activities in the development phase are guided by goals and objectives articulated in the action plan. Review the actions implemented by Gabe Thomas and Niki Lindstrom during this time. Are they goal directed? Which activities work to achieve which objectives?
2. Generalist social workers perform many tasks to “activate client resources” by functioning as consultants, resource managers, and educators. Carefully examine the case study to identify actions that Gabe takes to function in these various ways. What other possible actions could Gabe have taken?
3. Gabe and Niki wrapped up their work before Niki actually achieved her goal. Is this acceptable practice? What actions did Gabe take to ensure an empowering resolution of the relationship? Gabe’s work with Niki demonstrates closure processes with an individual client. How might these processes differ when a social worker closes with a larger client system such as in the example of Evelyn Mackey when she wraps up her work with the WOPAC organization?

\*Entire assignment used for EAA

**Specialized** **Embedded Assessment Assignments**

The Specialized assignments are labeled, in order, by competency and dimension using the following system:

Competency number, initial of dimension, course number, assignment title, e.g., *C1V 717 Case Study*

If an assignment is used more than once, it is repeated and re-labeled for each competency it measures.

Assignments that cover the entire change process are labeled as such, C6-9, rather than repeated each time.  Similarly, cognitive affective processes are measured in field and are labeled C1-9.

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C1- C9 CAP Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 716 & SW 718:** **Master of Competencies**  **(Entire assignment comprises EAA score.)** |

**UW-Green Bay MSW Program**

**SOC WORK 716 & 718: Specialized Field III and IV**

**Progress toward Mastery of Competencies Assignment**

**PURPOSE:** The social work field Practicum is considered the capstone experience of the MSW curriculum and is a required component for all social work students graduating from accredited social work programs. At UW-Green Bay, students complete a minimum of 384 hours, over the course of two semesters, in a social service setting related to their area of interest.

The field Practicum provides integrative experiences merging the application of knowledge, values, and skills with the goal of preparing students for social work professional practice. Students achieve this goal by demonstrating the integration and application of all nine CSWE competencies in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner to promote human and community well-being.

The field Practicum measures the students’ cognitive and affective processes which include critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment regarding unique practice situations.

The process of completing the field Practicum helps students achieve these primary objectives:

1. Apply knowledge and skills learned throughout the curriculum to daily experiences as advanced practice social workers in the field.
2. Examine implications of practice experiences for serving clients from diverse cultures, social classes, and communities.

**TASK:** The following information describes the goals and requirements of the field Practicum. These tasks are designed to be as individualized as possible in order to accommodate diverse learning needs, varying agency opportunities, and unique areas of social work practice.

These tasks build upon one another to guide the students’ learning experiences while in the agency field Practicum, and provide feedback/information of their advancing skills, knowledge, and professional development.

**1. Learning Contract**

Using the template provided on Canvas, students develop a learning contract at the beginning of the field Practicum. The learning contract consists of specific activities that will be performed during the field Practicum to address each of the competencies. These activities, along with the student’s plan to meet the minimum 192 hours per semester, are documented on the learning contract. While the learning contract is intended to be followed as written, the identified activities represent one means of meeting the competencies. Students may choose, or need, to alter the learning contract activities over the course of the semester in order to make progress toward mastery of the competencies. Developing and altering the learning contract is done in consultation with the agency field instructor (FI) and faculty field liaison (FFL) to ensure activities are feasible and directly related to the competencies. This consultation begins early in the fall semester with a meeting between the student, FI, and FFL. Examples of a learning contract will be discussed in the Seminar course. Students develop a new contract in the beginning of the spring semester.

**2. Field Instructor Feedback**

Near the end of the semester, field instructors are sent an electronic survey asking for feedback on the students’ progress toward each of the nine competencies. In addition, the student, FI, and FFL will hold an evaluative meeting at the end of the semester to discuss the overall field Practicum and student performance. This written and verbal feedback is used to inform the mastery of the competencies grade.

**3. Progress Report**

At the end of each semester, students will submit a Progress Report summarizing their major accomplishments, development, and progress toward mastery of the competencies. The fall Progress Report is intended to demonstrate the journey towards competence in practice. Students are not expected to be “perfect social workers” but rather individuals who value inquiry, critical thinking, and understand the importance of self-critique and examination. Instructors will review the progress reports with the following question in mind:

*Do the examples referenced throughout the progress report illustrate development as an advanced practitioner and mastery of professional social work competencies?*

With this understanding in mind, students may elect to include examples where things went well, along with examples of challenges they faced and how these challenges promoted personal and professional growth. Progress Reports are due prior to the end-of-semester field visits so the information can be used to guide those evaluative discussions. Further details are provided in class.

**4. General Contributions**

Students’ general contributions to their own learning is assessed in a number of ways including observations and documentation in the agency, classroom, and formal or informal meetings. In addition, students must complete the requisite number of field hours to pass the field Practicum course.

**CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS:** Mastery of the competencies accounts for 60% of the final field Practicum grade for each semester.  The grade for this portion of field is based on a combination of the tasks/assignments described above.  Feedback from field instructors and other agency staff, as well as progress reports from the student, are used to inform the mastery of competencies portion of the field grade. Field instructors, however, do not determine a student’s grade. The faculty field liaison is responsible for assigning the official points and letter grade for all field assignments.

Each individual competency is assessed using the rubric below. The total of all nine competencies determines the final grade for this portion (60%) of the field grade.

**Mastery of Competencies Grading Rubric**

(\*This entire assignment is used for EAA.)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring** | **Learning Contract Activities** | **Field Instructor Feedback** | **Self-Assessed**  **Progress Report** | **General Contributions** |
| 4: Excels | *Actively* sought opportunities to meet the competency as described in the learning plan, and/or initiated additional or alternative opportunities | Comments reflect a *high level* of critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment | *Thorough* articulation of knowledge of concepts, policies, and/or methods; provides appropriate examples of same | *Frequently:*  Asks critical questions;  Offers thoughts or suggestions in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner.  Completed required hours. |
| 3: Meets expectations | Activities not completed, as described in the learning plan, but are at an *acceptable* level of progress. | Comments reflect a *basic level* of critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment | *Basic* articulation of knowledge of concepts, policies, and/or methods: provides appropriate examples of same | *Periodically:*  Asks critical questions;  Offers thoughts or suggestions in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner  Completed required hours. |
| 2: Below expectations | *Passive* approach: Has not sought opportunities to meet the competency as described in the learning plan; nor alternative activities to meet the competency. | Comments reflect a *low level* of critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment | *Insufficient* articulation of knowledge of concepts, policies, and/or methods; and/or unable to provide appropriate examples of same | *Rarely:*  Asks critical questions;  Offers thoughts or suggestions in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner.  Completed required hours. |
| 1: Needs Improvement | *Refused and/or avoided* opportunities to meet the competency as described in the learning plan; has not pursued alternative activities. | Comments reflect *lack of* critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment | *Unable* to articulate knowledge of concepts, policies, and/or methods; and/or provided inappropriate examples of same | *Never:*  Asks critical questions;  Offers thoughts or suggestions in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner.  Completed required hours. |
| 0: Unacceptable |  |  |  | Conduct or interactions with agency staff, clients, etc. are *unethical and/or unprofessional*.  Did *not complete* required hours. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **University of Wisconsin - Green Bay** **MSW Specialized Student Field Placement Learning Contract**  **Student Name:**       **Semester:** | |
| ***Competency***  *(Defined for Advanced Generalist practice by the UWGB MSW Program)* | ***Activities to be completed to attain competence***  *Complete this section as your learning plan at the beginning of the semester. Articulate the* ***activities*** *you will complete in the field placement setting this semester in order to demonstrate mastery of the competency practice behaviors.* |
| Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior | |
| Advanced generalist social workers have a broad knowledge base of the social work profession; its history, theories, principles, and ethical standards (including the ethical use of technology.) AG social workers understand how this collective knowledge informs all levels of service delivery from micro to mezzo to macro. AG social workers recognize the influence of personal values on professional decisions and actions, and understand the importance of employing strategies to navigate that influence. AG social workers understand that managing ethical situations requires consultation and leadership. AG social workers are committed to regular and relevant continuing education, as both learners and teachers, to enhance their own knowledge and skills and that of the overall profession. AG social workers understand the intersection between direct practice, research, and policy; the role of social work; and the benefit of intra- and inter-disciplinary collaboration in each of these arenas.  AG social workers will:   * -Demonstrate ability to independently engage in activities that advance the core values of the social work profession. * -Contribute to the advancement of the profession by disseminating emerging knowledge obtained through professional development. * -Demonstrate moral courage (the ability to utilize critical thinking to recognize ethical dilemmas and develop appropriate action plans) in practice situations. * -Engage in professional development opportunities directed at challenging personal biases and enhancing professional values. * -Demonstrate ability to work effectively within and across coalition groups. |  |
| Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice | |
| Advanced generalist social workers understand diversity as a multi-dimensional concept that impacts all areas of service delivery. AG social workers understand the intersectionality of a broad range of identity statuses and the personal and societal values that overtly and covertly impact individuals and groups who share those identities. AG social workers recognize the need to approach their professional practice with cultural humility in order to best serve their clients and the communities with which they engage. AG social workers understand they hold a vital role in combatting personal, professional, and systemic racism and oppression across all levels from micro to mezzo to macro and how to utilize their positions to advance equity within these systems.  AG social workers will:   * -Demonstrate cultural humility when working cross-culturally in practice and professional settings. * Utilize empowerment and strengths-based strategies appropriate to client’s identity status(es) and acculturation-level across the systematic change process. * -Critically assess the congruence of social work principles of diversity with the mission, goals, and organizational climate of social service delivery system(s). |  |
| Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice | |
| Advanced generalist social workers understand the role of social work is to advocate for all individuals and groups to ensure inclusivity, equity, and justice. AG social workers understand the connection between the profession’s mission and principles; and the advancement of human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice. Advanced generalist social workers understand that personal and societal values impact all aspects of service delivery. AG social workers understand their role as leaders in addressing these issues at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.  AG social workers will:   * -Analyze the congruence between social service delivery systems and social work values relative to social justice. * -Engage in macro-level advocacy on behalf of oppressed populations. |  |
| Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice | |
| Advanced generalist social workers understand that knowledge derives from broad, diverse, and multiple means. AG social workers understand that sound and ethical practice at micro, mezzo, and macro levels is based on evidence that is ethically collected and representative. AG social workers understand that evidence is gathered through scientific inquiry and culturally-informed research. AG social workers understand that research findings must be analyzed for authenticity, applicability, and relevance before applying to practice. AG social workers understand their role in advancing the knowledge and skills of the profession by engaging in research-related activities.  AG social workers will:   * -Engage in critical consumption of research and practice literature. * -Investigate current Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) and introduce in professional settings. * -Evaluate service effectiveness and efficiency through synthesis of outcome data from multiple methods and sources. |  |
| Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice | |
| Advanced generalist social workers have depth of knowledge in policy formulation, analysis, implementation, and evaluation. AG social workers understand the interconnectedness between policy and practice. AG social workers understand that policy impacts access, equity, inclusivity, justice, and human rights across all aspects of service delivery. AG social workers recognize their leadership role in informing policy at the federal, state, local, and agency levels.  AG social workers will:   * -Critique social policy relevant to area of emphasis using a policy analysis model as a framework. * -Assess the micro to macro implications of social policy relevant to area of emphasis within the context of social work values and principles. * -Identify and assess the role of political influences on social service delivery systems in area of emphasis. |  |
| Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | |
| Advanced generalist social workers recognize engagement as a critical first step in the change process. AG social workers understand the influence of many factors in establishing rapport with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. AG social workers acknowledge influences such as environment, culture, history, values, development, language/communication, and power differentials; and work to adapt their approach accordingly.  AG social workers will:   * -Identify factors across systems levels that impact the development of helping relationships in area of emphasis. * -Differentially apply engagement strategies in consideration of diverse client needs, characteristics, contexts, and changing practice dynamics. |  |
| Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | |
| Advanced generalist social workers understand that assessment is a continual process that occurs at every step in the change process with individuals, families, groups, organizations or communities. AG social workers understand that assessment can be a formal process, dictated by agency or practice setting, and an informal process that occurs at every interaction with the client system. AG social workers recognize the impact of personal, professional, and societal values on the assessment process and strive to mitigate that impact by utilizing strengths-based, client-centered assessment strategies.  AG social workers will:   * -Demonstrate ability to apply bio-psycho-social-spiritual-cultural assessments across systems levels grounded in strengths-based perspectives. * -Critique assessment methods in area of emphasis using a process of continual modification and application. |  |
| Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | |
| Advanced generalist social workers understand evidence-based interventions for their specific area of practice, whether it is with individuals, families, groups, organizations, or communities. AG social workers recognize that client-centered interventions, based on empowerment principles, have the greatest outcomes at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels; and should be employed whenever possible.  AG social workers will:   * -Apply strategically chosen, critically evaluated interventions relevant to area of emphasis. * -Utilize empowerment principles to enhance the capacities of clients and social service delivery systems. |  |
| Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | |
| Advanced generalist social workers understand that evaluation is a vital step in any level of social work practice—micro, mezzo, and macro. AG social workers understand that evaluative evidence is necessary to adequately and appropriately evaluate service delivery throughout the change process. AG social workers recognize that evaluation can be formal, using a scientific, research-based approach; and informal, using consultation and/or self-reflection to evaluate their interactions with the individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities with which they engage.  AG social workers will:   * -Evaluate effectiveness of intervention strategies, practice, and conscious use of self across systems levels. * -Demonstrate use of evaluation to inform the change process from micro to macro levels. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C1 (V) – C1 (S) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 719: Capstone Poster**  **(Entire assignment comprises EAA score.)** |

**Overview of the MSW Capstone Project**

The Capstone Project for the UW-Green Bay MSW Program is derived from the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) competencies of which all students graduating from accredited social work programs must demonstrate mastery. At the end of their final year in the program, UW-Green Bay MSW students will prepare a poster presentation that is grounded in research, theory, values, and practice-based knowledge. Posters are presented in a public forum and, as such, help students meet Competency 1: *Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior,* Competency 3: *Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice,* and Competency 4: *Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-informed Practice*.

Specific details, processes, ideas, and examples for the MSW Capstone Project are provided below. It is expected that students keep this document as a primary resource in developing their projects.

**The Professional Poster**

The creation and display of a Poster is intended to help students disseminate professional knowledge through an interactive format. Posters are displayed, accompanied by their author, at the annual Social Work Symposium held at the end of the spring semester.

The primary focus of the Poster is to demonstrate the integration of theory, practice, values, and research in a particular aspect of social work. The Poster should illustrate the student’s knowledge of the relevant literature, the intersection with social work practice, and the linkages between theory and practice. The Poster provides evidence of mastery for competencies one and four and, as such, can be identified in the spring learning contract as a plan to meet these two competencies.

Posters are to be electronically prepared and professionally printed in order to meet the high- quality standards of graduate level work. While creativity in Poster presentation is encouraged, the minimum required guidelines are provided below. Posters from previous years can be found in the University Archives at <http://diglib.uwgb.edu/digital/collection/p17003coll5/search>

# 

**Developing a Poster Idea**

Selecting an idea for the professional Poster is the first step in this process. The Poster topic should be linked to the student’s practicum experience and/or Individualized Area of Emphasis (IAE) and must have the ability to be explored through the lens of research, theory, values, and practice. Specifically, students will be asked to: describe the topic, explain how it is conceptualized in practice, identify the theoretical basis, discuss the societal values impacting the topic, provide a synopsis of the research evidence that supports or refutes the main point(s) of the topic, and conclude with a discussion or implications section. Seminar instructors, Field Instructors, and classmates are good resources to help students identify topics to explore for their Posters. The following examples are provided to spark ideas of relevant Poster topics:

Micro or clinical topics: Person-Centered Care, Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR), Dialectic Behavior Therapy (DBT), Mindfulness, Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Trauma-Informed Care, Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS), Equine Therapy, Peer Mentors or Support Groups, Life Review, etc.

Macro or programmatic topics: visitation policy and incarceration, influencing effective social policy change, agency sustainability, program evaluation/outcomes, learning collaboratives, addressing diversity in long term care settings, Family Find, etc.

**Steps to Follow**

Time will be allotted in the Specialized Seminar courses to help students prepare for, and develop, their professional posters. The following processes, in the order suggested, will be introduced and monitored throughout the year with the goal of supporting students as they complete the Capstone Project. At the end of this document is a worksheet to help guide your work.

1. Narrow the topic
2. Describe how this topic looks in practice
3. Consider the societal values impacting the issue
4. Search the literature for research related to the topic (See annotated bibliography instructions on page 11 of this document.)
5. Identify the theory that provides the framework for the topic (See Overview handout on pp. 5-10)
6. Link practice, values, research, and theory
7. Consider implications, further discussions, conclusions
8. Develop an introduction
9. Create a title
10. Design the poster with the key elements from steps 2-8
11. Identify accompanying materials/handouts to display during Symposium
12. Show up at the Symposium and demonstrate your knowledge!

**Creating a Professional Poster**

All Posters should have a title that reflects the content or intent of the Poster, not to exceed 12 words. The remaining sections of the Poster must include the student’s name; an introduction; the elements of practice, research, values, and theory; and a discussion/implications section. All sources must be cited using proper APA in-text formatting. To conserve space, do not list the references on the Poster, but they must be provided in a separate Word document that accompanies the poster. It is recommended to use a font size no smaller than 24 for the text; no greater than 60 for the title. Citations should be the same size font as the text.

Posters must be electronically created, saved in an acceptable format for submission to the instructor and University archives, and professionally printed. There are several ways to create an electronic Poster; the simplest may be through Power Point. The following links provide easy to follow instructions for creating a Poster using Power Point: <https://www.iwu.edu/library/tools/CPMP.pdf> <https://faculty.washington.edu/robinet/poster.html> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_WnhoIbfcoM>

[(Follow our size requirements, not those suggested in the links)](https://undergraduateresearch.as.ua.edu/presenting-your-work/making-posters/)

Students have the option of using the UWGB Poster templates found on the DLE site or creating their own design. Poster sizes are to be 24” x 36”, printed horizontally, in full color. Do not laminate the poster. The MSW Program provides foam board and easels to display the posters during the Symposium. Additional guidelines for creating effective Posters can be found at the following link: [https://projects.ncsu.edu/project/Posters/.](https://projects.ncsu.edu/project/posters/)

**Evaluation of the Poster**

Evaluation of the Poster is based on the student’s ability to demonstrate the linkage between research,

theory, values, and practice. The Poster comprises 40% of the final course grade in SOC WORK 719: Capstone Seminar. (See full rubric on page 12 of this document.) Because the ability to present information in a logical format is critical to effective research, this entire assignment (mechanics and content) is used as an embedded assessment assignment.

*Posters will be assessed based on the following basic criteria:*

The Poster is well-organized, clearly presented, and professionally prepared. (15%)

The Poster illustrates an integration of research, theory, values, and practice related to a relevant area of social work; and includes an introduction and a strong forward-thinking conclusion/discussion. (85%)

**The Social Work Symposium**

At the end of the spring semester, students present their posters in an on-campus public Symposium to which colleagues, University administrators, Social Work faculty, field instructors, friends, and family are invited to attend. The Symposium venue and timing may change from year to year, but the general format remains the same. Each student has a table/section of a table to display the Poster and any handouts that are relevant. Students stand near their Poster for the duration of the Symposium to provide additional information to interested guests. It is expected that all students will attend and engage in the Symposium with a high level of professionalism, ready to share their expertise with the public.

**University Archiving**

The University requires graduate students to submit their Capstone Projects to the University Archives in order to fulfill their graduation requirements. The MSW Program supports archiving as it gives current and future students the opportunity to access the high-quality research produced by MSW graduates. Students who do not wish to archive their Posters have the option to waive this step (see below).

The process for archival submission will be discussed and monitored through the Capstone Seminar course. Students who wish to waive their right to archive their Posters should complete the Project Archive Waiver e-form found on the Graduate Studies website: [http://www.uwgb.edu/graduate/students/thesis-project/.](http://www.uwgb.edu/graduate/students/thesis-project/)

IMPORTANT NOTE: The MSW degree will not be conferred on student’s official transcript until Graduate Studies receives the Poster submission or waiver form. This may result in an unavoidable delay of student’s credentialing and employment efforts.

**OVERVIEW OF THEORIES OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR** & **THE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT**

**APPLICATIONS TO SOCIAL WORK GENERALIST PRACTICE**

***The following is a very general outline summarizing the theories covered in the NCSSS foundation classes of SSS 571: Human Behavior*** & ***the Social Environment. Theory application*** & ***integration with practice are demonstrated. This outline is only a summary of highlights; all theorists, ideas, and concepts are not included.***

***Because human behavior is complex and the social work profession is broad, numerous theories are utilized for social work practice at the micro-meso-macro levels. These theories focus on human growth and development, psychological and social functioning, and social service delivery. Some theories emphasize social and economic justice. All theories are value-laden and come out of a socio-historical context. Thus, all theories should be critiqued with attention paid to their cross-cultural applicability.***

**DEFINITIONS:**

*Theory-interrelated sets of concepts and propositions, organized into a deductive system to explain relationships about certain aspects of the world (e.g., the theories listed below).*

**Perspective-an** *emphasis or point of view; concepts at an earlier level of development (e.g., a "strengths perspective') or at a broader and higher level of abstraction (ex: a "humanistic perspective" or a "developmental perspective')*

**Paradigm-an** *archetype or mode of thought; a general way of seeing the world (e.g., "modernism" or ''post-modernism' )*

**Practice Model-a** *guide for practitioner interaction that operationalizes theory; includes concrete actions and techniques (note: some theories have more well-developed practice models than others)*

**Dimension-a** *feature that can be focused on individually or separately, but can only be understood in relation to other features (as in "dimensions of human behavior" or a "multi-dimensional approach" to human behavior)*

**[Sources:** Hutchison, E. D. (2003). *Dimensions of human behavior: Person and environment* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.; Robbins, S., Chatterjee, P., & Canda, E. (Eds.) (2005). *Contemporary human behavior theory: A critical perspective for social work* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.]













|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **MSW Capstone Poster Grading Rubric (40% of grade)**  (This entire assignment is used for EAA) | | |
| **Content** (85 Points Possible)  **(poor) 0—15 (excellent)** | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| **Introduction:** Background information about the project and/or rationale for choosing the topic | /10 |  |
| **Practice:** Clear explanation of the effectiveness and/or impact of your topic on social work practice | /15 |  |
| **Research:** Concise integration of literature findings | /15 |  |
| **Theory:** Explanation of theoretical model(s) and connection to the topic/issue. | /15 |  |
| **Values**: Discussion of societal values impacting the issue/topic using competency 3 as a guide | /15 |  |
| **Discussion:** Summary of implications *and* recommendations for practice, policy, and research | /15 |  |
| **Total Score for Content (of 85)** |  |  |
| **Mechanics** (15 Points Possible)  **(poor) 0—10 (excellent)** | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| APA formatting for in-text citations and annotated bibliography. Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. | /5 |  |
| Poster was well constructed, organized, visually appealing. All elements were present (title of poster, student name, introduction, 5 content sections) | /5 |  |
| Day of Symposium: Professional presentation and engagement, reference page available in hard copy. | /5 |  |
| **Total Score (100 possible)** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C1 (V) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 717: Case Study Presentation**  **(EAA score components indicated by “\*”.)** |

**UW-Green Bay MSW Program**

**SOC WORK 717: Seminar III**

**Case Study Presentation**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this assignment is to provide students the opportunity to present a client case study similar to an agency case staffing. The case study is to be based on a client/agency scenario or situation in which personal, professional, and societal values are identifiable. Students may choose a situation that is particularly challenging or one that has been resolved but provides an example of a noteworthy learning experience. Students should be certain to protect confidential and client-identifying information throughout the assignment. A significant element of this assignment is to facilitate a discussion in which the presenter solicits feedback from peers on various aspects of the case. This assignment has two parts and is worth 40% of the final grade for this course*.*

**Knowledge:** This assignment gives students the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of how values impact all aspects of the change process: engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation (competencies 6, 7, 8, and 9).

**Skills:** This assignment allows students to “practice” leading a case presentation and soliciting team input.

**Task:** Select a situation from field upon which to build this assignment, as described above, and complete Parts I and II.

**Part I: Written Outline**

Prepare a written outline (1-3 pages) of your case, including all the elements listed below. Submit your outline to Canvas by 11:59 on the Friday before the case study presentation. All students are expected to arrive to the discussion having read the outline and being prepared to ask questions and offer input to the presenter.

Required elements:

1. Student name and name of your agency

1. Relevant demographic information and history
2. Client challenges
3. Client strengths
4. Brief summary of client’s service/treatment plan
5. Identification of the personal, professional, and societal values that impact engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation of this client system/agency situation.
6. Specific questions for student-facilitated class discussion

**Part II: Presentation of Case Study**

Each student will have approximately 15 minutes for the entire presentation; less than 5 minutes for the presentation of the case and 10 minutes for the discussion. The oral presentation should include only the key elements of the case as the audience is expected to have read the outline prior to the presentation. The focus of this assignment is to elicit a discussion on the aspects of the case you find most challenging or educational, including the values that impact the situation.

**Grading Rubric** (\*indicates portion of assignment used for EAA)

15 points Identification and discussion of the personal, professional, and societal values at **each** stage of the change process \*

15 points Facilitation of classroom discussion (demonstrated leadership, open-mindedness, and encouraged balanced participation) \*

5 points Outline (submitted on time, included all required content, professionally prepared) \*

5 points Oral presentation (succinct, included key elements, stayed within timeframe) \*

40 points TOTAL

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C2 (K) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 720: Diversity In-service**  **(Entire assignment comprises the EAA score.)** |

**SOC WORK 720: DIVERSITY, SOCIAL JUSTICE & ADVOCACY**

**Diversity In-Service Rubric**

**Purpose:** In order to practice inductive learning, advocacy, and leadership in preparation for practicing with diverse populations, groups of students will conduct “Diversity In-Service” trainings for the class related to a particular non-dominant racial-ethnic group. Each group will be responsible for selecting two social work practice- relevant readings for the class to read. All group members will receive the same grade for this assignment; one-third of the grade will be determined by the “audience” who will provide evaluations to presenters. Groups will decide on the topic of the In-Service.

**Using the entire Assignment for EAA. Grade (25%)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Full Marks** | **Points** | **Comments** |
| Brief History of the Group  Brief history of how the group came to be living in Northeastern Wisconsin, including where the group originated from (if applicable | 5 |  |  |
| Brief of Percentage and Socioeconomic status  Brief history of how the group came to be living in Northeastern Wisconsin, including where the group originated from (if applicable (focus may be either on: Northeast Wisconsin, a particular city or county in Northeast Wisconsin, or the state broadly), a Percentage of the population relative to other racial-ethnic groups b. Socioeconomic status of the group relative to other racial-ethnic groups | 5 |  |  |
| Readings Selection for In-Service  Appropriateness of selected readings | 5 |  |  |
| ides or handouts distributed to instructor before presentation (either emailed 24 hours before or paper copy distributed in class); all sources should be fully referenced according to APA form | 5 |  |  |
| Presenters Criteria for grading  Well- developed criteria for how presenters want their presentation to be graded | 5 |  |  |
| **Total Points** | **25** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C2 (S) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 720: Resource Visit**  **(Entire assignment comprises EAA score.)** |

**SOC WORK 720: DIVERSITY, SOCIAL JUSTICE & ADVOCACY**

Purpose: Each student is required to **visit one resource/program/agency** that provides services to diverse and multicultural populations. It is expected that the student will use this opportunity to explore a resource they are currently unfamiliar with. The resource must specifically target services to members of a non-dominant identity status (e.g., LGBTQ persons, the Hmong community, tribal members, etc.)

**Diversity in-Service Rubric (10%) Using the entire assignment.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Full marks** | **Points** | **Comment** |
| **Description of resource/type of resource (remember, the organization must target non-dominant racial/ethnic groups** | 2 |  |  |
| **Clientele served (include a description of demographics, minimally including best estimates of the percentages of men/women, adults/children, racial-ethnic groups, and SES levels):** | 2 |  |  |
| **Description of the racial/ethnic composition of staff and administrators (minimally include best estimates of percentages of different racial-ethnic groups):** | 1 |  |  |
| **Accessibility (wheelchair, bus route, racial-ethnic, and SES demographics of neighborhood, interpreter, ASL, etc.):** | 1 |  |  |
| **Eligibility criteria:** | 1 |  |  |
| **Cost/acceptable method of payment** | 1 |  |  |
| **Barriers** here you should provide your own critical analysis of any potential barriers to accessing services; this should be from your perspective, not the agency’s**):** | 2 |  |  |
| **Total Point** | **10** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C2 (V) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 720: Critical Journal Reflection**  **(EAA score components indicated by “\*”.)** |

**SOC WORK 720: DIVERSITY, SOCIAL JUSTICE & ADVOCACY**

**PART I REFLECTION JOURNAL DISCUSSION**

You will be required to post 5 critical reflection journals during the semester Each reflection post receives up to 8 points. Journals posts provide a means for you to critically analyze and demonstrate that you are keeping up with the readings Also, the journals are designed to stimulate interaction with other students. Within your journal narrative, be sure to discuss at least half of the required readings for the week (if there are only 2 readings, be sure to include both in your discussion. Before posting, it will be important to thoughtfully read the appropriate material. Students should demonstrate their own knowledge in the forums and avoid copying and pasting from readings. **The initial post should be your original critical reflection.** **The journal should be minimum of 500 words and maximum of 600 words. Your journal must follow the template uploaded in Canvas. Failure to follow the template will result in deduction 2 points from your discussion post.** This assignment does not require a cover page or reference sheet, but in-text citations should be used and be APA 7th edition style compliant.

A. Critical Reaction to Readings for Selected Week:

B. Reflection on Connections between A and Field Placement/Employment:

**Critical Journal Rubric (8 x 5) 50% Using Part I of the Assignment.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Full Marks** | **Points** | **Comment** |
| \*Overall effort & Critical thinking:  Overall effort and critical thinking applied to reading | 3 |  |  |
| \*Overall effort & critical thinking applied to connections between class & placement | 3 |  |  |
| Writing, grammar, and appropriate APA documentation | 2 |  |  |
| **Total points** | **8** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C3 (K) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 720: Diversity In-service**  **(Entire assignment comprises EAA score.)** |

**SOC WORK 720: DIVERSITY, SOCIAL JUSTICE & ADVOCACY**

Purpose: Each student is required to **visit one resource/program/agency** that provides services to diverse and multicultural populations. It is expected that the student will use this opportunity to explore a resource they are currently unfamiliar with. The resource must specifically target services to members of a non-dominant identity status (e.g., LGBTQ persons, the Hmong community, tribal members, etc.)

**Diversity in-Service Rubric (10%) Using the entire assignment.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Full marks** | **Points** | **Comment** |
| **Description of resource/type of resource (remember, the organization must target non-dominant racial/ethnic groups** | 2 |  |  |
| **Clientele served (include a description of demographics, minimally including best estimates of the percentages of men/women, adults/children, racial-ethnic groups, and SES levels):** | 2 |  |  |
| **Description of the racial/ethnic composition of staff and administrators (minimally include best estimates of percentages of different racial-ethnic groups):** | 1 |  |  |
| **Accessibility (wheelchair, bus route, racial-ethnic, and SES demographics of neighborhood, interpreter, ASL, etc.):** | 1 |  |  |
| **Eligibility criteria:** | 1 |  |  |
| **Cost/acceptable method of payment** | 1 |  |  |
| **Barriers** here you should provide your own critical analysis of any potential barriers to accessing services; this should be from your perspective, not the agency’s**):** | 2 |  |  |
| **Total Point** | **10** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C3 (S) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 728: Policy Project: Diversity In-service**  **(Entire assignment comprises EAA score.)** |

**Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice**

**Assignment Criteria and Grading Rubric for Policy Project Entire assignment (50%)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading Component** | **Points Possible** | **Criteria** | **Points Given** |
| Identification of Policy, Policy Intent, Goals and Stakeholders | 10 | Policy is clearly identified by title, sponsor, and policy focus. Status of policy is presented. Clear identification of the policy issues and what it intends to address. Policy goals are identified. Stakeholders are identified. |  |
| Identification of Problem, Target Population, Impact | 5 | The social problem is identified and defined. Demographic information identifies scope and magnitude of the problem. Target population is identified. The consequences/impact of the policy are thoroughly discussed. |  |
| Value Assumptions, Strengths & Limitations | 10 | Clear identification of values that underpin policy; Identification and discussion of strengths and limitations of policy |  |
| Advocacy Options | 10 | Presentation of potential advocacy activities to effect change. |  |
| Recommendations & Position/ Platform Statement | 15 | Discussion of recommended changes to improve policy. Platform statement describes your stance on the policy, views/beliefs, and your position relative to the policy under discussion. |  |
| **Total Points** | **50** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C3 (V) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 719: Capstone Assignment**  **(Entire assignment comprises EAA score.)** |

**Overview of the MSW Capstone Project**

The Capstone Project for the UW-Green Bay MSW Program is derived from the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) competencies of which all students graduating from accredited social work programs must demonstrate mastery. At the end of their final year in the program, UW-Green Bay MSW students will prepare a poster presentation that is grounded in research, theory, values, and practice-based knowledge. Posters are presented in a public forum and, as such, help students meet Competency 1: *Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior,* Competency 3: *Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice,* and Competency 4: *Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-informed Practice*.

Specific details, processes, ideas, and examples for the MSW Capstone Project are provided below. It is expected that students keep this document as a primary resource in developing their projects.

**The Professional Poster**

The creation and display of a Poster is intended to help students disseminate professional knowledge through an interactive format. Posters are displayed, accompanied by their author, at the annual Social Work Symposium held at the end of the spring semester.

The primary focus of the Poster is to demonstrate the integration of theory, practice, values, and research in a particular aspect of social work. The Poster should illustrate the student’s knowledge of the relevant literature, the intersection with social work practice, and the linkages between theory and practice. The Poster provides evidence of mastery for competencies one and four and, as such, can be identified in the spring learning contract as a plan to meet these two competencies.

Posters are to be electronically prepared and professionally printed in order to meet the high- quality standards of graduate level work. While creativity in Poster presentation is encouraged, the minimum required guidelines are provided below. Posters from previous years can be found in the University Archives at <http://diglib.uwgb.edu/digital/collection/p17003coll5/search>

**Developing a Poster Idea**

Selecting an idea for the professional Poster is the first step in this process. The Poster topic should be linked to the student’s practicum experience and/or Individualized Area of Emphasis (IAE) and must have the ability to be explored through the lens of research, theory, values, and practice. Specifically, students will be asked to: describe the topic, explain how it is conceptualized in practice, identify the theoretical basis, discuss the societal values impacting the topic, provide a synopsis of the research evidence that supports or refutes the main point(s) of the topic, and conclude with a discussion or implications section. Seminar instructors, Field Instructors, and classmates are good resources to help students identify topics to explore for their Posters. The following examples are provided to spark ideas of relevant Poster topics:

Micro or clinical topics: Person-Centered Care, Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR), Dialectic Behavior Therapy (DBT), Mindfulness, Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Trauma-Informed Care, Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS), Equine Therapy, Peer Mentors or Support Groups, Life Review, etc.

Macro or programmatic topics: visitation policy and incarceration, influencing effective social policy change, agency sustainability, program evaluation/outcomes, learning collaboratives, addressing diversity in long term care settings, Family Find, etc.

**Steps to Follow**

Time will be allotted in the Specialized Seminar courses to help students prepare for, and develop, their professional posters. The following processes, in the order suggested, will be introduced and monitored throughout the year with the goal of supporting students as they complete the Capstone Project. At the end of this document is a worksheet to help guide your work.

1. Narrow the topic
2. Describe how this topic looks in practice
3. Consider the societal values impacting the issue
4. Search the literature for research related to the topic (See annotated bibliography instructions on page 11 of this document.)
5. Identify the theory that provides the framework for the topic (See Overview handout on pp. 5-10)
6. Link practice, values, research, and theory
7. Consider implications, further discussions, conclusions
8. Develop an introduction
9. Create a title
10. Design the poster with the key elements from steps 2-8
11. Identify accompanying materials/handouts to display during Symposium
12. Show up at the Symposium and demonstrate your knowledge!

**Creating a Professional Poster**

All Posters should have a title that reflects the content or intent of the Poster, not to exceed 12 words. The remaining sections of the Poster must include the student’s name; an introduction; the elements of practice, research, values, and theory; and a discussion/implications section. All sources must be cited using proper APA in-text formatting. To conserve space, do not list the references on the Poster, but they must be provided in a separate Word document that accompanies the poster. It is recommended to use a font size no smaller than 24 for the text; no greater than 60 for the title. Citations should be the same size font as the text.

Posters must be electronically created, saved in an acceptable format for submission to the instructor and University archives, and professionally printed. There are several ways to create an electronic Poster; the simplest may be through Power Point. The following links provide easy to follow instructions for creating a Poster using Power Point: <https://www.iwu.edu/library/tools/CPMP.pdf> <https://faculty.washington.edu/robinet/poster.html> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_WnhoIbfcoM>

[(Follow our size requirements, not those suggested in the links)](https://undergraduateresearch.as.ua.edu/presenting-your-work/making-posters/)

Students have the option of using the UWGB Poster templates found on the DLE site or creating their own design. Poster sizes are to be 24” x 36”, printed horizontally, in full color. Do not laminate the poster. The MSW Program provides foam board and easels to display the posters during the Symposium. Additional guidelines for creating effective Posters can be found at the following link: [https://projects.ncsu.edu/project/Posters/.](https://projects.ncsu.edu/project/posters/)

**Evaluation of the Poster**

Evaluation of the Poster is based on the student’s ability to demonstrate the linkage between research,

theory, values, and practice. The Poster comprises 40% of the final course grade in SOC WORK 719: Capstone Seminar. (See full rubric on page 12 of this document.) Because the ability to present information in a logical format is critical to effective research, this entire assignment (mechanics and content) is used as an embedded assessment assignment.

*Posters will be assessed based on the following basic criteria:*

The Poster is well-organized, clearly presented, and professionally prepared. (15%)

The Poster illustrates an integration of research, theory, values, and practice related to a relevant area of social work; and includes an introduction and a strong forward-thinking conclusion/discussion. (85%)

**The Social Work Symposium**

At the end of the spring semester, students present their posters in an on-campus public Symposium to which colleagues, University administrators, Social Work faculty, field instructors, friends, and family are invited to attend. The Symposium venue and timing may change from year to year, but the general format remains the same. Each student has a table/section of a table to display the Poster and any handouts that are relevant. Students stand near their Poster for the duration of the Symposium to provide additional information to interested guests. It is expected that all students will attend and engage in the Symposium with a high level of professionalism, ready to share their expertise with the public.

**University Archiving**

The University requires graduate students to submit their Capstone Projects to the University Archives in order to fulfill their graduation requirements. The MSW Program supports archiving as it gives current and future students the opportunity to access the high-quality research produced by MSW graduates. Students who do not wish to archive their Posters have the option to waive this step (see below).

The process for archival submission will be discussed and monitored through the Capstone Seminar course. Students who wish to waive their right to archive their Posters should complete the Project Archive Waiver e-form found on the Graduate Studies website: [http://www.uwgb.edu/graduate/students/thesis-project/.](http://www.uwgb.edu/graduate/students/thesis-project/)

IMPORTANT NOTE: The MSW degree will not be conferred on student’s official transcript until Graduate Studies receives the Poster submission or waiver form. This may result in an unavoidable delay of student’s credentialing and employment efforts.

**OVERVIEW OF THEORIES OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR** & **THE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT**

**APPLICATIONS TO SOCIAL WORK GENERALIST PRACTICE**

***The following is a very general outline summarizing the theories covered in the NCSSS foundation classes of SSS 571: Human Behavior*** & ***the Social Environment. Theory application*** & ***integration with practice are demonstrated. This outline is only a summary of highlights; all theorists, ideas, and concepts are not included.***

***Because human behavior is complex and the social work profession is broad, numerous theories are utilized for social work practice at the micro-meso-macro levels. These theories focus on human growth and development, psychological and social functioning, and social service delivery. Some theories emphasize social and economic justice. All theories are value-laden and come out of a socio-historical context. Thus, all theories should be critiqued with attention paid to their cross-cultural applicability.***

**DEFINITIONS:**

*Theory-interrelated sets of concepts and propositions, organized into a deductive system to explain relationships about certain aspects of the world (e.g., the theories listed below).*

**Perspective-an** *emphasis or point of view; concepts at an earlier level of development (e.g., a "strengths perspective') or at a broader and higher level of abstraction (ex: a "humanistic perspective" or a "developmental perspective')*

**Paradigm-an** *archetype or mode of thought; a general way of seeing the world (e.g., "modernism" or ''post-modernism' )*

**Practice Model-a** *guide for practitioner interaction that operationalizes theory; includes concrete actions and techniques (note: some theories have more well-developed practice models than others)*

**Dimension-a** *feature that can be focused on individually or separately, but can only be understood in relation to other features (as in "dimensions of human behavior" or a "multi-dimensional approach" to human behavior)*

**[Sources:** Hutchison, E. D. (2003). *Dimensions of human behavior: Person and environment* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.; Robbins, S., Chatterjee, P., & Canda, E. (Eds.) (2005). *Contemporary human behavior theory: A critical perspective for social work* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.]













|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **MSW Capstone Poster Grading Rubric (40% of grade)** | | |
| **Content** (85 Points Possible)  **(poor) 0—15 (excellent)** | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| **Introduction:** Background information about the project and/or rationale for choosing the topic | /10 |  |
| **Practice:** Clear explanation of the effectiveness and/or impact of your topic on social work practice | /15 |  |
| **Research:** Concise integration of literature findings | /15 |  |
| **Theory:** Explanation of theoretical model(s) and connection to the topic/issue. | /15 |  |
| **Values**: Discussion of societal values impacting the issue/topic using competency 3 as a guide | /15 |  |
| **Discussion:** Summary of implications *and* recommendations for practice, policy, and research | /15 |  |
| **Total Score for Content (of 85)** |  |  |
| **Mechanics** (15 Points Possible)  **(poor) 0—10 (excellent)** | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| APA formatting for in-text citations and annotated bibliography. Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. | /5 |  |
| Poster was well constructed, organized, visually appealing. All elements were present (title of poster, student name, introduction, 5 content sections) | /5 |  |
| Day of Symposium: Professional presentation and engagement, reference page available in hard copy. | /5 |  |
| **Total Score (100 possible)** |  |  |

*Entire assignment is used for EAA measure*

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C4 (K) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 731: Research Critique Assignment**  **(Sections I – V comprise EAA score.)** |

**Research Critique Assignment Grading Rubric**

**Items (I, II, III & IV) which is 85% of the total grade will be used for calculating Embedded Assignment**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Points** | **Comments** |
| 1. **Problem Statement:** | **15** |  |
| * Identified and briefly described the social concern or background under study and stated the basic research question, or problem under study | /5 |  |
| * Identified and briefly described the purpose of this study (explanatory, exploratory, evaluative, or descriptive) or more than one purpose. | /5 |  |
| * Identified and briefly described the importance of the research question (or rationale for doing the research) in the context of social work practice and/or social welfare policy. | /5 |  |
| 1. **Lit. Review:** | **20** |  |
| * Identified a conceptual/theoretical framework (or more than one) and evaluated whether it seemed appropriate for the research question addressed. | /5 |  |
| * Analyzed briefly prior literature reviewed and evaluated whether it was relevant to the research problem and the theoretical framework. | /5 |  |
| * Evaluated whether the literature review appeared adequate to include important studies related to the research problem, the researchers identified gaps in prior studies, and studies reviewed were up to date. | /5 |  |
| * Located the key research questions and/or hypotheses (hypothesis only applies to quantitative study) and discussed whether the hypotheses or research questions fit well with the goals the researcher seemed to be trying to achieve. | /5 |  |
| 1. **Methods** | **20** |  |
| **Participants (Sample), Procedures, & Design**: | 15 |  |
| * Identified and described the quantitative study design (experimental, single-subject, survey, or other research design used) or the orientation of the qualitative study as a qualitative study in general, and/or a specific approach such as ethnography, grounded theory, or narrative analysis. | /5 |  |
| * Identified and described the study population (a sample, or participants) and the study site. Was a sample size large or small? | /5 |  |
| * Described whether the researcher(s) used a probability or nonprobability sampling method. Discussed the specific type of sampling method used in the study and the sampling procedure (any selection criteria, recruitment procedure). | /5 |  |
| **Measures**: | 5 |  |
| * Identified quantitative independent and dependent variables in the hypotheses or research questions and described whether they were nominally and operationally well-defined. An operational definition can be a question or an instrument/scale (e.g., the Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test instrument). Evaluated whether the instrument’s validity and reliability were described in the Method.   or   * Described what qualitative data collection methods were used and who gathered data (interviewers or informants, field notes, focus groups, or any training offered to those interviewers or informants) | /5 |  |
| **Data Analysis:** | 5 |  |
| * Indicated whether the researcher(s) used quantitative data analysis (any statistical data analyses) * Or * Described how the researchers analyzed data and established consistency in data analysis (e.g., grounded theory, coding and interpretation processes, any effort of triangulating findings, any member-checking or checking their findings with participants or informants) | /5 |  |
| 1. **Findings** | **25** |  |
| * Described the findings reported in the study | /5 |  |
| * Discussed whether the researchers explained or interpreted the findings well in line with their research questions. | /5 |  |
| * Quantitative study: Discussed whether the findings answered the research question (s)/hypothesis(es) posed within the study.   Or   * Qualitative Study: Discussed any new theory that the researchers generated from the findings. | /5 |  |
| * Discussed any limitations of the study | /5 |  |
| * Discussed any implications for social work practice and/or social welfare policy | /5 |  |
| 1. **Writing** | 15 |  |
| * Grammar, punctuation, spelling, clarity and organization of ideas | /10 |  |
| * **Citations and References (Refer to APA manual, 7th edition)** | /5 |  |
| Completed by the due date? -5 points each day late |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | 100 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C4 (K) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 731: Research Proposal**  **(Sections I – V comprise the EAA score.)** |

**Final Research Proposal Assignment #3 Grading Rubric**

Items (I, II, III.IV, & V) which is 85% of the total grade will be used calculating Embedded Assignment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | Points | Comments |
| 1. **Introduction (problem Statement)** | **10** |  |
| * Described the social concern or background under study and stated the basic research question, or problem under study | /6 |  |
| * Briefly described the purpose of this study (explanatory, explorative, evaluative, or descriptive) or more than one purpose. | /2 |  |
| * Described the importance of the research question (or rationale for doing the research) in the context of social work practice and/or social welfare policy. | /2 |  |
| 1. **Theoretical Framework** | **10** |  |
| * Provided the theory/paradigms that guide the proposed study (Quantitative) * Provided the paradigms, perspectives, approaches, or lens that the proposed study uses as a context (e.g., feminist, critical lens, symbolic interactionism, social constructivist, or empowerment) (Qualitative) |  |  |
| 1. **Lit. Review:** | **20** |  |
| * Used seven peer-reviewed journal articles that are up to date. | /5 |  |
| * Reviewed or defined key variables/concepts named in the research questions or hypotheses. | /2 |  |
| * Analyzed and synthesized prior literature relevant to the research problem and the theoretical framework. | /5 |  |
| * Identified gaps in prior studies. | /5 |  |
| * Stated the key research questions and/or hypotheses (hypotheses are applied to only a quantitative study) and discussed whether the proposed study will contribute to the new knowledgebase | /3 |  |
| 1. **Methods** | **30** |  |
| 1. **Participants (Sample) & Design** | **10** |  |
| * Described the study population (a sample, participants) and the setting/site in which the study will be conducted. | /5 |  |
| * Discussed the specific type of sampling method used in the study and the sampling procedure (e.g., selection criteria). | /5 |  |
| 1. **Data Collection Procedure & Design** | 15 |  |
| * Described the quantitative study design (experimental, single-subject, survey, or other research design used) or the orientation of the qualitative study in general, and/or a specific approach such as ethnography, grounded theory, or narrative analysis. | /5 |  |
| * Described procedure of the study (recruitment procedure) and human subject protection protocol | /5 |  |
| * Quantitative Measures: Identified the operational definitions of independent and dependent variables. An operational definition can be an instrument/scale (e.g., the Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test instrument). Provided the instrument’s validity and reliability.   Or   * Qualitative Measures: Described what data collection methods were used and who gathered data (interviewers or informants, field notes, focus groups, or any training offered to those interviewers or informants) | /5 |  |
| 1. **Data Analysis** | 5 |  |
| * Quantitative Data Analysis: Described quantitative data analysis (any statistical data analyses: Chi-square, intendent t-test, pared t-test, ANOVA, regression, logistic regression)   Or   * Qualitative Data Analysis: Described how data were analyzed and established validity and consistency in data analysis (e.g., grounded theory, coding and interpretation processes, any effort of triangulating findings, or any member-checking or checking their findings with participants or informants: NVivo, Atlas.ti) | /5 |  |
| 1. **Discussion** | **15** |  |
| * Described the expected findings of the study. | /5 |  |
| * Discussed any strengths and limitations of the study. | /5 |  |
| * Discussed any implications of the expected findings for social work practice, research, and/or social welfare policy. | /5 |  |
| 1. **Writing** | **15** |  |
| Grammar, punctuation, spelling, clarity and organization of ideas | /10 |  |
| **Citations and References (Refer to APA manual, 7th edition)** | /5 |  |
| Completed by the due date? -5 points each day late |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | **100** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C4 (V) & C4 (S) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 719: Capstone Project Assignment**  **(Entire assignment comprises EAA score.)** |

**Overview of the MSW Capstone Project**

The Capstone Project for the UW-Green Bay MSW Program is derived from the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) competencies of which all students graduating from accredited social work programs must demonstrate mastery. At the end of their final year in the program, UW-Green Bay MSW students will prepare a poster presentation that is grounded in research, theory, values, and practice-based knowledge. Posters are presented in a public forum and, as such, help students meet Competency 1: *Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior,* Competency 3: *Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice,* and Competency 4: *Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-informed Practice*.

Specific details, processes, ideas, and examples for the MSW Capstone Project are provided below. It is expected that students keep this document as a primary resource in developing their projects.

**The Professional Poster**

The creation and display of a Poster is intended to help students disseminate professional knowledge through an interactive format. Posters are displayed, accompanied by their author, at the annual Social Work Symposium held at the end of the spring semester.

The primary focus of the Poster is to demonstrate the integration of theory, practice, values, and research in a particular aspect of social work. The Poster should illustrate the student’s knowledge of the relevant literature, the intersection with social work practice, and the linkages between theory and practice. The Poster provides evidence of mastery for competencies one and four and, as such, can be identified in the spring learning contract as a plan to meet these two competencies.

Posters are to be electronically prepared and professionally printed in order to meet the high- quality standards of graduate level work. While creativity in Poster presentation is encouraged, the minimum required guidelines are provided below. Posters from previous years can be found in the University Archives at <http://diglib.uwgb.edu/digital/collection/p17003coll5/search>

**Developing a Poster Idea**

Selecting an idea for the professional Poster is the first step in this process. The Poster topic should be linked to the student’s practicum experience and/or Individualized Area of Emphasis (IAE) and must have the ability to be explored through the lens of research, theory, values, and practice. Specifically, students will be asked to: describe the topic, explain how it is conceptualized in practice, identify the theoretical basis, discuss the societal values impacting the topic, provide a synopsis of the research evidence that supports or refutes the main point(s) of the topic, and conclude with a discussion or implications section. Seminar instructors, Field Instructors, and classmates are good resources to help students identify topics to explore for their Posters. The following examples are provided to spark ideas of relevant Poster topics:

Micro or clinical topics: Person-Centered Care, Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR), Dialectic Behavior Therapy (DBT), Mindfulness, Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Trauma-Informed Care, Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS), Equine Therapy, Peer Mentors or Support Groups, Life Review, etc.

Macro or programmatic topics: visitation policy and incarceration, influencing effective social policy change, agency sustainability, program evaluation/outcomes, learning collaboratives, addressing diversity in long term care settings, Family Find, etc.

**Steps to Follow**

Time will be allotted in the Specialized Seminar courses to help students prepare for, and develop, their professional posters. The following processes, in the order suggested, will be introduced and monitored throughout the year with the goal of supporting students as they complete the Capstone Project. At the end of this document is a worksheet to help guide your work.

1. Narrow the topic
2. Describe how this topic looks in practice
3. Consider the societal values impacting the issue
4. Search the literature for research related to the topic (See annotated bibliography instructions on page 11 of this document.)
5. Identify the theory that provides the framework for the topic (See Overview handout on pp. 5-10)
6. Link practice, values, research, and theory
7. Consider implications, further discussions, conclusions
8. Develop an introduction
9. Create a title
10. Design the poster with the key elements from steps 2-8
11. Identify accompanying materials/handouts to display during Symposium
12. Show up at the Symposium and demonstrate your knowledge!

**Creating a Professional Poster**

All Posters should have a title that reflects the content or intent of the Poster, not to exceed 12 words. The remaining sections of the Poster must include the student’s name; an introduction; the elements of practice, research, values, and theory; and a discussion/implications section. All sources must be cited using proper APA in-text formatting. To conserve space, do not list the references on the Poster, but they must be provided in a separate Word document that accompanies the poster. It is recommended to use a font size no smaller than 24 for the text; no greater than 60 for the title. Citations should be the same size font as the text.

Posters must be electronically created, saved in an acceptable format for submission to the instructor and University archives, and professionally printed. There are several ways to create an electronic Poster; the simplest may be through Power Point. The following links provide easy to follow instructions for creating a Poster using Power Point: <https://www.iwu.edu/library/tools/CPMP.pdf> <https://faculty.washington.edu/robinet/poster.html> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_WnhoIbfcoM>

[(Follow our size requirements, not those suggested in the links)](https://undergraduateresearch.as.ua.edu/presenting-your-work/making-posters/)

Students have the option of using the UWGB Poster templates found on the DLE site or creating their own design. Poster sizes are to be 24” x 36”, printed horizontally, in full color. Do not laminate the poster. The MSW Program provides foam board and easels to display the posters during the Symposium. Additional guidelines for creating effective Posters can be found at the following link: [https://projects.ncsu.edu/project/Posters/.](https://projects.ncsu.edu/project/posters/)

**Evaluation of the Poster**

Evaluation of the Poster is based on the student’s ability to demonstrate the linkage between research,

theory, values, and practice. The Poster comprises 40% of the final course grade in SOC WORK 719: Capstone Seminar. (See full rubric on page 12 of this document.) Because the ability to present information in a logical format is critical to effective research, this entire assignment (mechanics and content) is used as an embedded assessment assignment.

*Posters will be assessed based on the following basic criteria:*

The Poster is well-organized, clearly presented, and professionally prepared. (15%)

The Poster illustrates an integration of research, theory, values, and practice related to a relevant area of social work; and includes an introduction and a strong forward-thinking conclusion/discussion. (85%)

**The Social Work Symposium**

At the end of the spring semester, students present their posters in an on-campus public Symposium to which colleagues, University administrators, Social Work faculty, field instructors, friends, and family are invited to attend. The Symposium venue and timing may change from year to year, but the general format remains the same. Each student has a table/section of a table to display the Poster and any handouts that are relevant. Students stand near their Poster for the duration of the Symposium to provide additional information to interested guests. It is expected that all students will attend and engage in the Symposium with a high level of professionalism, ready to share their expertise with the public.

**University Archiving**

The University requires graduate students to submit their Capstone Projects to the University Archives in order to fulfill their graduation requirements. The MSW Program supports archiving as it gives current and future students the opportunity to access the high-quality research produced by MSW graduates. Students who do not wish to archive their Posters have the option to waive this step (see below).

The process for archival submission will be discussed and monitored through the Capstone Seminar course. Students who wish to waive their right to archive their Posters should complete the Project Archive Waiver e-form found on the Graduate Studies website: [http://www.uwgb.edu/graduate/students/thesis-project/.](http://www.uwgb.edu/graduate/students/thesis-project/)

IMPORTANT NOTE: The MSW degree will not be conferred on student’s official transcript until Graduate Studies receives the Poster submission or waiver form. This may result in an unavoidable delay of student’s credentialing and employment efforts.

**OVERVIEW OF THEORIES OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR** & **THE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT**

**APPLICATIONS TO SOCIAL WORK GENERALIST PRACTICE**

***The following is a very general outline summarizing the theories covered in the NCSSS foundation classes of SSS 571: Human Behavior*** & ***the Social Environment. Theory application*** & ***integration with practice are demonstrated. This outline is only a summary of highlights; all theorists, ideas, and concepts are not included.***

***Because human behavior is complex and the social work profession is broad, numerous theories are utilized for social work practice at the micro-meso-macro levels. These theories focus on human growth and development, psychological and social functioning, and social service delivery. Some theories emphasize social and economic justice. All theories are value-laden and come out of a socio-historical context. Thus, all theories should be critiqued with attention paid to their cross-cultural applicability.***

**DEFINITIONS:**

*Theory-interrelated sets of concepts and propositions, organized into a deductive system to explain relationships about certain aspects of the world (e.g., the theories listed below).*

**Perspective-an** *emphasis or point of view; concepts at an earlier level of development (e.g., a "strengths perspective') or at a broader and higher level of abstraction (ex: a "humanistic perspective" or a "developmental perspective')*

**Paradigm-an** *archetype or mode of thought; a general way of seeing the world (e.g., "modernism" or ''post-modernism' )*

**Practice Model-a** *guide for practitioner interaction that operationalizes theory; includes concrete actions and techniques (note: some theories have more well-developed practice models than others)*

**Dimension-a** *feature that can be focused on individually or separately, but can only be understood in relation to other features (as in "dimensions of human behavior" or a "multi-dimensional approach" to human behavior)*

**[Sources:** Hutchison, E. D. (2003). *Dimensions of human behavior: Person and environment* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.; Robbins, S., Chatterjee, P., & Canda, E. (Eds.) (2005). *Contemporary human behavior theory: A critical perspective for social work* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.]













|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **MSW Capstone Poster Grading Rubric (40% of grade)**  (This entire assignment is used for EAA) | | |
| **Content** (85 Points Possible)  **(poor) 0—15 (excellent)** | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| **Introduction:** Background information about the project and/or rationale for choosing the topic | /10 |  |
| **Practice:** Clear explanation of the effectiveness and/or impact of your topic on social work practice | /15 |  |
| **Research:** Concise integration of literature findings | /15 |  |
| **Theory:** Explanation of theoretical model(s) and connection to the topic/issue. | /15 |  |
| **Values**: Discussion of societal values impacting the issue/topic using competency 3 as a guide | /15 |  |
| **Discussion:** Summary of implications *and* recommendations for practice, policy, and research | /15 |  |
| **Total Score for Content (of 85)** |  |  |
| **Mechanics** (15 Points Possible)  **(poor) 0—10 (excellent)** | **Totals** | **Comments** |
| APA formatting for in-text citations and annotated bibliography. Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. | /5 |  |
| Poster was well constructed, organized, visually appealing. All elements were present (title of poster, student name, introduction, 5 content sections) | /5 |  |
| Day of Symposium: Professional presentation and engagement, reference page available in hard copy. | /5 |  |
| **Total Score (100 possible)** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C5 (K) & C5 (S) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 728: Policy Project**  **(Entire assignment comprises EAA score.)** |

**Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice**

**Assignment Criteria and Grading Rubric for Policy Project Entire assignment (50%)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading Component** | **Points Possible** | **Criteria** | **Points Given** |
| Identification of Policy, Policy Intent, Goals and Stakeholders | 10 | Policy is clearly identified by title, sponsor, and policy focus. Status of policy is presented. Clear identification of the policy issues and what it intends to address. Policy goals are identified. Stakeholders are identified. |  |
| Identification of Problem, Target Population, Impact | 5 | The social problem is identified and defined. Demographic information identifies scope and magnitude of the problem. Target population is identified. The consequences/impact of the policy are thoroughly discussed. |  |
| Value Assumptions, Strengths & Limitations | 10 | Clear identification of values that underpin policy; Identification and discussion of strengths and limitations of policy |  |
| Advocacy Options | 10 | Presentation of potential advocacy activities to effect change. |  |
| Recommendations & Position/ Platform Statement | 15 | Discussion of recommended changes to improve policy. Platform statement describes your stance on the policy, views/beliefs, and your position relative to the policy under discussion. |  |
| **Total Points** | **50** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C5 (V) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 728: Online Facilitation**  **(Entire assignment comprises EAA score.)** |

**SOC WORK 728: Advanced Policy: Leadership, Advocacy and Practice**

**Initial Film Q & A: Responses and Discussion Posts (20%).** Students are required to view films for each of the asynchronous class sessions and respond to instructor's posted questions. Up to five points will be awarded for responses to the questions for each of the four asynchronous film discussions. **Responses to the questions must include reference to relevant course materials** and consist of a minimum of 150 words for each question on each film. **Also, (10%)** Two posts on other students' initial Q & A are required. Up to 1.25 points will be awarded for each of the two posts. (Two posts for each film x 4 films = 8 posts = 10 points.) While two replies of 100 words or more are expected, students are encouraged to participate beyond the minimum to facilitate thoughtful conversation.

**Online Facilitation of Questions and Answers (Q&A) Entire 4 online Facilitations (7.5 x 4)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Full Marks | Points | Comments |
| Answer questions/prompts provided by the instructor | 3 |  |  |
| Relate the film to class discussions, readings, notes or knowledge | 2 |  |  |
| Two Responses to other student initial posts | 2.5 |  |  |
| **Total points** | **7.5** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C6 – C9 (K) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 721: Student Choice Topic Paper**  **(Content section (85%) comprises EAA score .)** |

**University of Wisconsin-Green Bay MSW Program**

**Soc Work 721 Advanced Practice: Multi-level Family Systems**

**Student Choice Topic Paper**

**Assignment Description from the Syllabus**

* **30% Student Choice Topic:**

Students will research and write an individual paper addressing how a specific condition/situation of one individual in the family affects all family members and the family dynamics. For example, if a family member is diagnosed with schizophrenia or a child is diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder, how does that impact the individual, individual members within the family, the family as a whole, and the community? When you select your topic of interest, please refer to the student choice topic list available in Canvas. Research and presentation will clearly address all five environmental systems levels (micro, meso, exo, macro, and chrono) from ecological theory.

First, students should develop a ‘family case’ around their topic. This makes the descriptions of impacts easier and also makes understanding the dynamics of the topic more accessible to the audience. Students can develop their family cases based on their field experiences with their clients/customers.

Paper is to be written according to APA style (6th edition) and should be no more than 8-10 pages in narrative length including cover and reference pages. Students are expected to cite **at least five references** (three peer-reviewed journal articles and two from class readings) in their papers. Due date for the student choice topic paper is written on your course schedule.

**Class presentation:** Students will inform their instructors of their selected topics by Week 2 (See the course schedule). On Week 3, instructors will provide students with a list of groups, so students will find out which group they belong to. Students grouped on the basis of their selected topics will discuss their findings with their own group members on Week 4 in class or online. It will be assumed that group members will share responsibility for developing the presentation itself. On Week 5, students will participate in their group presentations whose content and structure can be based on similarities and differences of their findings for 20-25 minutes. After each group presentation, all students will engage in class discussion and/or questions for 5-10 minutes.

**Timeliness & Grading**: Students’ individual papers should be submitted to the Canvas Assignment by the date and time when students are undertaking their presentations. Late submissions will be deducted 5 points for each day the assignment is late. Students can bring and share their handouts of community resources in class (Students do not need to copy their handouts more than one). The detailed criteria and grading rubric will be available in Canvas. Students should follow the grading rubric in preparing the paper and presentation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Choice Topic Paper Rubric** | | | |
| **This assignment is intended to allow students to address how a specific condition/situation of on individual in the family affects all family members and the family dynamics.  (Total 30% of grade)** | | | |
| **Content 85 Points Possible** | **Points Possible** | **Points Earned** | **Comments** |
| All eleven key elements of the assignment were covered in a substantive way. |  |  |  |
| 1. Introduction: A brief background information about why you chose this family and how you engaged with the family in the beginning of the helping process | 5 |  |  |
| 1. Provided a general description of a family case addressing how a specific condition/situation of one individual in the family affects all family members and the family dynamics. Described how the condition impacts the individual and the family system (children/siblings, parents/caregivers and potentially extended family) and the community (think about costs) and how the individual and the family system had been dealing with or trying to cope with | 15 |  |  |
| 1. Briefly described a definition of the specific condition of the individual in the family and provided an overview of the condition/situation in the U.S., Wisconsin State, and/or County (e.g., prevalence, incidence, or any statistical data about the condition/situation) | 5 |  |  |
| 1. Assessed risk and protective factors influencing the adaptations that the individual and the family have made at micro and mesosystems levels. Please use Bronfenbrenner’s social ecology theory and horizontal and vertical stressors that you learned in class when applicable (see Rasheed et al.s’ chapter 2) | 10 |  |  |
| 1. Explained how recursive dynamics between the family system and the environment (ecological systems perspective: Geographical location, sociopolitical, cultural, and economic context) impact or might impact availability, access and provision of services. Please use Bronfenbrenner’s social ecology theory and horizontal and vertical stressors that you learned in class when applicable (see Rasheed et al.s’ chapter 2) | 10 |  |  |
| 1. Identified the family’s overall goals for meeting the levels of needs that you assessed. | 5 |  |  |
| 1. Identified at least one evidence-based practice that would be appropriate as an intervention approach and described what would make it appropriate for the condition/situation, ideally for the family (see the EBP documents in Canvas modules--Resources). | 10 |  |  |
| 1. Identified the specific indicators that would tell you that the intervention(s) helped the family reach their goals, and evaluated the effectiveness of those interventions by using supportive readings including class and peer-reviewed journal articles. | 10 |  |  |
| 1. Identified potential ethical implications in how the condition is addressed at micro, mezzo and macro levels. | 5 |  |  |
| 1. Included resources that help the family as an attachment to the paper.   [Handout: information of community resources (bring one copy to class)] | 5 |  |  |
| 1. Cited **at least five references (three peer-reviewed journal articles and two from course readings)** in text. | 5 |  |  |
| **Mechanics 15 Points Possible** | **Points Possible** | **Points Earned** |  |
| Quality of engaging in the group presentation and class discussion | 5 |  |  |
| Sentences were complete, clear, and concise. The paper was well-constructed and organized. Sentence transitions were present and maintained the flow of thought. Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. | 5 |  |  |
| The paper, including the title page, introduction, the body, conclusion, and reference page, followed APA formatting guidelines. Paper included Times New Roman font, was double spaced, and **included headings (from 1 to 10 in content section, conclusion, and references)**. Citations of original works within the body of the paper followed APA guidelines. It must be 8-10 pages in length, including the cover and reference pages. | 5 |  |  |
| Emailed by the due date?  -5 points each day late |  |  |  |
| ***Total Points*** | **100** |  |  |
| ***Final Grade*** | |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C6 – C9 (S) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 721: Role Play & Reflexivity/Feedback Journal**  **(Content only, 75%, comprises EAA score.)** |

**40% Role Play & Reflexivity/Feedback Journaling:**

Students will draw numbers to randomly form **four or** **five family groups** of five or six members each, depending on class size.  Each group will randomly select a family scenario from the pre-determined list provided by the instructor. These scenarios will reflect a diversity of immediate challenges, ages, culture/race/ethnicity, location/community, and practice setting.

* Student groups will meet to develop their family situation.
* Each family will have six counseling sessions, which are typically held during the end of class for one hour.  During these counseling sessions, student will apply various theories, skills and techniques for working with families that are being studied in class.
* Each student will keep the same role throughout the series of sessions, except when taking the role of the social worker (see below).
* Students may take additional roles, if needed, to include 3rd parties germane to the case scenario.  For example:  case manager, neighbor, friend, current or former partner, other relative, etc. In this case, the person the student usually plays will be ‘absent’ for some reason from the session (this includes when the student is in the role of the social worker).
* Students will rotate the role of the social worker, with each student playing the social worker at least once. For groups with just four or five members, those who volunteer to take the social work role twice will receive 2 points added to their final grade for the assignment. Students will sign a contract indicating the session for which they will be the social worker.
* In situations during the evolution of the case where the session calls for fewer individual/group members to be present than there are available students, non-character students will assume the role of observer/consultant to the social worker.  Example:  in session three of the child welfare case, the social worker wants only to meet with the mother and the father, with no children present.
* The instructor will provide suggested content for each of the six sessions.  The goal for each session is for the social worker to incorporate techniques from the particular treatment model being studied that week.
* Using critical thinking, students will write a professional reflection and social worker feedback for each session, per guidelines provided by the instructor, and will post those to a family-group discussion on Canvas.  Feedback is intended to support the learning of all students in the family group. All family-group members will participate in the on-line discussion of the session, with each member posting at least two meaningful contributions to the conversation; meaningful contributions mean those that provide constructive feedback to the social worker and peers in the group, that reflect the experience of social worker/family member/observer AND that reflect course readings and classroom discussions.
* Instructor will monitor these discussions and will contribute commentary as appropriate.
* Instructor will observe each group session each week for at least 10 minutes. 
* After the family sessions, class will reconvene as a group for a short de-briefing:  share experiences, ask questions, offer suggestions, etc.

**Multi-level Family Intervention: Canvas Discussion Journal Questions:**

**Social Worker**:

1. What were you hoping to accomplish in your role as social worker during this session?
2. What new skills or techniques, if any, did you use or try to use during this session?  Explain your assessment of how it went.  (Use a Likert scale:  1= not so much; needs work 3= satisfactory 5= I was awesome
3. What was challenging for you during this family session?
4. What did you think you did well during the session?  What tells you this?
5. What do you wish you would have done differently and why?
6. What kinds of thoughts and feelings did you have before, during and after the session?

**Character:**

**As your character:**

1. What your character was t*hinking* and *feeling* during the session?
2. My character found this session: \_\_\_\_ helpful?      \_\_\_\_\_ not helpful?  **Explain**:
3. From your character’s perspective, what did the social worker do that was helpful to you?

**As a student of family interventions:**

1. What did you learn about working with families during this session?
2. What did the social worker do that you will want to replicate in your own practice?
3. What skill(s) or technique(s) that we have studied did you observe the social worker using?
4. What might the social worker have done in addition or differently that you believe could have been useful during this session?

**Observer:**

**As a student & observer of family interventions consider the following:**

1. Focus on what you observed regarding the *process*of working with this family at this point in time and the *focus*of working with this family at this point in time.
2. Provide your assessment of how well the process and focus seemed to work and what might have been done differently. (Include feedback to social worker’s reflections & group discussion.)
3. What were your thoughts and feeling about what you were observing; what might be the personal and/or professional genesis of those thoughts and feelings?
4. What skill(s) or technique(s) that we have studied did you observe the social worker using?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Role Play & Reflexivity/Feedback Journaling Rubric.**  **(Total 6 sessions: 40% of grade)** | | | |
| **Journaling: 75 points** | **Points Possible** | **Points Earned** | **Comments** |
| Answered questions below based on your role. Critical thinking; responded to each question with thought and detail. Reflected on use of concepts found in the readings. At least one response included reference to the readings. | 50 |  |  |
| Posted twice. Sentences were complete, clear, and concise. Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation were followed. Spelling was correct. | 25 |  |  |
| **Role Plays: 25 points** |  |  |  |
| 1. Role play lasted the full hour 2. Student demonstrated professionalism and supported other group members 3. Processed the experience, was actively involved in the large group debriefing following the role play | 25 |  |  |
| **Total Points** | **100** |  |  |
| **Final Grade** |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Specialized Curriculum**  **C6 – C9 (V) Dimension EAA Measure**  **SW 717: Case Study Presentation**  **(EAA score components identified by “\*”.)** |

**UW-Green Bay MSW Program**

**SOC WORK 717: Seminar III**

**Case Study Presentation**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this assignment is to provide students the opportunity to present a client case study similar to an agency case staffing. The case study is to be based on a client/agency scenario or situation in which personal, professional, and societal values are identifiable. Students may choose a situation that is particularly challenging or one that has been resolved but provides an example of a noteworthy learning experience. Students should be certain to protect confidential and client-identifying information throughout the assignment. A significant element of this assignment is to facilitate a discussion in which the presenter solicits feedback from peers on various aspects of the case. This assignment has two parts and is worth 40% of the final grade for this course*.*

**Knowledge:** This assignment gives students the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of how values impact all aspects of the change process: engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation (competencies 6, 7, 8, and 9).

**Skills:** This assignment allows students to “practice” leading a case presentation and soliciting team input.

**Task:** Select a situation from field upon which to build this assignment, as described above, and complete Parts I and II.

**Part I: Written Outline**

Prepare a written outline (1-3 pages) of your case, including all the elements listed below. Submit your outline to Canvas by 11:59 on the Friday before the case study presentation. All students are expected to arrive to the discussion having read the outline and being prepared to ask questions and offer input to the presenter.

Required elements:

1. Student name and name of your agency

1. Relevant demographic information and history
2. Client challenges
3. Client strengths
4. Brief summary of client’s service/treatment plan
5. Identification of the personal, professional, and societal values that impact engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation of this client system/agency situation.
6. Specific questions for student-facilitated class discussion

**Part II: Presentation of Case Study**

Each student will have approximately 15 minutes for the entire presentation; less than 5 minutes for the presentation of the case and 10 minutes for the discussion. The oral presentation should include only the key elements of the case as the audience is expected to have read the outline prior to the presentation. The focus of this assignment is to elicit a discussion on the aspects of the case you find most challenging or educational, including the values that impact the situation.

**Grading Rubric** (\*indicates portion of assignment used for EAA)

15 points Identification and discussion of the personal, professional, and societal values at **each** stage of the change process \*

15 points Facilitation of classroom discussion (demonstrated leadership, open-mindedness, and encouraged balanced participation) \*

5 points Outline (submitted on time, included all required content, professionally prepared) \*

5 points Oral presentation (succinct, included key elements, stayed within timeframe) \*

40 points TOTAL

**Measure 2: Course Objectives from Course Evaluations**

**Template for End-of-Semester Course Evaluations**

In addition to the embedded assessment assignments just indicated, course objective ratings from the end-of-semester evaluations are included in the assessment plan. Course objectives are identified in the course syllabi within Volume II.

|  |
| --- |
| **Course Evaluation Template**  Course Number  Course Title  Instructor  Semester  Directions: The following statements examine various aspects of the course. Course evaluations are one basis for decisions about the future structure of the course. They also assist instructors in their professional development. Please rate each question according to your assessment of the statements in relationship to this course. Consider the items carefully and rate them frankly. You may add narrative comments about the course at the end of the survey.   1. OUTCOMES   This course had the following objectives. Please rate how well the course achieved each objective. Use the following scale:  Not at all A B C D Very much   1. Course Objective 2. Course Objective 3. Course Objective *[Each is measured]* 4. TEACHING METHODOLOGIES   Please rate how strongly you agree to the following statements. Use the following scale:  Not at all A B C D Very much   1. The instructor maintained my interest throughout the semester. 2. The instructor created an environment in which I wanted to learn about the topic. 3. The instructor created a learning environment that encouraged me to be self-directed with my learning. 4. The instructor helped me to examine my own values and perspectives. 5. The instructor helped me to develop knowledge and skills to master the course content. 6. The instructor responded to me in a timely manner. 7. COMMENTS   Please use this section to write your comments about the course.   1. What positive strategies or approaches did this instructor use to support student learning and engagement? (e.g. method/tone of communication, approaches to content delivery or engagement, assignments, strategies for maintaining community, strategies to support students regardless of computer/internet access or ability to attend in-person sessions, etc.)? 2. What positive strategies or approaches did you use to support yourself and your learning in this course (e.g. strategies for time management, approaches to communication with instructor and student support staff, self-care strategies, etc.)? 3. Additional Comments: Please use this space to share additional comments about your experiences in this course. |

**Measure 3: Mastery of Competencies Scores by Competency**

The third measure, the Final Field Evaluation, is located as a support document with the EAA measure for Competencies 1 – 9 Cognitive Affective dimension above. (See [Generalist](#Gen_Progress_toward_Competencies) and [Specialized](#Spec_Progress_toward_Competencies) Mastery of Competencies grading rubrics.)

**Implicit Curriculum Evaluation**

**Program Evaluation**

**Student Evaluation of Social Work Program 2020-2021**

Each spring we ask students to give us feedback about the BSW and MSW Programs – the overall curriculum, advising, field, and relationships with Program staff and peers. This evaluation compliments the evaluations you are asked to do of your individual courses and field.  We would appreciate it if you would take a few minutes to complete this survey. When we have comprehensive feedback from students, we have a better picture of the strengths of the Program and of areas where improvement is needed. Further, the data collected here are used to help us maintain accreditation status with the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE).

*First five questions filter questions using skip logic within Qualtrics*

What Cohort are you in?

* BSW Junior Cohort
* BSW Senior Cohort
* MSW Program Generalist
* MSW Program Specialist

Is this your first year in the MSW Program?

* Yes
* No

Are you currently enrolled part- or full-time in the MSW Program?

* Full-time
* Part-time

Are you currently in a field placement?

* Yes
* No

Are you in the Child Welfare Stipend Program?

* Yes
* No

**Curriculum and Climate Assessment**

The next set of items asks about your experiences with the Social Work curriculum and climate. Please rate how strongly you agree with the following statements.

*Response Options Strongly Disagree-Disagree-Agree-Strongly Agree-Not Applicable*

The way the Social Work courses are scheduled works well for me.

The courses are well integrated; they fit well together and build on one another.

The curriculum pays enough attention to issues of diversity and oppression.

Courses are intellectually challenging.

The Social Work Program’s curriculum and expectations are culturally appropriate.

My instructors respect my identity status(es) (e.g., race, gender identity, sexual orientation, etc.) in the classroom.

My peers respect my identity status(es) (e.g., race, gender identity, sexual orientation, etc.) in the classroom.

Classmates generally act in a professional manner.

Additional comments about the Program curriculum and/or climate:

[*Open response*]

**Program Communication & Relations with Faculty**

The next set of items asks about the quality of the overall communication within the Program and faculty outside the scope of a specific course, advising, or field coordination, Please rate how strongly you agree with the following statements; select “not applicable” if an item does not apply to you.

*Response Options Strongly Disagree-Disagree-Agree-Strongly Agree-Not Applicable*

The initial orientation to the Social Work Program was helpful.

The Social Work Program regularly communicates with students.

The Social Work Program pays attention to students’ needs and concerns.

The Social Work office is a welcoming environment for students.

The Program Chair responds to my inquiries in a timely manner.

My instructors know my name.

I would feel comfortable asking one of my Social Work instructors for a reference letter.

Additional comments about Program communication and relations with faculty:

[*Open response*]

**Advising**

The next set of items asks about your experiences with advising in the Social Work Program. Please rate how strongly you agree with the following statements; select “not applicable” if an item does not apply to you.

*Response Options Strongly Disagree-Disagree-Agree-Strongly Agree-Not Applicable*

I know who my Advisor is.

The roles of the Advisor are clear to me.

My Advisor was accessible to me.

My Advisor responded to me in a timely manner.

Over the past fall and spring semesters, how frequently did you communicate (e.g., email, meet, call, etc.) with your advisor, on average?

* Not at all
* Once or Twice
* Three or Four Times
* More than Four Times

Did this level of communication meet your needs?

* No
* Yes

Additional comments about Program Advising:

[*Open response*]

**Field Coordination**

The next set of items asks about your experiences with the field coordination process. Please rate how strongly you agree with the following statements; select “not applicable” if an item does not apply to you.

*Response Options Strongly Disagree-Disagree-Agree-Strongly Agree-Not Applicable*

The Field Coordination process is helpful in finding an appropriate field placement.

My questions about field placement policies and procedures were answered.

The Field Coordinator is accessible to me.

The Field Coordinator responded to my inquiries in a timely manner.

**Field Evaluation**

My field placement allowed me sufficient independent practice.

The fit between field learning experience and classroom content was sufficient for me. ( I was able to make connections between field and class material).

I was provided opportunities to consult with other staff at agency.

I was provided opportunities to observe various styles and approaches of other workers.

I received adequate opportunities for BSW (or MSW) level generalist practice.

I was able to obtain feedback on my performance from field instructor.

I was treated like a valued member of the agency/team.

I was encouraged to develop my own style of practice

I was encouraged to utilize independent problem-solving.

My field agency fostered strengths-based perspectives.

Please explain any responses that you marked disagree or strongly disagree:

[*Open response*]

Additional Open Response Questions:

Please describe the strengths of this placement:

Please describe the challenges/weaknesses of this placement:

Please describe the qualities a student needs to succeed in this placement.

Please describe the qualities a student needs to succeed in this placement.

**Student Evaluation of Field Instructor**

My field instructor was available when needed.

My field instructor assigned tasks that met my learning needs.

My field instructor prepared me for activities within my placement.

My field instructor was realistic about my skills and abilities with regard to practice expectations.

My field instructor provided supervision at levels appropriate to meet my learning needs.

Please explain any responses that you marked strongly disagree or strongly agree:

[*Open response*]

Additional comments about field coordination:

[*Open response*]

**Child Welfare Stipend Program**

The next set of items asks about your experiences in the Child Welfare Stipend Program. Please rate how strongly you agree with the following statements. Select “not applicable” if an item does not apply to you.

My questions about the stipend program were satisfactorily answered.

The Child Welfare Coordinator was accessible to me.

The Child Welfare Coordinator responded to my inquiries in a timely manner.

Additional comments about the Child Welfare Stipend Program:

[*Open response*]

**Additional Questions**

Have you applied to any graduate school programs?

* Yes
* No

Were you accepted to a graduate program?

* Yes
* No

Degree sought and field of study

* MSW From UW-Green Bay
* MSW from another program, please identify
* Other, please specify

If you will not be in a graduate program in fall, do you plan to apply within the next 7 years?

* No
* Yes, MSW from UW-Green Bay
* Yes, MSW from another program, please identify
* Yes, Other, please specify

*Skip logic for only BSW Program Senior Year or MSW Program Specialist*

Have you applied for employment in social work?

* Yes
* No

Have you received any job offers?

* Yes
* No

Have you formally initiated the process of obtaining social work certification appropriate for your new degree?

* Yes
* No

Do you plan to pursue certification in the future?

* Yes
* No

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this evaluation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated. If there is anything else you would like to share with us about your experiences in the Social Work Program, please do so now. Thank you again.

[*Open response*]

**Agency Field Instructor End-of Year Survey**

|  |
| --- |
| Agency:  Field Instructor  Years as a Field Instructor  Field Instructor Degree  Years in Practice  Were you able to join us for the beginning of the year field orientation?   * Yes * No   Have you attended beginning of the year field orientations previous years?   * Yes * No   Number of students supervised through UWGB Social Work Program this year  Please check the level of students you supervised: [Check all that apply]   * BSW * MSW-Generalist * MSW- Specialist   Please indicate the modality in which your student(s) completed the majority of their field experience this year.   * Primarily in-person * Primarily remotely/online/virtually * A mixture of in-person and remotely   Overall Experience  *Response options: Strongly Disagree-Disagree- Agree- Strongly Agree*  In general, the Social Work Program prepared the student(s) for this field placement.  The amount of time required to assist student development was what I expected.  Students were adequately prepared with a skill set appropriate to the setting at the beginning of placement.  The student’s level of independence is what I expected.  Please provide any recommendation to improve student preparedness for field.  Additional Feedback [If you supervised more than one student and your response would differ by student, please note your thoughts in the comment space below]  *Response options: Strongly Disagree-Disagree- Agree- Strongly Agree*  In general, the Social Work Program prepared the student(s) for this field placement.  The amount of time required to assist student development was what I expected.  Students were adequately prepared with a skill set appropriate to the setting at the beginning of placement.  The student’s level of independence is what I expected.  Ways in which the social work program could better support my efforts as a field instructor  The Social Work Program is required to evaluate field using the competency-based model. Student learning is evaluated based on the learning contract developed jointly between the field instructor and student with the guidance of the faculty. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements.  *Response options: Strongly Disagree-Disagree- Agree- Strongly Agree*  The process of development of the learning contract was clear.  The process of evaluation of the student(s) in the field setting was clear.  Evaluating the student(s) based on competencies was a useful way for me to provide feedback.  Evaluating the student(s) based on professional behaviors was a useful way for me to provide feedback.  I had adequate opportunity to provide feedback to the student(s).  I had adequate opportunity to provide feedback to the faculty field liaison.  Please list any additional comment that would strengthen the field education program.  Explain what you like best about being a field instructor.  Any additional comments about the field program.  Please rank the topics you would like to see included to Field Orientation in the fall.  *Rank 1 - 10*  Giving feedback to students  Developing a learning contract  More information about the Social Work Competencies and related agency activities  Addressing professional &amp; ethical behaviors with students  Hearing from a panel of seasoned field instructors  Hearing from a panel of students  Time to meet with my student(s)  Time to have discussion with field instructors in similar agencies  UWGB Social Work Program Field Policies  Time to meet with my students' faculty field liaison  Annually the Social Work Program offers a Spring Workshop as a thank you for field instructor service to the Program. Please indicate topics that would interest you for future continuing education / trainings. |

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 4.0.2: *The program provides its most recent year of summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of the identified competencies, specifying the percentage of students achieving program benchmarks for each program option.* |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative provides the program’s most recent year of summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of the identified competencies for each program option. |

The Tables below reflect the data per competency:

* [Table 4.7](#Table4_7): Generalist Assessment Outcomes (noted per competency and dimension)
* [Table 4.9](#Table4_9): Specialized Assessment Outcomes (noted per competency and dimension

Composite data (means of competency measures) for the competency attainment can be found in

* [Table 4.8](#Table4_8): Overall Generalist Competency Outcomes
* [Table 4.10](#Table4_10): Overall Specialized Competency Outcomes

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: Narrative specifies the percentage of students achieving program benchmarks for each program option for each program option. |

Table 4.7: Generalist Practice Assessment Outcomes) and 4.9: Specialized Practice Assessment Outcomes provide the data used to calculate students’ achievement of program benchmarks for each of the nine EPAS 2015 competencies using the three measures (EAA, CO and FFE) described in Accreditation Standard 4.0.1 above. Measures for each competency, the benchmarks, and percentage of students attaining those benchmarks are outlined in each of the tables according to either generalist or specialized practice level. The percentage of students achieving each competency was calculated by (1) adding the percentage of students achieving outcome measure benchmarks for each dimension, Knowledge, Values, Skills, and Cognitive Affective Processes and (2) dividing by the four dimensions. Percentage achieving the competency dimension is calculated by averaging the percent of students meeting the benchmark of the embedded assessment assignment scores.

Furthermore, Tables 4.8 and 4.10 present overall achievement of the nine competencies competence by dimension and measures. As noted, Table 4.8: Overall Competency Outcomes for Generalist Practice, 99.12% of students met the benchmarks for all competencies in embedded assessment assignments and 97.73% with the Final Field Evaluation. The Course Objectives ratings did not meet the benchmark, with 85.38% below the 90% achievement outlined by the Program. Table 4.10: Overall Competency Outcomes for Specialized Practice demonstrates similar findings. The benchmark for EAA competency scores was met by 98.57% achievement and FFE at a rate of 98.75%. Course outcomes again fell below the 90% benchmark with 78.52% of CO scores attaining that level of achievement.

If the Program would have retained the 83% Competency Benchmark used in its 2008 EPAS self-study, the Program would have achieved its Competency Benchmark for each competency outcome individually, as well as across all three types of measures. It is interesting to note that these two are the competency outcomes evaluated by faculty instructors, while the course objectives are rated by students.

Outcome measures that did not meet benchmarks are highlighted in red font. We describe the process used to evaluate these outcomes in standard 4.0.4, below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4.7: Generalist Assessment Outcomes for the MSW Program** | | | | | | | |
| **Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior** | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures** | | **Average Grade % (Outcome Measure Benchmark = 83%)** | **Average CO Rating (Outcome Measure Benchmark = 3.0 of 4.0)** | **% Achieving Outcome Measure Benchmark (Competency Benchmark = 90% achievement)** | **Competency Obtained? (Yes if met Competency Benchmark)** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | **EAA =** | Embedded Assessment Assignment |
| **CO =** | Course Objective Rating on End-of-Semester Evaluation |
| **FFE =** | Final Field Evaluation |
| **Knowledge** | | | | **95.51%** | **3.11** | **88.99%** | **No** |
|  | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 701 | Contemporary Social Work Ethics | EAA | Final Ethics Paper | 93.46% |  | 95.65% | Yes |
| CO | 3 |  | 3.27 | 84.12% | No |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare | EAA | Discussion 1 | 97.57% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 1 |  | 2.95 | 76.19% | No |
| **Values** | | | | **95.74%** | **3.27** | **86.74%** | **No** |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | EAA | Values and Assumptions Paper (minus mechanics) | 95.74% |  | 92.86% | Yes |
| CO | 3 |  | 3.27 | 80.63% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | **93.46%** | **3.37** | **89.88%** | **No** |
| 701 | Contemporary Social Work Ethics | EAA | Final Ethics Paper | 93.46% |  | 95.65% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.37 | 84.12% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | **99.13%** | **3.72** | **96.77%** | **Yes** |
| 714 | Field II | EAA | Competency Mastery Grade | 99.13% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.72 | 93.54% | Yes |
| **C1 Outcomes** | | | | **95.96%** | **3.36** | **90.60%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | 0.889895308123249+0.8674+0.898838235294118+0.967708333333333 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | Sum = | 3.624 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9060 |
| **C1 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **96.04%** | **Yes** |
| **C1 CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **83.72%** | **No** |
| **C1 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice** | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures** | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | **92.81%** | **3.29** | **90.42%** | **Yes** |
| 707 | HBSE | EAA | Movie Analysis | 92.81% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 1 |  | 3.29 | 80.83% | No |
| **Values** | | | | **92.64%** | **3.46** | **93.75%** | **Yes** |
| 707 | HBSE | EAA | Developmental Environmental Influences Paper | 92.64% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 4 |  | 3.46 | 87.50% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | **99.04%** | **3.38** | **96.15%** | **Yes** |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I | EAA | Applied Learning-Cultural | 99.04% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 3 |  | 3.38 | 92.31% | Yes |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | **95.00%** | **3.72** | **96.77%** | **Yes** |
| 714 | Field II | EAA | Competency Mastery Grade | 95.00% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.72 | 93.54% | Yes |
| **C2 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | **94.87%** | **3.46** | **94.27%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | 0.904166666666667+0.9375+0.961538461538462+0.967708333333333 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | Sum = | 3.771 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9427 |
| **C2 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **C2 CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **88.55%** | **No** |
| **C2 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **95.24%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice** | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures** | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | **91.26%** | **3.19** | **90.28%** | **Yes** |
| 701 | Contemporary Social Work Ethics | EAA | Social Justice Project | 93.55% |  | 91.31% | Yes |
| CO | 4 |  | 3.24 | 84.12% | No |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare | EAA | Policy Analysis Paper/Video | 88.96% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 3 |  | 3.14 | 85.71% | No |
| **Values** | | | | **92.88%** | **3.14** | **90.48%** | **Yes** |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare | EAA | Policy Values Quiz and Reflection | 92.88% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 2 |  | 3.14 | 80.95% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | **88.96%** | **3.05** | **88.10%** | **No** |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare | EAA | Policy Analysis Paper/Video | 88.96% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.05 | 76.19% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | **96.48%** | **3.72** | **95.02%** | **Yes** |
| 714 | Field II | EAA | Competency Mastery Grade | 96.48% |  | 96.50% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.72 | 93.54% | Yes |
| **C3 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | **92.39%** | **3.27** | **90.97%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | 0.902842331932773+0.904761904761905+0.880952380952381+1 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | Sum = | 3.639 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9097 |
| **C3 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **97.83%** | **Yes** |
| **C3 CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **84.10%** | **No** |
| **C3 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **96.50%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice** | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures** | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | **94.40%** | **3.13** | **89.21%** | **No** |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | EAA | Group Statute Presentation (minus mechanics) | 99.84% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 1 |  | 3.20 | 80.63% | No |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare | EAA | Policy Analysis Paper/Video | 88.96% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.05 | 76.19% | No |
| **Values** | | | | **95.74%** | **3.20** | **86.74%** | **No** |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | EAA | Values and Assumptions Paper (minus mechanics) | 95.74% |  | 92.86% | Yes |
| CO | 1 |  | 3.20 | 80.63% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | **99.81%** | **3.46** | **94.23%** | **Yes** |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I | EAA | Applied Learning-EBP | 99.81% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 4 |  | 3.46 | 88.46% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | **95.09%** | **3.72** | **96.77%** | **Yes** |
| 714 | Field II | EAA | Competency Mastery Grade | 95.09% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.72 | 93.54% | Yes |
| **C4 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | **96.26%** | **3.38** | **91.74%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | 0.892051190476191+0.8674+0.942307692307692+1 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | Sum = | 3.669 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9174 |
| **C4 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **98.21%** | **Yes** |
| **C4 CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **83.89%** | **No** |
| **C4 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice** | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures** | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | **88.96%** | **3.14** | **92.86%** | **Yes** |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare | EAA | Policy Analysis Paper/Video | 88.96% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 3 |  | 3.14 | 85.71% | No |
| **Values** | | | | **93.78%** | **3.14** | **90.48%** | **Yes** |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare | EAA | Exam | 93.78% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 2 |  | 3.14 | 80.95% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | **88.96%** | **3.05** | **88.10%** | **No** |
| 711 | Foundations of Social Welfare | EAA | Policy Analysis Paper/Video | 88.96% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.05 | 76.19% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | **93.34%** | **3.72** | **95.02%** | **Yes** |
| 714 | Field II | EAA | Competency Mastery Grade | 93.34% |  | 96.50% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.72 | 93.54% | Yes |
| **C5 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | **91.26%** | **3.26** | **91.61%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | 0.928571428571429+0.904761904761905+0.880952380952381+0.950208333333333 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | Sum = | 3.664 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9161 |
| **C5 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **C5 CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **84.10%** | **No** |
| **C5 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **91.30%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures** | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | **94.34%** | **3.50** | **96.15%** | **Yes** |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I | EAA | Case Study I | 99.68% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.50 | 88.46% | No |
| 704 | Generalist Practice II | EAA | Community Assessment | 89.00% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 0 |  |  |  | Yes |
| **Values** | | | | **99.17%** | **3.27** | **90.31%** | **Yes** |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | EAA | Multicultural Practice Paper (Identities in Others section) | 99.17% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 3 |  | 3.27 | 80.63% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | **97.72%** | **3.50** | **94.23%** | **Yes** |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I | EAA | Final Role-Play | 97.72% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.50 | 88.46% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | **98.88%** | **3.72** | **96.77%** | **Yes** |
| 714 | Field II | EAA | Competency Mastery Grade | 98.88% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.72 | 93.54% | Yes |
| **C6 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | **97.53%** | **3.50** | **94.37%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | 0.961538461538462+0.903125+0.942307692307692+1 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | Sum = | 3.775 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9437 |
| **C6 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **C6 CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **87.04%** | **No** |
| **C6 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures** | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | **93.88%** | **3.34** | **91.43%** | **Yes** |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I | EAA | Case Study II | 98.75% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.50 | 88.46% | No |
| 704 | Generalist Practice II | EAA | Community Assessment | 89.00% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 1 |  | 3.18 | 77.27% | No |
| **Values** | | | | **99.17%** | **3.27** | **90.31%** | **Yes** |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | EAA | Multicultural Practice Paper (Identities in Others section) | 99.17% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 3 |  | 3.27 | 80.63% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | **97.72%** | **3.50** | **94.23%** | **Yes** |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I | EAA | Final Role-Play | 97.72% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.50 | 88.46% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | **99.00%** | **3.72** | **96.77%** | **Yes** |
| 714 | Field II | EAA | Competency Mastery Grade | 99.00% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.72 | 93.54% | Yes |
| **C7 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | **97.44%** | **3.46** | **93.19%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | 0.914335664335664+0.903125+0.942307692307692+1 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | Sum = | 3.727 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9319 |
| **C7 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **C7 CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **85.67%** | **No** |
| **C7 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures** | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | **94.28%** | **3.34** | **91.43%** | **Yes** |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I | EAA | Case Study III | 99.56% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.50 | 88.46% | No |
| 704 | Generalist Practice II | EAA | Community Assessment | 89.00% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 1 |  | 3.18 | 77.27% | No |
| **Values** | | | | **99.17%** | **3.27** | **90.31%** | **Yes** |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | EAA | Multicultural Practice Paper (Identities in Others section) | 99.17% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 3 |  | 3.27 | 80.63% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | **97.72%** | **3.50** | **94.23%** | **Yes** |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I | EAA | Final Role-Play | 97.72% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.50 | 88.46% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | **98.76%** | **3.72** | **96.77%** | **Yes** |
| 714 | Field II | EAA | Competency Mastery Grade | 98.76% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.72 | 93.54% | Yes |
| **C8 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | **97.48%** | **3.46** | **93.19%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | 0.914335664335664+0.903125+0.942307692307692+1 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | Sum = | 3.727 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9319 |
| **C8 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **C8 CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **85.67%** | **No** |
| **C8 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures** | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | **94.10%** | **3.34** | **91.43%** | **Yes** |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I | EAA | Case Study IV | 99.19% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.50 | 88.46% | No |
| 704 | Generalist Practice II | EAA | Community Assessment | 89.00% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 1 |  | 3.18 | 77.27% | No |
| **Values** | | | | **99.17%** | **3.27** | **90.31%** | **Yes** |
| 700 | Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | EAA | Multicultural Practice Paper (Identities in Others section) | 99.17% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 3 |  | 3.27 | 80.63% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | **97.72%** | **3.50** | **94.23%** | **Yes** |
| 702 | Generalist Practice I | EAA | Final Role-Play | 97.72% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.50 | 88.46% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | **98.54%** | **3.72** | **95.02%** | **Yes** |
| 714 | Field II | EAA | Competency Mastery Grade | 98.54% |  | 96.50% | Yes |
| CO | 5 |  | 3.72 | 93.54% | Yes |
| **C9 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | **97.38%** | **3.46** | **92.75%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | 0.914335664335664+0.903125+0.942307692307692+1 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | Sum = | 3.710 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9275 |
| **C9 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **C9 CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **85.67%** | **No** |
| **C9 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **96.50%** | **Yes** |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4.8: Overall Competency Outcomes for Generalist Practice** | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures** | | **Average Grade % (Outcome Measure Benchmark = 83%)** | **Average CO Rating (Outcome Measure Benchmark = 3.0 of 4.0)** | **% Achieving Outcome Measure Benchmark (Competency Benchmark = 90% achievement)** | **Competency Obtained? (Yes if met Competency Benchmark)** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | **EAA =** | Embedded Assessment Assignment |
| **CO =** | Course Objective Rating on End-of-Semester Evaluation |
| **FFE =** | Final Field Evaluation |
| **Knowledge** |  |  |  | **93.28%** | **3.26** | **91.36%** | **Yes** |
| **Values** | | | | **96.38%** | **3.25** | **89.94%** | **No** |
| **Skills** | | | | **95.68%** | **3.37** | **92.60%** | **Yes** |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | **97.13%** | **3.72** | **94.19%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | **95.62%** | **3.40** | **92.02%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency EAA Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **99.12%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **85.38%** | **No** |
| **Competency FFE Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **97.73%** | **Yes** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4.9 Specialized Assessment Outcomes for the MSW Program** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension**  Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | **Outcome Measures** | | | | **Average Grade % (Outcome Measure Benchmark = 83%)** | **Average CO Rating (Outcome Measure Benchmark = 3.0 of 4.0)** | **% Achieving Outcome Measure Benchmark (Competency Benchmark = 90% achievement)** | **Competency Obtained? (Yes if met Competency Benchmark)** |
| **EAA =** | | Embedded Assessment Assignment | |
| **CO =** | | Course Objective Rating on End-of-Semester Evaluation | |
| **FFE =** | | Final Field Evaluation | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | | **95.11%** | **2.30** | **71.81%** | **No** |
| 728 | Advanced Policy | | EAA | | Policy Practice Project | 95.11% |  | 96.67% | Yes |
| CO | | 4 |  | 2.30 | 46.94% | No |
| **Values** | | | | | | **94.70%** | **3.37** | **89.05%** | **No** |
| 717 | Seminar III | | EAA | | Case Study (entire assignment) | 95.84% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 5 |  | 3.44 | 83.33% | No |
| 719 | Capstone Seminar | | EAA | | Poster (entire assignment) | 93.57% |  | 94.64% | Yes |
| CO | | 5 |  | 3.29 | 78.21% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | | | **95.09%** | **2.85** | **79.12%** | **No** |
| 719 | Capstone Seminar | | EAA | | Poster (entire assignment) | 95.07% |  | 94.64% | Yes |
| CO | | 5 |  | 3.29 | 78.21% | No |
| 728 | Advanced Policy | | EAA | | Policy Practice Project | 95.11% |  | 96.67% | Yes |
| CO | | 2 |  | 2.41 | 46.94% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | | | **93.79%** | **3.43** | **92.86%** | **Yes** |
| 718 | Field IV | | EAA | | Competency Mastery Grade (entire assignment) | 93.79% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 6 |  | 3.43 | 85.71% | No |
| **C1 Outcomes** | | | | | | **94.67%** | **2.99** | **83.21%** | **No** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | | | 0.718055555555556+0.890475297619048+0.791169742063492+0.928571428571429 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | | | Sum = | 2.962 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.8321 |
| **C1 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **96.52%** | **Yes** |
| **C1 CO Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **69.89%** | **No** |
| **C1 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | | **Outcome Measures** | | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | | **96.64%** | **3.27** | **91.80%** | **Yes** |
| 720 | Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy | | EAA | | Diversity Inservice | 96.64% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 2 |  | 3.27 | 83.60% | No |
| **Values** | | | | | | **97.27%** | **3.27** | **91.80%** | **Yes** |
| 720 | Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy | | EAA | | Critical Reaction Journals | 97.27% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 2 |  | 3.27 | 83.60% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | | | **96.97%** | **3.09** | **90.21%** | **Yes** |
| 720 | Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy | | EAA | | Resource Visit Paper | 96.97% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 3 |  | 3.09 | 80.42% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | | | **94.84%** | **3.43** | **92.86%** | **Yes** |
| 718 | Field IV | | EAA | | Competency Mastery Grade (entire assignment) | 94.84% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 6 |  | 3.43 | 85.71% | No |
| **C2 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | | | **96.43%** | **3.26** | **91.67%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | | | 0.917989417989418+0.917989417989418+0.902116402116402+0.928571428571429 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | | | Sum = | 3.667 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9167 |
| **C2 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **C2 CO Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **83.33%** | **No** |
| **C2 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | | **Outcome Measures** | | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | | **96.64%** | **3.27** | **91.80%** | **Yes** |
| 720 | Diversity, Social Justice, and Advocacy | | EAA | | Diversity Inservice | 96.64% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 2 |  | 3.27 | 83.60% | No |
| **Values** | | | | | | **95.07%** | **3.21** | **85.54%** | **No** |
| 719 | Capstone Seminar | | EAA | | Poster (entire assignment) | 95.07% |  | 94.64% | Yes |
| CO | | 3 |  | 3.21 | 76.43% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | | | **95.11%** | **2.41** | **71.81%** | **No** |
| 728 | Advanced Policy | | EAA | | Policy Practice Project | 95.11% |  | 96.67% | Yes |
| CO | | 2 |  | 2.41 | 46.94% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | | | **93.07%** | **3.43** | **90.23%** | **Yes** |
| 718 | Field IV | | EAA | | Competency Mastery Grade (entire assignment) | 93.07% |  | 94.75% | Yes |
| CO | | 6 |  | 3.43 | 85.71% | No |
| **C3 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | | | **94.97%** | **3.08** | **84.84%** | **No** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | | | 0.917989417989418+0.855355357142857+0.718055555555556+0.902321428571429 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | | | Sum = | 3.394 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.8484 |
| **C3 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **97.10%** | **Yes** |
| **C3 CO Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **73.17%** | **No** |
| **C3 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **94.75%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | | **Outcome Measures** | | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | | **92.05%** | **3.13** | **88.69%** | **No** |
| 731 | Research for MSW Practice | | EAA | | Research Critique | 92.05% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 1 |  | 3.13 | 77.38% | No |
| **Values** | | | | | | **95.07%** | **3.23** | **85.54%** | **No** |
| 719 | Capstone Seminar | | EAA | | Poster (entire assignment) | 95.07% |  | 94.64% | Yes |
| CO | | 7 |  | 3.23 | 76.43% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | | | **92.85%** | **3.22** | **86.14%** | **No** |
| 731 | Research for MSW Practice | | EAA | | Research Proposal | 90.63% |  | 96.10% | Yes |
| CO | | 7 |  | 3.20 | 77.38% | No |
| 719 | Capstone Seminar | | EAA | | Poster (entire assignment) | 95.07% |  | 94.64% | Yes |
| CO | | 2 |  | 3.23 | 76.43% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | | | **94.46%** | **3.43** | **91.11%** | **Yes** |
| 718 | Field IV | | EAA | | Competency Mastery Grade (entire assignment) | 94.46% |  | 96.50% | Yes |
| CO | | 6 |  | 3.43 | 85.71% | No |
| **C4 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | | | **93.61%** | **3.25** | **87.87%** | **No** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | | | 0.886904761904762+0.855355357142857+0.861380059523809+0.911071428571429 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | | | Sum = | 3.223 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.8787 |
| **C4 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **96.35%** | **Yes** |
| **C4 CO Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **78.67%** | **No** |
| **C4 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **96.50%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | | **Outcome Measures** | | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | | **95.11%** | **2.23** | **68.65%** | **No** |
| 728 | Advanced Policy | | EAA | | Policy Practice Project | 95.11% |  | 96.67% | Yes |
| CO | | 5 |  | 2.23 | 40.63% | No |
| **Values** | | | | | | **97.55%** | **2.34** | **71.81%** | **No** |
| 728 | Advanced Policy | | EAA | | Online Facilitation & Discussions | 97.55% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 1 |  | 2.34 | 43.61% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | | | **95.11%** | **2.41** | **71.81%** | **No** |
| 728 | Advanced Policy | | EAA | | Policy Practice Project | 95.11% |  | 96.67% | Yes |
| CO | | 2 |  | 2.41 | 46.94% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | | | **94.08%** | **3.43** | **91.11%** | **Yes** |
| 718 | Field IV | | EAA | | Competency Mastery Grade (entire assignment) | 94.08% |  | 96.50% | Yes |
| CO | | 6 |  | 3.43 | 85.71% | No |
| **C5 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | | | **95.46%** | **2.60** | **75.84%** | **No** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | | | 0.686507936507937+0.718055555555556+0.718055555555556+0.911071428571429 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | | | Sum = | 3.034 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.7584 |
| **Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | | **Outcome Measures** | | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | | **94.14%** | **3.27** | **88.94%** | **No** |
| 721 | Multi-Level Family Systems | | EAA | | Student Choice Topic Paper | 94.14% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 4 |  | 3.27 | 77.88% | No |
| **Values** | | | | | | **95.84%** | **3.46** | **90.63%** | **Yes** |
| 717 | Seminar III | | EAA | | Case Study (entire assignment) | 95.84% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 4 |  | 3.46 | 81.25% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | | | **95.79%** | **3.33** | **90.61%** | **Yes** |
| 721 | Multi-Level Family Systems | | EAA | | Role Play and Journal | 95.79% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 3 |  | 3.33 | 81.21% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | | | **0.93** | **3.43** | **92.86%** | **Yes** |
| 718 | Field IV | | EAA | | Competency Mastery Grade (entire assignment) | 93.24% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 6 |  | 3.43 | 85.71% | No |
| **C6 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | | | **94.75%** | **3.37** | **90.76%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | | | 0.889393939393939+0.90625+0.906060606060606+0.928571428571429 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | | | Sum = | 3.630 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9076 |
| **Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | | **Outcome Measures** | | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | | **94.14%** | **3.27** | **88.94%** | **No** |
| 721 | Multi-Level Family Systems | | EAA | | Student Choice Topic Paper | 94.14% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 4 |  | 3.27 | 77.88% | No |
| **Values** | | | | | | **95.84%** | **3.46** | **90.63%** | **Yes** |
| 717 | Seminar III | | EAA | | Case Study (entire assignment) | 95.84% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 4 |  | 3.46 | 81.25% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | | | **95.79%** | **3.33** | **90.61%** | **Yes** |
| 721 | Multi-Level Family Systems | | EAA | | Role Play and Journal | 95.79% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 3 |  | 3.33 | 81.21% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | | | **93.34%** | **3.43** | **92.86%** | **Yes** |
| 718 | Field IV | | EAA | | Competency Mastery Grade (entire assignment) | 93.34% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 6 |  | 3.43 | 85.71% | No |
| **C7 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | | | **94.78%** | **3.37** | **90.76%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | | | 0.889393939393939+0.90625+0.906060606060606+0.928571428571429 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | | | Sum = | 3.630 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9076 |
| **C7 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **C7 CO Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **81.51%** | **No** |
| **C7 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | | **Outcome Measures** | | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | | **94.14%** | **3.27** | **88.94%** | **No** |
| 721 | Multi-Level Family Systems | | EAA | | Student Choice Topic Paper | 94.14% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 4 |  | 3.27 | 77.88% | No |
| **Values** | | | | | | **95.84%** | **3.46** | **90.63%** | **Yes** |
| 717 | Seminar III | | EAA | | Case Study (entire assignment) | 95.84% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 4 |  | 3.46 | 81.25% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | | | **95.79%** | **3.33** | **90.61%** | **Yes** |
| 721 | Multi-Level Family Systems | | EAA | | Role Play and Journal | 95.79% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 3 |  | 3.33 | 81.21% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | | | **93.42%** | **3.43** | **92.86%** | **Yes** |
| 718 | Field IV | | EAA | | Competency Mastery Grade (entire assignment) | 93.42% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 6 |  | 3.43 | 85.71% | No |
| **C8 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | | | **94.80%** | **3.37** | **90.76%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | | | 0.889393939393939+0.90625+0.906060606060606+0.928571428571429 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | | | Sum = | 3.630 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9076 |
| **C8 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **C8 CO Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **81.51%** | **No** |
| **C8 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | | **Outcome Measures** | | | **Ave. Grade % (OMB=83%)** | **Ave. CO Rating (OMB=3.0)** | **% Achieving OMB (CB=90%)** | **Competency Obtained?** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | |
| **Knowledge** | | | | | | **94.14%** | **3.27** | **88.94%** | **No** |
| 721 | Multi-Level Family Systems | | EAA | | Student Choice Topic Paper | 94.14% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 4 |  | 3.27 | 77.88% | No |
| **Values** | | | | | | **95.84%** | **3.46** | **90.63%** | **Yes** |
| 717 | Seminar III | | EAA | | Case Study (entire assignment) | 95.84% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 4 |  | 3.46 | 81.25% | No |
| **Skills** | | | | | | **95.79%** | **3.33** | **90.61%** | **Yes** |
| 721 | Multi-Level Family Systems | | EAA | | Role Play and Journal | 95.79% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 3 |  | 3.33 | 81.21% | No |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | | | **94.19%** | **3.43** | **92.86%** | **Yes** |
| 718 | Field IV | | EAA | | Competency Mastery Grade (entire assignment) | 94.19% |  | 100.00% | Yes |
| CO | | 6 |  | 3.43 | 85.71% | No |
| **C9 Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | | | **94.99%** | **3.37** | **90.76%** | **Yes** |
| Percentage of Students Achieving Competency Calculated by: | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adding % achieving outcome measure benchmark for each dimension: | | | | | | 0.889393939393939+0.90625+0.906060606060606+0.928571428571429 | | | |
| 2. Dividing that sum by 4 (total dimensions): | | | | | | Sum = | 3.630 | Sum ÷ 4 = | 0.9076 |
| **C9 EAA Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
| **C9 CO Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **81.51%** | **No** |
| **C9 FFE Outcome Scores** | | | | | |  |  | **100.00%** | **Yes** |
|  | | | | | |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4.10: Overall Competency Outcomes for Specialized Practice** | | | | | | | |
| **Dimension** | | **Outcome Measures** |  | **Average Grade % (Outcome Measure Benchmark = 83%)** | **Average CO Rating (Outcome Measure Benchmark = 3.0 of 4.0)** | **% Achieving Outcome Measure Benchmark (Competency Benchmark = 90% achievement)** | **Competency Obtained? (Yes if met Competency Benchmark)** |
| Course # and Title (Year and Semester Measured) | | **EAA =** | Embedded Assessment Assignment |
| **CO =** | Course Objective Rating on End-of-Semester Evaluation |
| **FFE =** | Final Field Evaluation |
| **Knowledge** |  |  |  | **94.68%** | **3.03** | **85.39%** | **No** |
| **Values** | | | | **95. 98%** | **3.25** | **87.36%** | **No** |
| **Skills** | | | | **95.36%** | **3.03** | **84.61%** | **No** |
| **Cognitive & Affective** | | | | **93.82%** | **3.30** | **89.42%** | **No** |
| **Competency Outcomes (Benchmark = 90% Achieve Student Benchmark)** | | | | **94.94%** | **3.15** | **89.69%** | **No** |
| **Competency EAA Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **98.57%** | **Yes** |
| **Competency CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **78.52%** | **No** |
| **Competency CO Outcome Scores** | | | |  |  | **98.75%** | **Yes** |

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 4.0.3:*The program uses Form AS 4(B) and/or Form AS 4(M) to report its most recent assessment outcomes for each program option to constituents and the public on its website and routinely up-dates (minimally every 2 years) its findings.* |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: The program uses Form AS 4(B) and/or Form AS 4(M) to report its most recent assessment outcomes for each program option to constituents and the public. |

Form AS 4(M)follows on the next page. The form is used to report the most recent outcomes for the MSW Program (2020-2021 data).

**COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION - FORM AS 4(M)**

**University of Wisconsin-Green Bay MASTER’S SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

**Summary of the Program’s Assessment Plan | Generalist Practice**

All students are assessed using a minimum of two measures on their mastery of the nine competencies that comprise the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards of the Council on Social Work Education and any additional competencies programs may choose to add. Summarize the program’s competency-based assessment plan. Programs may add/delete rows to accurately reflect the number measures included in the data presented.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Measure #1: Embedded Assignments** | |
| Dimension(s) assessed: | Knowledge, Values, Skills, & Cognitive-Affective |
| When/where students are assessed: | Throughout academic year in coursework |
| Who assessed student competence: | Social Work Faculty |
| Outcome Measure Benchmark (minimum score indicative of achievement) for Competencies 1-9: | 83% |
| Competency Benchmark (percent of students the program expects to have achieved the minimum scores, inclusive of all measures) for Competencies 1-9: | 90% |
| **Assessment Measure #2: Field Evaluations** | |
| Dimension(s) assessed: | Cognitive-Affective |
| When/where students are assessed: | End-of-semesters in field practicum |
| Who assessed student competence: | Social Work Faculty |
| Outcome Measure Benchmark (minimum score indicative of achievement) for Competencies 1-9: | 83% |
| Competency Benchmark (percent of students the program expects to have achieved the minimum scores, inclusive of all measures) for Competencies 1-9: | 90% |
| **Assessment Measure #3: Course Evaluations** | |
| Dimension(s) assessed: | Knowledge, Values, Skills, & Cognitive-Affective |
| When/where students are assessed: | End of semester in field and coursework. |
| Who assessed student competence: | Social Work Faculty |
| Outcome Measure Benchmark (minimum score indicative of achievement) for Competencies 1-9: | 3.0 of 4.0 |
| Competency Benchmark (percent of students the program expects to have achieved the minimum scores, inclusive of all measures) for Competencies 1-9: | 90% |
|  | |

**Summary of the Program’s Assessment Plan | Specialized Practice**

Students are assessed using a minimum of two measures on their mastery of the nine competencies that comprise the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards of the Council on Social Work Education and any additional competencies programs may choose to add, that reflect the area of specialized practice. Summarize the program’s competency-based assessment plan. Programs may add/delete rows to accurately reflect the number of areas of specialized practice and each measure included in the data presented.

**Area of Specialized Practice: Advanced Generalist**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Measure #1: Embedded Assignments** | |
| Dimension(s) assessed: | Knowledge, Values, Skills, & Cognitive-Affective |
| When/where students are assessed: | Throughout academic year in coursework |
| Who assessed student competence: | Social Work Faculty |
| Outcome Measure Benchmark (minimum score indicative of achievement) for Competencies 1-9: | 83% |
| Competency Benchmark (percent of students the program expects to have achieved the minimum scores, inclusive of all measures) for Competencies 1-9: | 90% |
| **Assessment Measure #2: Field Evaluations** | |
| Dimension(s) assessed: | Cognitive-Affective |
| When/where students are assessed: | End-of-semesters in field practicum |
| Who assessed student competence: | Social Work Faculty |
| Outcome Measure Benchmark (minimum score indicative of achievement) for Competencies 1-9: | 83% |
| Competency Benchmark (percent of students the program expects to have achieved the minimum scores, inclusive of all measures) for Competencies 1-9: | 90% |
| **Assessment Measure #3: Course Evaluations** | |
| Dimension(s) assessed: | Knowledge, Values, Skills, & Cognitive-Affective |
| When/where students are assessed: | End of semester in field and coursework. |
| Who assessed student competence: | Social Work Faculty |
| Outcome Measure Benchmark (minimum score indicative of achievement) for Competencies 1-9: | 3.0 of 4.0 |
| Competency Benchmark (percent of students the program expects to have achieved the minimum scores, inclusive of all measures) for Competencies 1-9: | 90% |
|  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Data Collected during the Academic Year (2020-2021)**  **Face-to-Face Delivery on UW-Green Bay Campus** | | | | |
| **COMPETENCY** | **COMPETENCY BENCHMARK (%) (GENERALIST)** | **COMPETENCY BENCHMARK**  **(AREA OF SPECIALIZED PRACTICE)** |  | |
|  |  |  | **Generalist Practice**  **n = 36** | **Specialized Practice: Advanced Generalist**  **n = 75** |
| **Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior** | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90.60% | 83.21% |
| **Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice** | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 94.27% | 91.67% |
| **Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and**  **Environmental Justice** | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90.97% | 84.84% |
| **Competency 4: Engage in Practice-**  **informed Research and Research- informed Practice** | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 91.74% | 87.87% |
| **Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice** | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90% of students will demonstrate competence  inclusive of 3 measures | 91.61% | 75.84% |
| **Competency 6: Engage with**  **Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 94.37% | 90.76% |
| **Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and**  **Communities** | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 93.19% | 90.76% |
| **Competency 8: Intervene with**  **Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities** | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90.19% | 90.76% |
| **Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups,**  **Organizations, and Communities** | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 3 measures | 92.75% | 90.76% |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: The program updates Form AS 4 (B) and/or Form AS 4(M) on its website with the most recent assessment outcomes for each program option. |

**Active Hyperlink to the Public Webpage where Assessment Outcomes are Posted:** <https://www.uwgb.edu/msw/about/msw-outcomes/>

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: The program updates the Form AS 4(B) and/or Form AS 4(M) minimally every 2 years for each program options. |

**Academic year reflected in *Form AS 4(B/M)* published on the program’s website:**

2020-2021. Data is updated annually.

The overall assessment scores were monitored throughout the 2020-2021 academic year. The final holistic competency scores were calculated in July and published on the MSW Program website by August. The summary data and outcomes for the assessment score for both generalist practice and specialized practice students are provided under Accreditation Standard 4.0.3 and are published on the program website https://www.uwgb.edu/msw/about/msw-outcomes/

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 4.0.4:*The program describes the process used to evaluate outcomes and their implications for program renewal across program options. It discusses specific changes it has made in the program based on these assessment outcomes with clear links to the data.* |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: The narrative describes the process used to evaluate outcomes for each program option. |

In both generalist practice and advanced generalist practice, evaluation of Program outcomes began with the gathering and compiling of data, particularly scores for embedded assessment assignments. Individually, the process of recording embedded assessment assignment scores was perceived as different from simply recording grades. The MSW Program requires that for a student to continue in a good academic standing they must maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.0 (on scale of 4.0) at the end of every semester. The final course grade has been the primary focus of faculty assessments of overall student performance (i.e., if a student earns the requisite “B,” the student is viewed as making adequate progress through the Program). The designation and recording of embedded assessment assignments necessarily resulted in more scrutiny for these assignments across the curriculum. Faculty were, therefore, more reflective about student performance within individual assignments than prior to the implementation of the embedded assessment assignment measures. As these assignments were considered key measures of students’ abilities to master the competencies, and therefore, also key measures of an instructor’s teaching of the material.

Tables [4.7](#Table4_7) and [4.9](#Table4_9) present the comprehensive assessment plans for both generalist practice and specialized practice competency outcome data from 2020-2021 for the achievement of each of the competencies monitored throughout the year. The two tables indicate the Program’s comprehensive approach to an examination of student competency achievement across all three outcome measures (embedded assessment assignments, final field evaluations, and end-of-semester course evaluations).

The information contained within form AS4 (M) under Accreditation Standard 4.0.3 provides a summary of our Program’s assessment plan for both generalist practice and specialized practice students’ learning outcomes and reflects data collected during the academic year 2020-2021. The data show generalist practice students exceeded the 90% benchmark on all the nine competencies. Whereas that of specialized practice students did not meet the 90% competency benchmark in Competencies 1, 3, 4, and 5. To obtain a better understanding of this outcome, faculty evaluated the data at four different levels. Each level is described in more detail below.

**Level 1: Competency Outcomes**

First, faculty examined the **competency outcomes**. As noted above, form AS4 (M) shows the Program exceeded the 90% competency benchmark for all the generalist practice students. These successes ranged from a low of 90.60% (Competency 1) to a high of 94.37 (Competency 6). While the students did well at generalist practice level, we did not see the same success for specialized practice students. In the case of specialized practice, the competency benchmark for Competencies 1, 3, 4, and 5 were not met. We could say that with exception of Competency 5, the other three competencies, (1, 3 and 4), though short of 90% ranging from .21 to 4.87%, were higher than our 83% benchmark we set for the program in the previous self-study using 2008 EPAS. The most challenging was Competency 5 where 75.84% of students achieved the outcome benchmark. This is an indication that this competency presents a struggle for our students.

**Level 2: Outcomes by Dimension**

Observations about the competency outcomes led to the next level of evaluation, which was an assessment of student outcomes by dimension. The overall summary for competency outcomes by dimensions is provided under Accreditation Standard 4.0.2. As noted in Table 4.8, the generalist practice students, 90% Competency Benchmark was met for knowledge, skills, cognitive/affective dimensions (91.36%, 92.60%, 94.19% 92,.02 % respectively). However, the 89.94% outcome for valuedid not meet the Competency Benchmark. The high performance of the generalist students was not surprising given our program’s competitive admission process where we certainly admit only those who we expect would succeed in our program.

[Table 4.10](#Table4_10) present the overall competency benchmark for all four dimensions (knowledge, values, skills, cognitive/affective) for specialized practice. Even though all the dimensions exceeded the EPAS 2008 benchmark of 83%, they fell short across the board in achieving the 90% benchmark set for EPAS 2015. The summary competency outcome for specialized students was that the majority convincingly exceed the minimum benchmark of 90% in all the four dimensions. This information suggests that we pay detailed attention to areas in the curriculum which may be challenging for specialized students. All that said, we are aware that some students will struggle at some point as they progress in the program for a variety of reasons which could include sudden life changes/events that could impact their performance. Also, COVID-19 disruptions in our society and across the world, and in our students’ lives that began at the time of data collection for this self-study could be a factor.

**Level 3: Outcome Measure Categories**

Observations about dimension-level outcomes led to the third level of investigation, which was to look at **outcome measure categories,** Table [4.8](#Table4_8) and Table [4.10](#Table4_10) present the overall competency outcomes for generalist practice and specialized practice students respectively. In both tables the course objective (CO) failed to meet the 90% benchmark. Interestingly, CO was the outcome measure rated by students. The other two measures (EAA and FFE) where students exceeded the 90% benchmark are measures used by faculty to assess their students’ mastery of the competencies. Given that course objectives are linked to each of the embedded assessment assignments, it suggests that while students are performing well on the assignments, they are not clearly seeing the connection between the course objectives and mastery of the competency. This is something for faculty consideration to see if the course objectives measure, part of the end-of -semester course evaluation is a good measure for explicit curriculum.

**Level 4: Individual Outcome Measures**

This observation led to our fourth level of analysis, which was to examine **individual outcome measures** within each of the categories of measures.

***Embedded Assessment Assignments (EAA)***

Overall, all embedded assessment assignments met the benchmark for generalist practice and advanced generalist practice students’ competency benchmark. The EAA outcome measure benchmark was set at 83%. Students earning 83% or higher was an indication that the assignments were successful in helping students achieve the competencies.

***Final Field Evaluations (FFE)***

The FFE data indicate students performed extremely well in field, with 100% of students earning higher than the 83% benchmark in each competency.

***Course Objective Ratings on End-of-Semester Evaluations***

Table 4.11 & 4.12, below, display all course objective ratings where less than 90% of the students attained the outcome measure benchmark in generalist practice and specialized practice respectively. The tables reveal important observations regarding the measure falling below the Program benchmark. Though the rating of each objective of the dimensions exceeded the expected 3.0 on the 4-point scale (see column 4 Average CO Benchmark = 3.0 of 4), the percentage of students who rated the measure failed to meet the outcome benchmark of 90% suggesting lower response on the scale. The outcome data in Table 4.11 and Table 4.12 suggest a need for deeper examination of course objectives to ensure that they are an appropriate measure for the explicit curriculum. Of the three measures, CO is students self-administered measure. Even though this self-administered measure is designed specifically to be completed without intervention of the instructors at the end of the semester during course evaluation, we must ensure that instructors in their respective courses understand how the course objectives and course assignments are linked to the four dimensions in each of nine competencies. Additionally, the failure to meet the 90% benchmark could be attributed to the delivery of course evaluation electronically during the pandemic. Prior to the pandemic CO measure was administered during class sessions where maximum number of students completed the assessment. The electronic delivery of this measure coupled with the pandemic might have impacted the number of students who participated in the self-administered assessment.

**Table 4.11: Course Outcome Ratings Scoring Below Competency Benchmark for Generalist Practice**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course** | **Course Objective** | **Dimension** | **Average CO Rating**  **(Benchmark=3.0 of 4 )** | **% Making Outcome Measure Benchmark** | |
| **Competency 1** | | | | | |
| 701: Contemporary Social Work Ethic | 3 | Knowledge | 3.27 | | 84.12 |
| 711: Foundations of Social Work | 1 | Knowledge | 2.95 | | 76.19 |
| 700 Gateway to the Profession of Social Work | 3 | Values | 3.27 | | 80.63 |
| 701: Contemporary Social Work Ethics | 5 | Skills | 3.37 | | 84.12 |
| **Competency 2** | | | | | |
| 707: HBSE  707: HBSE | 1 | Knowledge | 3.29 | 80.83 | |
| 4 | values | 3.46 | 87.50 | |
| **Competency 3** | | | | | |
| 701: Contemporary Social Work Ethics | 4 | Knowledge | 3.24 | 84.12 | |
| 711: Foundations of Social Work | 3 | knowledge | 3.14 | 80.71 | |
| 711: Foundations of Social Work | 2 | Values | 3.14 | 80.95 | |
| 711: Foundations of Social Work | 5 | Skills | 3.05 | 76.19 | |
| **Competency 4** | | | | | |
| 700 Gateway to the Profession of Social Work I | 1 | Knowledge | 3.20 | 80.63 | |
| 711: Foundations of Social Work | 5 | Knowledge | 3.05 | 76.19 | |
| 700 Gateway to the Profession of Social Work I | 1 | values | 3.20 | 80.63 | |
| 702: Generalist Practice I | 4 | Skills | 3.46 | 88.46 | |
| **Competency 5** | | | | | |
| 711: Foundations of Social Work | 3 | Knowledge | 3.14 | 85.71 | |
| 711: Foundations of Social Work | 2 | Values | 3.14 | 80.95 | |
| 711: Foundations of Social Work | 5 | Skills | 3.05 | 76.19 | |
| **Competency 6** | | | | | |
| 702: Generalist Practice I | 5 | Knowledge | 3.50 | 88.46 | |
| 700 Gateway to the Profession of Social Work I | 3 | Values | 3.27 | 80.63 | |
| 702: Generalist Practice I | 5 | Skills | 3.50 | 88.46 | |
| **Competency 7** | | | | | |
| 702: Generalist Practice I | 5 | Knowledge | 3.50 | 88.46 | |
| 704: Generalist Practice II | 1 | knowledge | 3.27 | 77.27 | |
| 700 Gateway to the Profession of Social Work I | 3 | values | 3.27 | 80.63 | |
| 702: Generalist Practice I | 5 | skills | 3.50 | 88.46 | |
| **Competency 8** | | | | | |
| 702: Generalist Practice I | 5 | Knowledge | 3.50 | 88.46 | |
| 704: Generalist Practice II | 1 | knowledge | 3.18 | 77.27 | |
| 700 Gateway to the Profession of Social Work I | 5 | values | 3.50 | 88.46 | |
| 702: Generalist Practice I | 5 | skills | 3.50 | 88.64 | |
| **Competency 9** | | | | | |
| 702: Generalist Practice I | 5 | Knowledge | 3.50 | 88.46 | |
| 704: Generalist Practice II | 1 | knowledge | 3.18 | 77.27 | |
| 700 Gateway to the Profession of Social Work I | 3 | Values | 3.27 | 80.63 | |
| 702: Generalist Practice I | 5 | skills | 3.50 | 88.46 | |
| \*Same course outcome used.  \*\*Same | | | | | |

**Table 4.12: Course Outcome Ratings Scoring Below Competency Benchmark for Specialized Practice**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course** | **Course Objective** | **Dimension** | **Average CO Rating**  **(Benchmark=3.0 of 4)** | **% students rated Outcome Measure Benchmark** | |
| **Competency 1** | | | | | |
| 728: Advanced Policy | 4 | Knowledge | 2.30 | | 46.94 |
| 717: Seminar III | 5 | Values | 3.44 | | 83.33 |
| 719: Capstone Seminar | 5 | Values | 3.29 | | 78.21 |
| 719: Capstone Seminar | 5 | Skills | 3.29 | | 78.21 |
| 728: Advanced Policy | 2 | Skills | 2.41 | | 46.94 |
| 718: Field IV | 6 | Cognitive & Affective | 3.43 | | 85.71 |
| **Competency 2** | | | | | |
| 720: Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy | 2 | Knowledge | 3.27 | 83.60 | |
| 720: Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy | 2 | Values | 3.27 | 83.60 | |
| 720: Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy | 3 | Skills | 3.09 | 80.42 | |
| 718: Field IV | 6 | Cognitive & Affective | 3.43 | 85.71 | |
| **Competency 3** | | | | | |
| 720: Diversity, Social Justice and Advocacy | 2 | Knowledge | 3.27 | 83.60 | |
| 719: Capstone Seminar | 3 | Values | 3.21 | 76.43 | |
| 728: Advanced Policy | 2 | Skills | 2.41 | 46.94 | |
| 718: Field IV | 6 | Cognitive & Affective | 3.43 | 85.71 | |
| **Competency 4** | | | | | |
| 731: Research for MSW Practice | 1 | Knowledge | 3.13 | 77.38 | |
| 719: Capstone Seminar | 7 | Values | 3.23 | 76.43 | |
| 731: Research for MSW Practice | 7 | Skills | 3.20 | 77.38 | |
| 719: Capstone Seminar | 2 | Skills | 3.23 | 76.43 | |
| 718: Field IV | 6 | Cognitive & Affective | 3.43 | 85.71 | |
| **Competency 5** | | | | | |
| 728: Advanced Policy | 5 | Knowledge | 2.23 | 40.63 | |
| 728: Advanced Policy | 1 | Values | 2.34 | 43.61 | |
| 728: Advanced Policy | 2 | Skills | 2.41 | 46.94 | |
| 718: Field IV | 6 | Cognitive & Affective | 3.43 | 85.71 | |
| **Competency 6** | | | | | |
| 721: Multi-level family Systems | 4 | Knowledge | 3.27 | 77.88 | |
| 717: Seminar III | 4 | Values | 3.46 | 80.63 | |
| 721: Multi-level family Systems | 3 | Skills | 3.33 | 81.21 | |
| 718: Field IV | 6 | Cognitive & Affective | 3.43 | 85.71 | |
| **Competency 7** | | | | | |
| 721: Multi-level family Systems | 4 | Knowledge | 3.27 | 77.88 | |
| 717: Seminar III | 4 | Values | 3.46 | 81.25 | |
| 721: Multi-level family Systems | 3 | Skills | 3.33 | 81.21 | |
| 718: Field IV | 6 | Cognitive & Affective | 3.43 | 85.71 | |
| **Competency 8** | | | | | |
| 721: Multi-level family Systems | 4 | Knowledge | 3.27 | 77.88 | |
| 717: Seminar III | 4 | Values | 3.46 | 81.25 | |
| 721: Multi-level family Systems | 3 | Skills | 3.23 | 81.21 | |
| 718: Field IV | 6 | Cognitive & Affective | 3.43 | 85.71 | |
| **Competency 9** | | | | | |
| 721: Multi-level family Systems | 4 | Knowledge | 3.27 | 77.88 | |
| 717: Seminar III | 4 | Values | 3.46 | 81.25 | |
| 721: Multi-level family Systems | 3 | Knowledge | 3.33 | 81.21 | |
| 718: Field IV | 6 | Cognitive & Affective | 3.43 | 85.71 | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: The narrative describes the implications for program renewal across all program options. |

As noted for compliance statement 4.0.1(2), following the Program’s evaluation process, considerable attention was devoted to analysis and interpretation of 2020-2021 Competency Outcome data. Data was reviewed and analyzed by the Evaluation and Research Committee, the MSW Curriculum Committee, the full Social Work faculty, and the Program Advisory Committee. While these discussions resulted in a few small changes, which will be explored below, each group agreed student outcomes related to EAAs and performance in field demonstrate the Program provides strong opportunities to master competencies. Even with such strong indicators of student mastery, two major implications for program renewal exist.

The biggest implication relates to the use of end-of-semester course objective ratings as part of the Program’s evaluation plan. As discussed above, if not for the course objective ratings, the Program would have met Program benchmarks for each of the competencies. Challenges related to COVID-19, specifically the fact that several courses traditionally taught in-person were offered in either virtual or asynchronous online modalities contributed to very low response rates in end-of-semester evaluations. Therefore, the Program has no way of knowing if the low ratings are reflective of the general student body, or simply the ratings of a few outlying students.

Given the disconnect between EAA scores and course objective ratings, the MSW Curriculum Committee proposed eliminating the use of course objective ratings in the assessment plan moving forward. Rather than using course objective ratings as an outcome indicator, they will be used to simply inform the evaluation process and facilitate examination of areas of disconnect between course outcomes and students’ perceptions of their achievement.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: The narrative discusses specific changes it has made in the program based on these assessment outcomes with clear links to the data for each program option. |

**Assessment-Based Program Changes**

As noted in 4.0.1(2), program outcome data is reviewed by the Social Work Evaluation and Research Committee, MSW Curriculum Committee, Full Faculty, and Program Advisory Committee; additionally, it is presented to students. Each group has opportunities to make recommendations for changes.

Faculty generally agreed that the assessment process, though cumbersome, was extremely helpful. Overall, faculty and other stakeholders are extremely satisfied with the results and pleased that our curriculum is helping students to master the 2015 EPAS competencies. Although this programmatic assessment highlighted a few “weak links” in the curriculum, at this time very few changes were suggested. As 2020-2021 was an extremely atypical year, COVID-19 combined with faculty changes, the faculty found that it would be unwise to change the curriculum or assessment plan based on this year of data analysis alone. Rather, discussions revolved around the content of particular embedded assessment assignments and course outcomes, which were the “culprits” of weaker scores as demonstrated in Tables [4.7](#Table4_7) and [4.9](#Table4_9), above. Because the Embedded Assessment Assignment scores and Final Field Evaluations were all within the established benchmarks, no significant changes were made.

***Course Objective Ratings***

As noted above, the MSW Program recommended removing course objective ratings from the Program assessment plan; this change was approved by the full faculty for 2021-2022. However, while not part of the outcome assessment, student ratings of course objectives are still powerful indicators of students’ comprehension of the connection between the wording of course objectives and student outcome performance.

Interestingly, the only course objectives which met the benchmark were those for the Final Field Evaluation measures, spanning each competency in the cognitive/affective dimension. This finding reflects student perception of field as beneficial to their development without as clear a pathway of understanding for other courses.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:

|  |
| --- |
| Accreditation Standard 4.0.5:*For each program option, the program provides its plan and summary data for the assessment of the implicit curriculum as defined in EP 4.0 from program-defined stakeholders. The program discusses implications for program renewal and specific changes it has made based on these assessment outcomes.* |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: For each program option, the narrative provides the program’s plan for assessing the implicit curriculum, including program-defined stakeholders. |

**Methodology of Assessment:**

The MSW Program systematically gathers and assesses data in multiple dimensions of the implicit curriculum. Figure 1 provides a graphic depiction of data sources which are discussed below. The UWGB MSW Program systematically gathers not only to assess students’ success in the mastery of the nine CWSE social worker competencies but to examine its environment as it supports students’ learning experience. This section examines our performance in multiple areas of implicit curriculum. We collect on (1) instructor effectiveness ratings, (2) student evaluation of the MSW Program, and (3) evaluation of MSW students experience by both students and Field Instructors. These evaluations provide a diverse overview of the Program which is used to address continued evaluation, responsiveness, and improvement within the Program.

**Area(s) of Implicit Curriculum Assessed:**

Figure 4.1 below shows the elements incorporated in the assessment of the implicit curriculum of the MSW program.

**Figure 4.1: Areas of Implicit Curriculum Assessed**



**Stakeholders Assessed:**

In preparing social work students to master the CSWE nine EPAS competencies, nothing is more important than obtaining feedback from the people who stand to be impacted. Above all, the stakeholders for the MSW Program have great interest in obtaining feedback from students and field agency instructors as to their observations and assessment holistically of our program. In addition, the Program Advisory Committee for the Social Work Programs (BSW and MSW jointly) provide guidance in areas influencing climate.

**Tools/Instruments Used:**

Measurement tools for the implicit curriculum include

* Instructor Effectiveness ratings on end-of semester course evaluations. (Students)
* Student evaluation of the MSW Program (Students)
* Evaluation of the Field Experience (students from both generalist and specialized years, agency field instructors).

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Compliance Statement: For each program option, the narrative provides summary data for the assessment of the implicit curriculum, as defined in EP 4.0, including program-defined stakeholders. |

**Detailed Findings:**

As part of the process of evaluating the implicit curriculum, faculty determined program benchmarks for each of the measures. Benchmarks represent the thresholds the Program set as standards for “success.” Benchmarks are noted below for each measure.

**Instructor Effectiveness Ratings**

Six items in the End-of-Semester Course Evaluations (see section B: Teaching Methodologies portion of [End-of-Semester Course Evaluation Template](#Course_Evaluation_Template)) invite students to rate instructors’ effectiveness using a scale from 1 (“not at all”) to 4 (“very much”). Evaluations are averaged across courses for each of the effectiveness ratings, and that summary score is used as an outcome measure for the implicit curriculum. ***The benchmark for the end-of-semester course evaluations is a mean of 3.0 across courses.*** Mean scores for the 2020-2021 academic year are noted in Table 4.14; each score exceeds the benchmark. Item means ranged from a low of 3.19 (“The instructor maintained my interest throughout the semester”) to a high of 3.35 (“The instructor created a learning environment that encouraged me to be self-directed with my learning”).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 4.14: 2020-2021 Instructor Effectiveness Ratings (Generalist)** | |
| **Evaluation Item** | **Mean score** |
| The instructor maintained my interest throughout the semester | 3.17 |
| The instructor created an environment in which I wanted to learn about the topic | 3.19 |
| The instructor created a learning environment that encouraged me to be self-directed with my learning | 3.30 |
| The instructor helped me to examine my own values and perspectives | 3.27 |
| The instructor helped me to develop knowledge and skills to master course content | 3.22 |
| The instructor responded to me in a timely manner | 3.27 |
| **Overall Average** | **3.24** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 4.15: 2020-2021 Instructor Effectiveness Ratings(Specialized)** | |
| **Evaluation Item** | **Mean score** |
| The instructor maintained my interest throughout the semester | 3.06 |
| The instructor created an environment in which I wanted to learn about the topic | 3.09 |
| The instructor created a learning environment that encouraged me to be self-directed with my learning | 3.13 |
| The instructor helped me to examine my own values and perspectives | 3.11 |
| The instructor helped me to develop knowledge and skills to master course content | 3.15 |
| The instructor responded to me in a timely manner | 3.14 |
| **Overall Average** | **3.11** |

The findings are consistent across generalist and specialized areas of our curriculum. Program faculty take great pride in these effectiveness ratings as the items measure instructors’ abilities to engage students, create a comfortable yet challenging learning environment, and responsiveness to students. Also, the results provide a positive representation of the perceptions of the student body in relation to their instructors’ teaching effectiveness. Such contexts provide the foundation of the implicit curriculum.

**Specific Changes Made or Planned:**

An [annual student evaluation](#Program_Evaluation_Tool) of the MSW Program has been used consistently since the program’s inception, reviewed annually and revised as necessary. The last revision occurred after the conclusion of the 2017-2018 academic cycle. At that time, faculty removed items related to what is now the Social Justice Club, as it had expanded to be broader than the social work major.

It is administered each spring, at which time students in all cohorts of the MSW Program are invited to complete the evaluation. It includes assessments of curriculum, advising, and experiences working with the Field Coordinator. Students also evaluate their relationships with faculty and peers.

Each of the items asks students to rate how strongly they agree with a statement using a scale from 1 to 4, where 1=not at all and 4=very much. The evaluation also allows students to provide narrative comments for each area. ***The benchmark for the items assessing the Program is a mean of 3.0 across cohorts.*** Average scores for the junior and senior cohorts for 2020-2021 are reported in the following tables. Every single item met or exceeded the benchmark.

In a “typical” year, students complete the evaluation in a computer lab during a regularly scheduled, in-person course. However, as most courses were online in spring of 2021, the evaluation was to be completed during regularly scheduled virtual classes. Even with time offered in class, many students elected not to complete the evaluation. Given the unusual situations created by the COVID-19 pandemic and lower-than-average response rate, the Program opted to compare the 2020-2021 data to pre-pandemic data from the 2018-2019 academic year for context.

Three aspects of the implicit curriculum are assessed in this evaluation. Summary data is presented below for each aspect.

***Curriculum & Climate Assessment***

Nine items assess the MSW Program’s curriculum and climate. They assess the convenience of course offerings, integration of courses and rigor, along with the curriculum’s attention to diversity and oppression, professionalism of peers, and respect of faculty and peers for identity statues. Table 4.16 indicates that students are generally pleased with these areas, particularly the respect of their instructors and peers for students’ identity statuses. Each item met or exceeded the benchmark. One particularly positive finding is the improvement of students’ perceptions of the professionalism of their classmates from 2018-2019 to 2020-2021. This pleased the faculty as it was a clear weakness in the climate measure in 2018-2019 and an area faculty worked to attend to. While it is difficult to know how much of this is due to cohort differences versus the interventions of faculty, given the overwhelmingly positive ratings across measures, it would appear faculty are doing well at creating a climate and curriculum that is respectful and inclusive.

**Table 4.16: Curriculum and Climate Assessment Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4-pt. scale; benchmark = 3.0** | **MSW Program** | | | |
| **Evaluation Items** | **2020-2021 Means** | | **2018-2019 Means** | |
| **Generalist Practice n=13** | **Advanced Generalist**  **n=27** | **Generalist Practice n=26** | **Advanced Generalist**  **n=50** |
| The way the Social Work courses are scheduled works well for me. | 3..92 | 3.46 | 3.58 | 3.68 |
| The courses are well integrated; they fit well together and build on one another. | 3.69 | 3. 42 | 3.64 | 3.56 |
| The curriculum pays enough attention to issues of diversity and oppression. | 3.85 | 3.54 | 3.77 | 3.78 |
| Courses are intellectually challenging. | 3.85 | 3.42 | 3.84 | 3.38 |
| The Social Work Program’s curriculum and expectations are culturally appropriate. | 3.85 | 3.65 | 3.80 | 3.76 |
| My instructors respect my identity status(es) (e.g., race, gender identity, sexual orientation, etc.) in the classroom. | 3.92 | 3.68 | 3.60 | 3.83 |
| My peers respect my identity status(es) (e.g., race, gender identity, sexual orientation, etc.) in the classroom. | 3.85 | 3.69 | 3.69 | 3.83 |
| Classmates generally act in a professional manner. | 4.0 | 3.58 | 3.58 | 3.35 |
| **OVERALL AVERAGE:** | **3.87** | **3.56** | **3.70** | **3.65** |

That said, when we examined the qualitative narrative on course evaluations and feedback submitted by students, especially the generalist practice students for the 2020-2021 year, we saw room for improvement. For instance, one generalist student stated that “because classes were moved online, even the live classes, there was a lot busy work assigned to make up for time not in class” (sic). Whereas another indicated that they like the online delivery model because it allowed them to balance work, family, and school. Other comments from specialized students were mixed feelings. Some students felt not challenged enough and others felt some instructors were too particular for what they were looking for in an assignment. Also, some students in the specialized curriculum were critical of instructors’ facilitation of difficult conversations in their classrooms, particularly, topics on racism and oppression. Another area for improvement in the curriculum that emerged from the comments was scheduling *SOC WORK 731: MSW Research for Social Work Practice* and *SOC WORK 719: Capstone Seminar.* Gleaning from the qualitative narrative we came to understand scheduling the advanced research course and capstone project in the Spring semester is too difficult because both courses involve conceptualization, synthesis of literature and producing a full-blown research paper and poster, all in the semester of 15 weeks. No changes to the curriculum were suggested by faculty. It was decided to monitor the qualitative narrative and wait for similar themes to help direct any changes in the most meaningful ways in the 2022 EPAS.

***Communication and Relations with Faculty & Administrators***

In Table 4.17 we presented the average scores on seven items in which we asked students to rate their experiences of communication from the program and relations with faculty. For instance, one generalist student indicated all professors are very friendly and thought they succeeded in connecting with students during the pandemic (sic). That individual student was right in the assessment of program communication. For example, because of the pandemic that hit in the middle of Spring 2020 and coupled with the University moratorium prohibiting all in-person activities, we did not hold orientation for 2020-2021 generalist students (see Table 4.17). Despite the pandemic, we are proud of our effort using alternative delivery to maintain communication and relationship with our students. The students felt that the program communicated regularly and was responsive to their needs and concerns. The results in Table 4.17 below are evidence of the hard work faculty put in to address and be responsive to our students. Both generalist and specialized students rated all the items much more positive in 2020-2021 than they did in the pre-pandemic year, 2018-2019. The qualitive comments submitted by students indicated they had a good personal connection with faculty and peers.

**Table 4.17: Program Communication & Relations with Faculty Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4-pt. scale; benchmark = 3.0** | **MSW Program** | | | |
| **Evaluation Items** | **2020-2021 Means** | | **2018-2019 Means** | |
| **Generalist Practice n=13** | Advanced Generalist  **n=27** | **Generalist Practice n=26** | Advanced Generalist  **n=50** |
| 1.The initial orientation to the Social Work Program was helpful. | N/A | 3.50 | 3.20 |  |
| 2.The Social Work Program regularly communicates with students. | 3.77 | 3.62 | 3.58 |  |
| 3.The Social Work Program pays attention to students’ needs and concerns. | 3.58 | 3.56 | 3.50 | 3.54 |
| 4.The Social Work office is a welcoming environment for students. | 3.73 | 3.78 | 3.64 |  |
| 5.The Program Chair responds to my inquiries in a timely manner. | 3.77 | 3.80 | 3.69 |  |
| 6.My instructors know my name. | 3.77 | 3.80 | 3.81 |  |
| 7.I would feel comfortable asking one of my Social Work instructors for a reference letter. | 3.54 | 3.35 | 3.81 | 3.60 |
| **OVERALL AVERAGE:** | **3.69** | **3.63** | **3.60** | **3.58** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

***MSW Advising***

In Table 4.18 below, four items were used to ask students to rate their experiences with advising and their MSW Advisor. In 2020-2021 generalist practice students rated their advisor positively ranging from 3.92 for *I know who my advisor is* to 3.31 for *My advisor responded to me in a timely manner*. Relatively, this item was rated lower in 2020-2021 by both generalist and specialized students than it was for 2018-2019, the pre-pandemic year. In 2018-2019 the average for generalist and specialized practice students’ ratings were 3.75 and 3.74 respectively. Despite that the quantitative outcome scores for generalist were positive, the qualitative narrative sent by a few students suggest that there is room for improvement. Some students, especially generalist students, indicated they did not receive the adequate guidance. The COVID-19 disruptions that led to switching advising model to virtually/asynchronously impacted the process.

**Table 4.18: Advising Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4-pt. scale; benchmark = 3.0** | **MSW Program** | | | |
| **Evaluation Items** | **2020-2021 Means** | | **2018-2019 Means** | |
| **Generalist Practice n=13/36** | Advanced Generalist  **n=27/75** | **Generalist Practice n=26** | Advanced Generalist  **n=50** |
| I know who my Advisor is. | 3.92 | 3.65 | 3.77 | 3.66 |
| The roles of the Advisor are clear to me. | 3.54 | 3.31 | 3.36 | 3.29 |
| My Advisor was accessible to me. | 3.69 | 3.54 | 3.68 | 3.62 |
| My Advisor responded to me in a timely manner. | 3.31 | 3.44 | 3.75 | 3.74 |
| **OVERALL AVERAGE:** | **3.62** | **3.49** | **3.64** | **3.58** |

At the end of every academic year all students, both generalist and specialized, are asked to evaluate their practicum experiences which include field coordination, field placement and their field agency instructors. Additionally, agency instructors are asked to provide feedback on students’ performance or simulated practice in mastering the CSWE nine competencies across all the dimensions. The overall ratings for orientation and field coordination in the MSW Student Evaluation of the Program were all above the established benchmark of “3” on a 4-point scale. Findings evidenced changes made after the poor performance in the previous self-study. Among the changes made were mandatory student Orientation at two pivotal points: in the spring shortly after admissions, and in the fall shortly before students begin the field.

***Field Coordination***

The findings of field coordination are presented in Table 4.19. We present how students viewed their interactions and the placement process. The four items on the four-point scale asked students to rate their experiences with the field process and Coordinator. In 2018-2019, we observed that generalist students rated the items more positively than in 2020-2021. Though ratings in 2020-2021 exceeded expectation they were lower compared to 2018-2019. The low average scores could have been impacted by moving field orientation from in-person to virtual during the pandemic.

The themes of qualitative narrative on field coordination observed among generalist and advanced generalist students were less positive. Only a small number of students provided feedback on field coordination. Though not substantive, they established their displeasure with their inability to receive quick responses from the Field Coordinator. Two out of nine that participated in the quantitative part of the evaluation provided qualitative narrative. The advanced generalist students did not provide qualitative narrative for this measure.

**Table 4.19: Student Field Coordination Process Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4-pt. scale; benchmark = 3.0** | **MSW Program** | | | |
| **Evaluation Items** | **2020-2021 Means** | | **2018-2019 Means** | |
| **Generalist Practice n=9** | Advanced Generalist  **n=18** | **Generalist Practice n=20** | Advanced Generalist  **n=41** |
| The Field Coordination process is helpful in finding an appropriate field placement. | 3 | 3.61 | 3.61 | 3.34 |
| My questions about field placement policies and procedures were answered. | 3.22 | 3.67 | 3.67 | 3.52 |
| The Field Coordinator is accessible to me. | 3.33 | 3.59 | 3.59 | 3.51 |
| The Field Coordinator responded to my inquiries in a timely manner. | 3.11 | 3.65 | 3.65 | 3.49 |
| **OVERALL AVERAGE:** | **3.17** | **3.63** | **3.63** | **3.47** |

***Child Welfare Stipend***

The Child Welfare stipend ratings (See Table 4.20) occurs only in at the end of specialized year with students whose emphasis area is Child Welfare. Though the ratings on the three items were 3.0 or better for 2020-2021 for child welfare emphasis students, they were significantly lower when compared to 2018-20219 pre-pandemic ratings on the same items. One, though isolated, comment in qualitative narrative was “I did the child welfare stipend and I work in child welfare. Even though my field placement was in a different county and within a different unit in child welfare, I saw many similarities, which made it difficult to feel that the field placement was overall beneficial” (sic). This was a good observation for the individual was already working in a child welfare agency. The fact that their field practicum was in the different county did not imply that agency create a different activity that were in Wisconsin Child Welfare statutes. Child Welfare agencies are required to follow standardized operation procedures across systems and structures therefore, agencies cannot deviate from those policies and procedures.

**Table 4.20: Child welfare Stipend Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4-pt. scale; benchmark = 3.0** | **MSW Program** | | | |
| **Evaluation Items** | **2020-2021 Means** | | **2018-2019 Means** | |
| **Generalist n=0** | **Advanced Generalist**  **n=4** | **Generalist n=0** | **Advanced Generalist**  **n=10** |
| 1.My questions about the stipend program were satisfactorily answered. | N/A | 3 | N/A | 3.80 |
| 2.The Child Welfare Coordinator was accessible to me. | N/A | 3.25 | N/A | 3.70 |
| 3.The Child Welfare Coordinator responded to my inquiries in a timely manner. | N/A | 3.25 | N/A | 3.80 |
| **OVERALL AVERAGE:** | **N/A** | **3.17** | **N/A** | **3.77** |

***Evaluations of Field***

Annually, the Program invites students to evaluate the Field experience, embedded in the [Program Evaluation](#Student_Evaluation_of_Program) and the MSW Field Coordinator invites both students and Field Instructors to complete evaluations of the Field Program (See [Agency Field Instructor](#Agency_FI_Survey) Survey). Unless otherwise indicated, all responses are rated on a scale of 1 (very satisfied/strongly agree) to (very dissatisfied/strongly disagree). ***The benchmark for field evaluations is a mean of 2.0 for each item.***For the few items using a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree), ***the benchmark is a mean of 3.0.***The following section outlines a summary of the evaluation of field from the perspectives of both generalist and advanced generalist students and Field Instructors for 2020-2021. The data is presented, below, and compared to the average scores on the same measures for 2018-2019 pre-COIVD-19 context.

Table 4.21 conveys students’ perceptions of the placement site. Overall, students were satisfied with their experiences across all the items, and we are proud of the changes made with the advent of the COVID-19. The MSW program faculty worked tirelessly to provide alternative to in-person placement at the start of the pandemic. In such instance, students had the option to complete some of the field practicum through the combination of in-person and synchronous modalities. This alternative delivery in the middle of the semester was very successful as evidenced by the positive ratings across all the items when compared with in-person field training in 2018-2019 (Table 4.21) The qualitative feedback supports the high ratings. For example, student said their placement gave them opportunity to challenge themselves. In other instance students stated field placement was successful even during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Table 4.21: 2020-21 MSW Student Evaluation of Field Placement**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item**  *Rating: (1) Strongly Disagree to (4) Strongly Agree* | **2020-2021**  **(N=27)** | **2018-2019**  **(N=61)** |
| The Field Coordination process is helpful in finding an appropriate field placement. | 3.41 | 3.5 |
| My questions about field placement policies and procedures were answered. | 3.52 | 3.6 |
| The Field Coordinator is accessible to me. | 3.50 | 3.6 |
| The Field Coordinator responded to my inquiries in a timely manner. | 3.46 | 3.4 |
| My field placement allowed me sufficient independent practice. | 3.25 | 3.4 |
| Fit between field learning experience and classroom content was sufficient for me. (I was able to make connections between field and class material.) | 3.36 | 3.5 |
| I was provided opportunities to consult with other staff at agency. | 3.5 | 3.6 |
| I was provided opportunities to observe various styles and approaches of other workers. | 3.43 | 3.3 |
| I received adequate opportunities for BSW [or MSW] level generalist practice. | 3.39 | 3.3 |
| I was able to obtain feedback on my performance from field instructor. | 3.68 | 3.5 |
| I was treated like a valued member of the agency/team. | 3.43 | 3.5 |
| I was encouraged to develop my own style of practice. | 3.46 | 3.5 |
| I was encouraged to utilize Independent problem-solving. | 3.54 | 3.6 |
| My field agency fostered strengths-based perspectives. | 3.54 | 3.5 |

Table 4.22 presents students’ perceptions of the relations with their Field Instructor. The field instructor evaluation was positively high across all the items in 2020-2021 compared to 2018 -2019. Qualitative feedback revealed that students were happy with the training they received from their field instructors. Feedback such as “the instructor applied provoking discussions that allowed me to reflect on my strengths and areas of weakness” (sic) evidenced positive learning environment. Others indicated their field instructors were extremely flexible and willing to work with them in many different aspects. A comment such as “thankful and blessed to have amazing social workers with wealth of knowledge” was a strong indication agency field instructor did excellent job providing real life experience or stimulated practice.

**Table 4.22: 2020-2021 Student Evaluation of Field Instructor**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item**  *Rating scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (4) Strongly Agree* | **2020-2021**  **(N=27)** | **2018-2019**  **(N=61)** |
| My field instructor was available when needed. | 3.56 | 3.5 |
| My field instructor assigned tasks that met my learning needs. | 3.52 | 3.4 |
| My field instructor prepared me for activities within my placement. | 3.52 | 3.2 |
| My field instructor was realistic about my skills and abilities with regard to practice expectations. | 3.59 | 3.4 |
| My field instructor provided supervision at levels appropriate to meet my learning needs. | 3.52 | 3.4 |

The findings from the 2020-2021 academic year presented in the below Table 4.23, were compared to 2018 -2019 pre-pandemic academic year. The findings revealed the Field Instructors found that the MSW Program prepared students well for field and were provided good access to support. Further, all the Field Instructors indicated that our competencies were clear and well-articulated. Faculty Field Liaisons were available to them, students were self-directed, and that the field logs were helpful. The qualitative comments provided by Field Instructors reflect these same positive ratings. One item “*Supervising the student(s) was more challenging than I expected*” was rated 1.5 on the 4-point scale suggesting that it was not challenging to supervise students. When we compare the item to pre-pandemic year, we saw the rating of the pandemic year was improved (see Table 4.23).

**Table 4.23: 2020-2021 Field Instructor Evaluation of Field**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Items**  *Rating scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (4) Strongly Agree* | **2020-2021**  **(N = 34)** | **2018-2019**  **(N=33)** |
| In general, the Social Work Program prepared the student(s) for this field placement. | 3.38 | 3.6 |
| The amount of time required to assist student development was what I expected. | 3.32 | 3.4 |
| Students were adequately prepared with a skill set appropriate to the setting at the beginning of placement. | 3.50 | 3.5 |
| The student’s level of independence is what I expected. | 3.41 | 3.5 |
| *Rating scale: (1) Rarely, (2) Sometimes, (3) Usually, (4) Always* |  |  |
| The Program offered sufficient support to meet my needs as a field instructor. | 3.76 | 3.9 |
| Program staff and faculty were accessible to me throughout the placement. | 3.76 | 3.9 |
| The student was able to support agency services. | 3.66 | 3.7 |
| Supervising the student(s) was more challenging than I expected. | 1.55 | 1.8 |
| *Rating scale: (1) Strongly Disagree to (4) Strongly Agree* |  |  |
| The process of development of the learning contract was clear. | 3.40 | 3.3 |
| The process of evaluation of the student in the field setting was clear. | 3.47 | 3.2 |
| Evaluating the student(s) based on competencies was a useful way to provide feedback. | 3.37 | 3.5 |
| Evaluating the student(s) based on professional behaviors was a useful way to provide feedback. | 3.53 | 3.6 |
| I had adequate opportunity to provide feedback to the student(s). | 3.63 | 3.6 |
| I had adequate opportunity to provide feedback to the faculty field liaison. | 3.57 | 3.5 |

Comprehensively, evaluations of field suggest our Field Program is successful in creating positive opportunities for students and Field Instructors. Further, they demonstrate our Instructors’ ongoing commitments to the Program and our students.  Taken as a whole, the Program’s efforts to consistently evaluate components of the field experience and incorporate feedback from students and Field Instructors demonstrate an earnest desire to maintain high quality standards for field education.

The Program has also institutionalized the sharing and reviewing data from the annual evaluations of the BSW and MSW programs by the Program Chair during the Committee’s first bi-annual meeting (See volume II, *[MSW Student Handbook, p.16](#Input_in_Program)*)

|  |
| --- |
| 1. *Compliance Statement:* For each program option, the narrative discusses the implications for program renewal and specific changes it has made based on these assessment outcomes. |

While the data presented above suggest that, overall, we are doing a great job in preparing students for advanced social work practice, we recognize that we must continually strive to improve our measures. After all, the evaluation tools are used as a means of continuous improvement of the Program as the results are analyzed, to address any developing trends or challenges for the Program. One of the measures that requires a critical review is the Course Objectives (CO) which is section “A “of End-of-Semester course evaluation. In addition, the end of semester course evaluations were changed for the 2021-2022 academic year in accord with the same changes across the entire University. The full faculty has adjusted the questions to include wording being used across campus that is designed to eliminate bias in evaluation. (See the revised [course evaluation](#Course_Evaluation_Template)).

The advent of the pandemic taught a lesson we will not forget in a hurry. To that effect, and beginning in 2020, we revised the structure of orientation for students. We created an MSW Portal in Canvas and moved significant elements of the orientation to online modules. Students now go to the portal to review the curriculum, course schedules and other resources available to them as graduate students. This enables students to review the materials as needed and schedule in-person meetings with faculty or their respective advisors.

**Program Options:**

*Select One:*

☒ The program has only one (1) option.

☐ Our response/compliance plan is the same for all program options.

☐ Our response/compliance plan differs between program options in the following ways:
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