

University of Washington

School of Social Work

**Graduate School Review
Self-Study Report
January 1997**

**Submitted by:
Nancy R. Hooyman, Ph.D.
Dean**

SELF-STUDY DOCUMENT: SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
January 1997

Table of Contents

Part 1 - Narrative

| | |
|--|-----------|
| PREFACE | 4 |
| I. ORGANIZATION | 5 |
| 1.1 Unit Authorized to Offer Degree Program | 5 |
| 1.3 Exact Title(s) of Degrees Granted | 5 |
| 1.4 Administration | 5 |
| II. DESCRIPTION | 9 |
| 2.1 Nature and Objectives | 9 |
| 2.2 Basic Program and Unit Data | 14 |
| III. FACULTY | 14 |
| 3.1 Faculty List and Curricula Vitae | 14 |
| 3.2 Visiting, Part-time and Other Faculty | 15 |
| 3.3 Underrepresented Groups | 16 |
| IV. STUDENTS | 20 |
| 4.1 Baseline Information | 20 |
| 4.2 Enrollment Patterns | 22 |
| 4.3 Graduation Patterns | 23 |
| 4.4 Underrepresented Groups | 25 |
| 4.5 Nontraditional Students | 29 |
| V. (A) CURRICULUM INSTRUCTION (Undergraduate) | 30 |
| 5.A.1 Degree Programs/Options | 30 |
| 5.A.2 General and Service Education | 31 |
| 5.A.3 Interdisciplinary Programs | 32 |
| 5.A.4 Success | 32 |
| V. (B) CURRICULUM INSTRUCTION (Graduate) | 33 |
| 5.B.1 Master's Degree | 33 |
| 5.B.2 Doctoral Degree | 36 |
| 5.B.3 Instructional Relationship to Other Programs | 38 |
| 5.B.4 Teaching and Research Participation | 38 |

| | | |
|--------------|---|-----------|
| 5.B.5 | Funding | 40 |
| 5.B.6 | Success | 40 |
| VI. | RESEARCH | 45 |
| 6.1 | Funding | 45 |
| 6.2 | Current Research | 47 |
| 6.3 | Interdisciplinary Projects | 49 |
| 6.4 | Technology Transfer | 50 |
| VII. | SERVICE | 52 |
| 7.1 | Consulting | 52 |
| 7.2 | Community Service | 53 |
| 7.3 | Continuing Education | 54 |
| VIII. | EVALUATION | 54 |
| 8.1 | Faculty | 54 |
| 8.2 | Students | 56 |
| 8.3 | Major Competency | 58 |
| 8.4 | Curriculum/Instruction | 60 |
| 8.5 | Research | 62 |
| 8.6 | Accreditation | 64 |
| 8.7 | Role Within Region | 64 |
| IX. | DEVELOPMENT | 65 |
| 9.1 | Faculty Distribution | 65 |
| 9.2 | Demand | 66 |
| 9.3 | Curricular Change | 67 |
| 9.4 | Research Development | 69 |
| 9.5 | Funding Sources | 71 |
| 9.6 | Resource Trends. | 74 |
| X. | SUMMARY | 75 |
| 10.1 | Present Condition and Future Plans | 75 |
| | PART II -- Appendices | 82 |
| | Appendix A: Basic Program Data | 82 |
| | Appendix B: List of Faculty | 85 |
| | Appendix C: Degree Options | 88 |
| | Appendix D: Placement of Graduates Past Three Years | 99 |
| | Appendix E. External Funding 1986-96 | 100 |
| | PART III -- Faculty Vitae | |
| | (In alphabetical order) | |

SELF-STUDY DOCUMENT: SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

January 1997

PREFACE

The University of Washington School of Social Work celebrated its 60th anniversary in 1995, having graduated over 4,000 BASW, MSW and Ph.D. graduates. Many of these alumni are leaders in social work education and in local, state, national and international social and human services, and many have become prominent researchers. As one of the leading social work education programs in the country, our School has been ranked sixth by US News and World Report (1994), and among the top ten in terms of scholarly and research productivity. Our doctoral program is regarded as one of the best in the country. In 1995-96, the School engaged in an extensive reaccreditation review through the Council on Social Work Education and received an atypically positive site team report. The team noted that a primary strength of the School is its "world class faculty."

The strengths of the faculty are reflected in the quality of their teaching, their service, and their scholarship. Faculty serve as editors of major social work journals; publish in prestigious journals, including interdisciplinary ones; receive more grants from NIH than any other social work program in the country, including the recent NIMH funding of a Social Work Research Development Center; serve as reviewers for NIH and other federal funding agencies; consult with human service agencies regionally, nationally and internationally; and are elected to major offices, including Vice President of the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education and President of the National Association of Deans and Directors of Social Work Programs. In recent years, faculty have devoted even more attention to the quality of their teaching and the integrity of the curriculum, and most serve as mentors for doctoral students through our innovative "Preparing Future Social Work Faculty" Program.

Our faculty have creatively responded to public demands for increased accountability and access by implementing major curricular changes in the MSW Program in 1992-93; creating a less resource-intensive curriculum while simultaneously strengthening program quality and integrity; reviewing the Ph.D. program to enhance the quality of the second and third years; developing assessment measures and increasing the size of the BASW program; and beginning to plan for an MSW distance learning program on the Olympic Peninsula and an MSW Program in Tacoma as ways to expand access to professional education.

Our School is highly regarded for our preparation of culturally-competent practitioners, our multicultural research, and our success in recruiting women faculty and students of color. Unfortunately, we have been less effective at retaining faculty of color, and have lost four outstanding women faculty of color to peer institutions in the past five years. The current situation of relatively stagnant salaries at UW and an increasingly competitive national market present us with the difficulty of retaining faculty, especially associate and full professors, who are being recruited at dramatically higher salaries at peer institutions.

Our greatest challenge in the next decade is to enhance the strengths that have been carefully built over the past ten years: our increase in federal funding for research and training, our outstanding faculty who are highly regarded nationally and frequently recruited by peer institutions, the diversity of our faculty and student bodies, the quality of our curriculum, our interdisciplinary teaching and research, and our national reputation for excellence. Building on these strengths becomes an even greater challenge in the face of declining resources, dramatic changes in human services (such as managed care and welfare

reform), and increased public and legislative demands for access and accountability. Although we are responding to these demands, including planning ways to expand access, we are unwilling to do so at the expense of program quality, and can only do so with additional state funding. Likewise, given dramatic changes in both human services and higher education, we must be constantly assessing how well we are preparing our graduates for changing practice and educational realities.

This self study provides a broad overview of the School's three degree programs, an assessment of current strengths, and ongoing steps to improve our degree programs for both undergraduate and graduate students. We look forward to the thoughtful input of those outside the School into this important review process.

I. ORGANIZATION

1.1 Unit Authorized to Offer Degree Programs

School of Social Work

1.3 Exact Titles of Degrees Granted

Bachelor of Arts with Major in the Field of Social Welfare (BASW)

Master of Social Work (MSW)

Doctor of Philosophy in Social Welfare (Ph.D.)

1.4 Administrative Structure. The School of Social Work is a separately organized professional unit with a discrete budget and administrative structure, including its own dean. The School is fully responsible for appointing and promoting faculty, admitting students, and designing its own curriculum, subject to usual University procedures. Such autonomy is expected as a basis for accreditation by the Council on Social Work Education.

The Dean has delegated immediate administrative responsibility for curriculum matters to the Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Student Affairs; for scholarship and research development to the Associate Dean for Research; and for supervision of staff and support services to the School's Administrator. Given this allocation of responsibilities, the Dean's responsibilities focus largely on fiscal matters, academic personnel, development, community relations, University-wide relations, and local and national community activities. The three deans and the administrator work in close collaboration regarding budgetary decisions and planning in support of the School's immediate and long-range goals.

This section briefly describes the allocation of functional responsibilities within the School: *instructional, including continuing education and community relations; research; and fiscal, administrative and support services.* Our School is not departmentalized because we have sought to avoid the rigidity inherent among departments. This does mean, however, that the Dean and Associate Deans carry a heavier workload than in units of comparable size which have departmental chairs.

Instructional Responsibilities. The responsibilities of the Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Student Affairs, Dr. John Longres, encompass workload planning, curricular development across the three programs, and new initiatives such as distance learning. He provides leadership on curricular and teaching issues, such as the integration of diversity content, articulation of foundation

and advanced curriculum, and teaching improvement; oversees data gathering and data management issues, such as the annual alumni survey, employer survey, and Student Services databases; and collaborates with the Directors of the BASW, Ph.D., Continuing Education, and Evening Degree Programs around programmatic issues such as financial aid. He serves ex-officio on the MSW and BASW Curriculum Committees and the Ph.D. Steering Committee.

Responsibilities for specific aspects of the School's instructional programs have been delegated to the Directors of the following programs: Ph.D.; BASW, Evening; Practicum, Admissions; Student Services, Continuing Education; Community Relations, and Development. These Directors report to the Associate Dean for Academic Programs, with the exception of the Director of Admissions who reports to the Dean. All the directors have considerable autonomy in implementing the plans of their units, developed in collaboration with relevant faculty groups

The overall responsibilities of the Ph.D. Program Director, Dr. Paula Nurius, include: chairing the Doctoral Program Steering Committee (SC); overseeing student progress, standards, and procedures; recruitment and program marketing, facilitating graduates' securing employment; meeting with applicants and admittees; advising students regarding program and career interests and issues; coordinating research and teaching practica; overseeing the admissions process; interfacing with the Graduate School around policies and procedures and student status; supervising the Lead TA and overseeing teaching preparation; sharing in decisions about faculty instruction, student appointments, funding, and related issues with faculty and the Associate Dean for Academic Programs; and representing the program in the national organizations.

The BASW Program Director, Ms. Margaret Spearmon, MSW, provides leadership on curriculum development and assessment; advises students; serves as a member of the BASW Admissions Committee, provides oversight of student progress, standards and procedures; and represents the program in national organizations.

The Director of Practicum for the BASW and MSW Programs is Dr. Rachel Wrenn, although Ms. Elizabeth Roberts, MSW is the Acting Director in 1996-97 while Dr. Wrenn is on family leave. The Director provides oversight of the practicum program for both the BASW and MSW; administers the practicum placement process; provides leadership for the development, implementation, and evaluation of practicum policies and programs, oversees the training for practicum instructors; identifies ways to effectively link the classroom curriculum with the practicum; plans practicum orientations for students; works closely with the Practicum Advisory Council (practicum instructors and faculty) and serves on the MSW Curriculum Committee.

The Director of the Evening Program, Mr. James DeLong, MSW, assumes overall administrative tasks for the Evening MSW Program. These include: collaborating on workload planning and course scheduling; coordinating resources for evening students (access to library, computer room and media center); student advising, consulting with faculty about teaching; serving on the Practicum Coordinating Committee and as liaison to practicum agencies; and planning curricular changes that affect the Evening Program.

The responsibilities of the Director of Continuing Education and Community Relations, Ms. Sally Davis, BA, include: develop and administer the School's self-sustaining continuing education program; serve as liaison to the School's Alumni Association, local professional associations (NASW and the Clinical Society), and the practice community; and administer the School's Annual Giving Program.

Research Responsibilities. Dr. Mary Gillmore, Associate Dean for Research, is responsible for assisting with the development of research proposals for external funding and generation of manuscripts; securing research and training grants to support graduate students; providing direction for the mentoring of junior faculty; overseeing the Human Subjects process; providing visibility for scholarly initiatives within the School (research colloquium series); serving ex-officio on the Ph.D. Steering Committee; representing the School on research-related matters (the President's Research Advisory Board), and supervising 1.0 FTE staff (budget preparation for grants development, part-time editing, journal article copying service).

Fiscal, Administrative and Support Services. The Administrator, Ms. Mary McMahon, MA, oversees non-academic affairs, including: fiscal administration of all budgets; capital and space planning and implementation; facilities administration; staff personnel administration, and overall administration of support service units (computer services, media services, word processing, office assistance, fiscal and administrative services). She interfaces with campus offices such as Planning and Budgeting, Capital Projects and Facility Management, Business and Personnel Services, Financial Management, and Grant and Contract Services, and supervises the staff and support services of Office Assistance, Fiscal Management Services (3.95 state funded FTE and 2.05 FTE funded by the Research support Allocation), Computing Services, (2.25 state funded FTE) Media Services, (1.0 FTE), and Information Services (.50 FTE).

The Director of the Office of Student Services, Mr. Don Whitney, MA, is responsible for overseeing course and room scheduling, managing the student database; advising students regarding degree requirements and scheduling; assisting the Directors of the BASW Program and the Ph.D. Program; and supervising 1.75 FTE staff who provide support services for all three programs.

Governance and Committee Structure. Numerous mechanisms allow for faculty participation in curriculum, personnel and general School- and University-wide governance. The major policy-making body is the faculty as a whole, who typically meet monthly for action on policies. Within the School, faculty responsibilities are structured through three standing committees elected by faculty as a whole: the Executive Committee, the MSW Curriculum Committee, and the Diversity Committee, and two standing committees elected by subgroups of faculty: the Ph.D. Program Steering Committee and the BASW Curriculum Committee. These committees also include students, alumni and clinical/affiliate faculty. The functions of these committees are briefly described

The **Executive Committee**, comprised of six faculty elected across ranks, advises the Dean on budget policies and planning, including identifying budgetary reductions and long-range goals; on the establishment or discharge of School committees; and on issues relating to academic personnel and programs (hiring, promotion, tenure, merit and reappointment reviews). It provides leadership in interpreting and recommending policy both to the faculty and to the Dean.

The **Diversity Committee** develops strategies for meeting School objectives related to diversity; monitors implementation, execution, and outcome of efforts; and provides an annual review of progress to the faculty.

The **MSW Curriculum Committee** oversees the development and implementation of all curriculum matters related to the MSW Program. A primary area of responsibility is to monitor existing courses for infusion of the major themes guiding the curriculum and adherence to accreditation guidelines and

policies. In addition, it oversees the coordination between the foundation and advanced curriculum content and between practicum and classroom-based content; and monitors the implementation of the Evening Program and planning of new programs such as distance learning. It is composed of two foundation (first year) curriculum representatives, two advanced practice (second year) representatives, one practicum representative, the Associate Dean for Academic Programs (ex-officio), and a practicum instructor from the Practicum Advisory Committee.

The **BASW Curriculum Committee** is composed of all state-funded faculty teaching in the BASW Program and an agency-based practicum instructor, and spearheads the development and monitoring of the BASW curriculum and related policies and procedures. Both the BASW and MSW curriculum committees work to ensure section consistency so that faculty are knowledgeable of each others' course content, objectives, student outcomes, topics and assignments.

The Social Welfare Ph.D. Program is administered by our School through the Doctoral Program Director and the **Ph.D. Program Steering Committee**. The Steering Committee comprises members elected on a rotating basis from the Social Welfare Faculty, the two Associate Deans (ex-officio), a doctoral student representative, and the Program Director. The Social Welfare Faculty is appointed by the Dean, with the advice and concurrence of the Graduate School and Steering Committee. The social welfare faculty provides input to the Ph.D. Director and Steering Committee regarding educational objectives and policy and are involved in instruction, curriculum planning, admissions, and student advisement.

Other standing committees in the School, to which faculty are appointed by the Executive Committee, include the **Library, Recruitment, and Scholarship**. All faculty are expected to join one of the **MSW Concentration Committees (Children/Youth and Families; Health/Mental Health; Social Work Administration; and Multiethnic Practice)**. There are numerous other ad hoc committees, including the **Educational Outreach Committee, the Committee for Academic Excellence, and the Admissions Policy Review Committee**. Social work faculty also participate on the UW Faculty Senate and are involved in various Senate Faculty Councils and other University committees. One faculty member has served both as the Faculty Senate's Deputy Legislative representative and as Chair of the Senate.

Interdepartmental Relationships. Interdisciplinary collaboration and cooperation between the School and other University departments and units occurs at many different levels. The School has membership on various administrative and policy-making boards through the office of the Dean (e.g., Board of Deans, Board of Health Sciences Deans, President's Council). Many faculty members are engaged in a variety of interdepartmental activities, including interdisciplinary committees, serving on supervising and examining committees for doctoral and master's degree candidates from other departments, conjoint teaching through units such as the Institute on Aging and the Teaching for Interdisciplinary Collaboration Project through Public Affairs, and consultation to other departments. One faculty member holds a joint appointment with the Graduate School of Public Affairs. Other faculty have adjunct appointments with Psychology, Women's Studies, Sociology, the UW Center for AIDS/STD Research in the School of Medicine, the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology in Sociology, the Center for Women's Health Research in Nursing, and the UW Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute. The Director of Research at the Casey Family Program holds a .2 FTE social work faculty position and is central to our graduate curriculum. The directors of the social work departments at the University Medical Center and Harborview hold adjunct appointments that carry part-time teaching responsibilities. The Directors of Social Work of the VA and Children's Medical

Center and the Heads of Social Work in the Pediatric and Adolescent Units at the UW Center on Human Development and Disability (CHDD) hold clinical faculty appointments and regularly teach MSW courses. Our new Center for Social Work Prevention Research will foster even more interdisciplinary collaboration

II. DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 Nature and Objectives.** The School of Social Work was founded with the establishment of the MSW Program in 1934 at the height of the Great Depression when social welfare programs were overwhelmed by unemployed and often homeless people. By 1938, over half the county welfare administrators in Washington State were former students of the school. This legacy in the public services and with the social and psychological problems exacerbated by economic fluctuations continues to shape the mission and goals of the School

The School was designated an independent professional school by the University in 1958 and the title of its chief administrator was changed from director to dean. The undergraduate program in social welfare was created in 1959, and the doctoral program was initiated in 1968 and approved by the Board of Regents in 1974. The first Ph.D. class was admitted in 1975.

The Bachelor of Social Welfare (BASW) Program enrolls 130 FTE students, the Master of Social Work (MSW) 327.4 FTE students. Students may attend the MSW Program full time in the day or part time through its evening degree. Since 1995, Advanced Standing, whereby students complete the MSW Program in one year, is also available to 24 qualified students with a bachelor's degree received during the prior five years from an accredited social work undergraduate program. A small but steady number of students (3-6 a year) take advantage of a concurrent MSW/Master of Public Health Program. The Ph.D. Program admits 8 to 10 students a year, with approximately 40 students currently working on their Ph.D. The MSW and BASW as professional programs are accredited by the Council on Social Work Education. They were last reaccredited in 1989, and a recommendation regarding reaccreditation will be made by the Commission on Accreditation in February 1997. The Ph.D. Program, not considered a professional program, does not require accreditation review. Continuing Education offers approximately 27 courses or workshops a year and six certificate programs to over 4,500 registrants.

Present State of the Profession. Social work emerged as a profession at the turn of the 20th century in response to the problems of growing social and economic inequality. Early social work practice took place in private voluntary agencies and focused on the problems of native born and immigrant working class families and their children. The first schools of social work appeared during the second and third decade of the century. With the growth of the welfare state during the Great Depression, public programs expanded as did the need for professional social workers. The 1960's brought a new focus to social work. In addition to working class concerns, concerns about other vulnerable groups were pushed to the fore with the rise of the Civil Rights Movement, the second Feminist Movement and, more recently, the Lesbian and Gay Movement and the Movement of People with Disabilities.

In spite of New Deal reforms and the War on Poverty, problems of social and economic inequities persist, and there is growing national debate about the place of the welfare state in society and the role of social workers within it. The profession and our School have responded to this debate in a number of ways. In addition to content on social welfare policies and services, human behavior and the social environment, and practice methodologies, content on diversity, populations-at-risk, and

social and economic justice is now expected at the doctoral level and required at both the BASW and MSW levels. Additionally, there has been renewed attention to the study of research methods at all three degree levels. It is increasingly recognized that accountable practice requires the development of policies, programs and interventions rooted in sound quantitative and qualitative research and the development of practitioners who can master emerging technological innovations. Social work education at the BASW level instructs students on the ability to critically evaluate research and apply it to their practice. Education at the MSW level reinforces these skills and in addition teaches students to evaluate their practice as well as the programs and policies affecting their practice. Doctoral education aims to produce academicians capable of teaching critical thinking and research skills at the undergraduate and graduate levels. More importantly, doctoral education seeks to develop the scholars able to conduct basic research on social problems and issues and applied research on policy, programs and practice.

One of the major challenges for the profession as a whole, given its practice roots, is to strengthen and expand social work research. In 1991, the National Institute on Mental Health sponsored a Task Force on Social Work Research. The resulting report emphasized the importance of building research infrastructures in social work programs to support research development. An outcome of this report was the establishment of funding within NIMH for Social Work Research Development Centers. Five have been funded nationally in the past four years, including one at our School that is focused on prevention of mental disorders. The Task Force report also highlighted the fact that social work faculty and doctoral students are inadequately represented among federally-funded researchers. Social work researchers receive less than one-half percent of all research support from the National Institutes of Health, even though many of the research priorities of NIH are shared by social work and are areas in which social workers might make valuable contributions. Overall, social work fares less well in obtaining federal funding for research than professional colleagues in psychology, nursing, psychiatry and sociology. In recognition of this, the Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research and the National Association of Deans and Directors of Social Work Programs recently undertook a national study to identify ways to strengthen the administrative infrastructure for research within social work programs. This survey determined that our School was number one nationally in terms of federally funded social work research. Our Dean, as Chair of the task force implementing this study, has provided national leadership on the importance of creating research cultures within social work education programs. As federal funding becomes even more competitive, increasing the national research presence of social work is an even greater challenge.

School of Social Work Mission. Our School affirms the social work tradition of promoting social and economic justice. Our primary goal is to enhance the quality of life for all with special attention to the poor and oppressed including people of different ethnic and racial groups, sexual orientation, physical and mental abilities, and women. We advance the profession by educating BASW, MSW, and Ph.D. social workers who value diversity and can work in ethically and culturally competent ways to influence individual as well as social change. We also believe that scientific inquiry and evolving information technology are important to effective education and practice.

As a School in a prominent research university, we focus our energies on achieving excellence in three interdependent educational functions: teaching, research and scholarship, and community service. The full exercise of these functions allows the School to provide leadership in the development of social welfare policies and publicly funded programs and services at the local, regional, national and international levels.

School of Social Work Goals. In implementing our School's mission, the BASW, MSW and Ph.D Programs share a number of functional aims. Our School aims to produce:

- A state-of-the-art curriculum that is focused on educating for social work practice with a range of social systems and that promotes planned social change.
- Graduates who are committed to ethical and culturally competent work with and on behalf of individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities and who are likewise dedicated to ongoing professional development.
- Innovative research by faculty and students on social problems, the use and delivery of social services, and the evaluation of services as a way of promoting improved practice.
- Faculty and students who actively participate in the university and in community services at the local, regional, national and international levels
- Student-faculty relationships that promote an effective learning and teaching environment
- An organizational environment that maximizes non-discrimination, collaboration and collegiality in all aspects of organizational functioning and decision making.

In addition to these shared goals, each degree granting program has its own unique goals and objectives.

Ph.D. Program Goals. The goal of the doctoral program is:

- To prepare students to contribute to the advancement of knowledge and practice in the field of social welfare and the profession of social work.
- To prepare graduates who will assume leadership positions teaching, research, administration, and policy analysis.
- To prepare graduates who, in these varying capacities will use their scholarly abilities to improve the quality of policies, programs, and services in the field.

Ph.D. Curriculum Objectives. Students will acquire:

- A broad understanding of the major policy and practice trends and issues in the field of social welfare and the profession of social work.
- A substantive knowledge of some field of social welfare, e.g., child welfare, aging, corrections, mental health, etc., with particular emphasis on the issues and questions in that field which require scholarly attention.
- A competence to conduct empirical research that informs and advances policy and/or practice in some area of social welfare.
- A balanced preparation for the profession, including teaching, scholarship, and related faculty roles.

The principal means to translate these objectives into programmatic form and assess student progress toward attainment of these objectives include: examinations, papers, and classroom participation in courses; individualized contracts and performance evaluation in research and teaching practica; preparation of a program of study proposal which guides study for qualifying or general examinations, both written and oral; preparation and presentation of a dissertation prospectus which guides the conduct of dissertation research; and periodic workshops and colloquia that target professional skills (e.g., developing a teaching portfolio, writing for publication, preparing for the job market) and contribute to a stimulating intellectual climate within the School and the doctoral program. To supplement these assessment procedures, instructors and advisors of the Ph.D.

Program meet periodically to discuss the progress of individual students. Advisors and students meet on a regular basis, and emphasis is placed on assisting students in developing effective strategic plans toward a successful educational experience.

MSW Program Goals. The MSW identifies two unique curriculum goals, consistent with the requirements of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the accrediting body.

- To provide a foundation year educational experience that builds on an undergraduate, liberal arts degree and prepares students to enter into a concentrated area of social work practice.
- To prepare students for advanced social work practice in an area of concentration.

MSW Curriculum Objectives. Graduates will be able to:

- Practice with relative autonomy in an area of concentration.
- Appropriately use supervision and consultation.
- Understand the values and ethics of the social work profession and be committed to a practice that is consistent with them.
- Understand and apply the strengths and empowerment perspectives in practice and research.
- Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and appropriate use of self in practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities.
- Practice within agencies and service delivery systems and, when necessary, identify, plan and pursue organizational and system change.
- Understand the history of social welfare and the social work profession and be able to analyze new issues in light of this history.
- Analyze the impact of economic and other public and social policies on clients, workers, agencies and welfare systems and influence the policy formulation and implementation process
- Advance social and economic justice through planned social change, with particular attention to populations-at-risk such as the poor, racial and ethnic minorities, women, lesbians and gays, and people with physical and mental challenges.
- Understand the ways in which oppression, discrimination, and social and economic disadvantage put people in need of social work intervention.
- Communicate and practice effectively with a diverse range of clients, colleagues and community members.
- Critically apply recognized theoretical frameworks which explain individual development and behavior as well as the interactions among individuals and between individuals and social systems.
- Demonstrate knowledge and skills in the processes of scientific inquiry to guide and evaluate programs and practice.
- Understand the ethical application of information technology in social work practice.

BASW Program Goals. The BASW program identifies three unique curriculum goals, consistent with the requirements of CSWE.

- To prepare entry level baccalaureate social workers for generalist practice in the American social welfare enterprise.
- Within the context of a liberal arts education, to foster a critical examination of the American social welfare enterprise through the study of its history, policies, research and practice interventions.
- To prepare students for graduate education

BASW Curriculum Objectives. Graduates will be able to:

- Apply entry level social work practice skills to individuals, families, groups, communities, and organizations.
- Demonstrate a professional use of self and the ability to use supervision and consultation
- Practice effectively within agencies and delivery systems and identify, plan and pursue needed agency and system improvements.
- Demonstrate knowledge of and commitment to social work values and ethics
- Demonstrate understanding and tolerance for differences based on gender, ethnicity, religious creed, sexual orientation, class, and physical and developmental disabilities.
- Understand the ways in which oppression and discrimination, and social and economic disadvantage put people in need of social work intervention
- Understand the strengths and empowerment perspectives in social work practice and research.
- Understand the history of the American social welfare system, the emergence of the social work profession, and the relations between the two
- Understand the growing prevalence of economic inequality, the distribution of poverty, and societal remedies to resolve these problems
- Analyze the impact of social policies on client systems, workers, and agencies.
- Apply knowledge of bio-psycho-social variables that affect individual development and behavior, and use theoretical frameworks to understand the interactions among individuals and between individuals and social systems (i.e., families, groups, organizations, and communities)
- With the help of supervision, demonstrate knowledge and skills in the basic processes of scientific inquiry to guide and evaluate practice.
- Understand the ethical application of information technology in generalist social work practice.
- Apply critical thinking skills to generalist social work practice
- Use effective oral and written communication skills with a range of client populations, colleagues and members of the community.

The principal means to translate BASW and MSW objectives into programmatic form and assess student progress toward attainment of these objectives includes: examinations, papers, and classroom participation in courses; individualized contracts and performance evaluations in the practicum; and skills self assessment and video assessment at the BASW level; and completion of the practicum.

Research, Community and Organizational Environment Objectives.

The purpose of social work and the premises underlying social work education underscore the need for a set of objectives related to other functions central to education and the profession. Therefore, the faculty has also developed School-wide research, community service, and organizational environment objectives.

Research Objectives. Our School assumes responsibility for systematic, high-quality scholarship that assesses social work practice and develops new knowledge.

To improve social welfare and the profession of social work, faculty and students are expected to:

- Engage in and disseminate research and scholarship that advances theory, policy, and practice.

- Assume leadership roles in the profession to encourage and support ethical, innovative, and high quality research and scholarship.
- Collaborate with community groups and organizations to conduct research and scholarship.

Community Service Objectives. To renew our curriculum and ensure the relevance of our research, we must stay abreast of professional developments occurring in social service agencies and community organizations. Accordingly, we have worked to develop close, reciprocal and ongoing relationships with social work practitioners as well as with professional associations and academic disciplines and departments. In order to do so, faculty are expected to

- Assume leadership roles within our School and the University.
- Assume leadership roles within the profession of social work.
- Assist community groups and organizations in addressing social welfare policy and practice issues through collaboration, public outreach and other service activities.

Organizational Environment Objectives The purpose of social work and the underlying premises of social work education imply that the organizations we build and the ways we socialize students need to be imbued with professional values and ethics. Our organizational environment objectives are:

- To create and encourage a supportive School environment characterized by open communication, collaboration, participation and a sense of community.
- To create a School environment which values people of different ethnicity and races, gender, sexual orientations, physical abilities, strengths, potential, and points of view.
- To promote adult learning
- To promote positive advising relations between students and faculty.

In the past decade, more attention has been given to building a positive organizational environment, and both formal and informal evidence from students, faculty, staff and practitioners suggest this has occurred.

2.2 Basic Program and Unit Data.

Please refer to Appendix A.

III. FACULTY

3.1 Faculty List and Curriculum Vitae. Please see Appendix B, List of Faculty, for names, rank, program in which each teaches, number of times each has chaired a supervisory committee over the past five years, and abbreviated CV's.

Of the 40.25 full-time equivalent (FTE) state-funded faculty positions, 36 individuals are full-time and 8 part-time; 14 professors, 14 associate professors, 10 assistant professors, and 6 lecturers. Of these, 45 percent are women, and 29 percent are persons of color. Thirty-nine faculty (head count, not FTE and including emeritus and research faculty) hold the status of Graduate Faculty (conferred by the Graduate School). The majority of state-funded faculty (84%) hold a Ph.D. or DSW in addition to the MSW degree. Eight, or 20 percent of faculty, hold a second masters degree in sociology, public health, or public affairs/administration in addition to the MSW and Ph.D./DSW. Faculty are expected to have the ability to teach across all three educational programs. As noted

under 14, faculty who teach in the doctoral program, supervise research, sit on doctoral committees, and exercise responsibility for the doctoral program are designated as Social Welfare Faculty. This designation is based on maintaining a record of research-based scholarship and qualifications for doctoral level teaching and research supervision. Social work faculty who serve as Social Welfare Faculty are also identified in Appendix B.

3.2 Part-time, Visiting and Other Faculty.

Part-Time State-Funded Faculty. The part-time state-funded faculty typically have continuous, stable teaching responsibilities that ensure their ongoing involvement in curriculum development and implementation. The part-time faculty complement includes .5 FTE Assistant Professors; three Practicum Coordinators (2.3 FTE); one faculty member with a joint appointment with the School of Public Affairs (.25 FTE with Social Work); and one faculty member who is also Director of Research at the Casey Family Program (.20 FTE). State funds are also provided on an annual basis for four faculty members on early retirement/partial reemployment (.40 FTE); and for the joint appointments to the Head of Social Work (.12 FTE), Center for Human Development and Disability; and Head of Social Work (.12 FTE) for the Adolescent Unit at the same Center. These joint appointments provide strong and direct linkages with both practice settings and other disciplines. Involvement of part-time faculty affiliated with agencies or with other academic departments is particularly critical to the interdisciplinary nature of the doctoral program.

Externally-Funded Faculty. Given our School's success in securing federal funding, 7 tenure-track faculty are partially funded on research grants and a growing number of non-tenure track faculty are fully funded externally. Five research faculty (4.0 FTE Research Assistant Professors and 1.0 FTE Research Associate Professor), with degrees in psychology, education and social work are PIs or Co-Pis on these projects. They attend faculty and concentration meetings and thus are well informed about program goals and priorities, and are available to teach courses on research methods, serve on doctoral supervisory committees and supervise doctoral research practica. Two and a half (2.5) FTE Lecturers and 8.75 FTE Teaching Associates, who are supported by externally-funded training grants, occasionally present guest lectures, supervise practica with their projects, or oversee independent projects. Of these, 3 FTEs are funded by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act and supervise field units of up to 18 students at the Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS).

Clinical and Affiliate Faculty. One hundred seventy-seven (177) Clinical and Affiliate Faculty are associated with the School. Clinical Faculty are selected Practicum Instructors from University-affiliated hospitals and Affiliate Faculty are Practicum Instructors in other agencies who meet the criteria for such an appointment. Practicum Instructors qualify for Affiliate and Clinical status after providing practicum supervision for at least two consecutive years and upon the approval of the School's Practicum Coordinating Committee and the Executive Committee. As a group, they represent long-term and loyal affiliations with the School. Turnover is very low, and each year, two or three are reviewed for promotion. Clinical and Affiliate Faculty not only provide supervision of BASW and MSW students, but also often present guest lectures, assist with SW 405 seminars in the BASW program, and occasionally teach BASW and MSW practice courses.

Auxiliary Faculty and Advanced Doctoral Students. Two other categories of instructional support are: 1) part-time auxiliary faculty, who are MSW practitioners in the community (some also hold the Ph.D.) and who may also meet the criteria for clinical or affiliate faculty, and 2) advanced doctoral students. Both categories are hired to teach courses uncovered because of faculty sabbaticals,

unpaid leaves, illness, or externally funded research and training responsibilities. Auxiliary faculty and advanced doctoral students thus serve to cover short-term gaps created by individual faculty development plans and funded research as well as to enhance and enrich BASW and MSW curriculum, particularly through their ability to draw upon ongoing practice experiences. Accordingly, they provide flexibility and breadth to the program's teaching goals and objectives. No auxiliary faculty or Ph.D. students are the primary instructors in doctoral level courses

Structures and processes are in place to ensure that auxiliary faculty and doctoral level Teaching Assistants are integrated into the professional curriculum structure and have supports similar to those of state-funded faculty. Before hiring, the Associate Dean for Academic Programs seeks the advice of the Director of the BASW program, concentration chairs, or lead instructors. Other faculty teaching the same required course meet with the auxiliary faculty or Ph.D. student to ensure consistency of course objectives and outcomes. In addition, the Associate Dean for Academic Programs and the School's Administrator hold an orientation, informing them of the School's expectations with regard to instruction (e.g., format for course syllabi, use of standardized student evaluations, office hour availability) and the resources to support their teaching (e.g., Office Assistance Services, journal article copying, word-processing, office space to meet individually with students).

Doctoral students also receive an intensive orientation and ongoing training through our teaching preparation initiative. A Lead TA provides overall coordination of doctoral student teaching activities. In addition to the TA experience, all students must fulfill a teaching practica, which is closely supervised by at least one state-funded faculty member. Whenever possible, auxiliary faculty and advanced doctoral students participate in concentration and faculty meetings to stay informed about the curriculum and other school issues. Regular meetings of all section instructors ensures institutionalized mechanisms for information-sharing related to course development and implementation, professional socialization and monitoring of teaching.

Visiting Scholars and Teaching Consultants. Visiting Scholars from other countries are often associated with all three programs and typically offer colloquia and informal seminars or serve as guest lecturers. We receive more requests from visiting scholars than we are able to accommodate, largely because of limited funding and space. In fact, visiting scholars typically have to share office space and are unable to access our limited operations support. We would like to expand our capacity to accommodate visiting faculty from other countries, because it enriches our research program and graduate training, but cannot do so without additional private or public funding.

The School frequently invites faculty from other social work programs to provide consultation on educational and research issues. For example, in 1996-97, we are hosting teaching consultants from the University of Chicago and University of California-Berkeley to address issues of diversity and advanced practice. In addition, we will be hosting outstanding prevention researchers through the new Social Work Prevention Research Center, including Dr. Hendricks Brown from Florida State University, Dr. Shep Kellam and Dr. Margaret Ensminger from Johns Hopkins and Dr. David Takeuchi from UCLA.

3.3 Underrepresented Groups - Faculty.

The School engages in proactive efforts to recruit and retain racial or ethnic minority faculty and those from other under-represented groups, which are summarized as follows:

Recruitment of Underrepresented Faculty:

- The School's procedures to set recruitment priorities include an annual review of the faculty composition in terms of gender and ethnic diversity.
- All position announcements ask for experience with historically oppressed and disadvantaged groups and include the following statement (or a slight variation thereof) *"As one of the top ranked schools in the country, we are a community of scholars committed to preparing graduates for ethical, culturally competent and self-reflective practice with underserved populations. The School is committed to equal opportunity and affirmative action and to strengthening our culturally diverse faculty. We strongly encourage women and persons of color to apply."*
- The University of Washington statement regarding non-discrimination is included on all position announcements. Consistent with University procedures to encourage the hiring of minority and women faculty, the School's position announcements are reviewed by the Provost's Office and by the Associate Dean for Minority Affairs in the Graduate School.
- Search committees include faculty who are strongly committed to recruiting candidates with multicultural teaching and practice experience as well as faculty of color.
- Position announcements are advertised in minority publications and distributed to lists of minority and women candidates maintained by the UW Graduate School.
- Search committee members and the faculty are encouraged to use informal collegial and professional networks to help identify potential minority applicants since informal contacts are typically the most effective recruitment strategies. Faculty of color have been invited as visiting scholars or consultants in order to become acquainted with our School. This latter process resulted in the recruitment of one full professor of color
- When prospective applicants (particularly members of under-represented groups) are identified, faculty make personal contacts to answer questions and help retain his/her interest in the position. Candidates from under-represented groups have an opportunity to meet with faculty members and students from those groups during their campus visit and with the Associate Dean for Minority Affairs in the Graduate School. These personalized, intensified efforts recognize the realities of the highly competitive national environment among social work programs to attract excellent faculty members.
- In the past ten years, our School has received new or supplemental funding from the Provost's Office to hire four faculty members of color, and funding for loaned or bridge positions for five faculty members of color. The Provost's Office has provided at least one month's summer salary support for all Assistant Professors of color, and in some instances, other incentives such as TA support and computer equipment. Also we provide research assistants to all new faculty for their first two years. Developing recruitment incentives for faculty of color is one of the major challenges facing our School and the University in the next five years.
- In 1993, the faculty supported the recommendation of the Task Force on Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual studies to recruit a scholar specializing in practice with gay, lesbian and bisexual populations. During this search, two outstanding candidates were identified. A loaned position from the University administration enabled us to hire both faculty members and thus to increase faculty diversity in terms of sexual orientation.

Of the 37 tenure track faculty members hired since 1986, 26, or 70 percent, have been women and 11, or 30 percent, faculty of color. As can be seen in Table 1, our School's record for hiring minority and women faculty compares very favorably with the University as a whole, exceeding the overall University in every category

| TABLE 1 TENURE-TRACK FACULTY SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK AND THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON | | |
|--|------------|-------------|
| | SSW (N=30) | UW (N=2699) |
| Women | 45% (15) | 26% (701) |
| Faculty of Color | 24% (8) | 8.7% (234) |
| African American | 6% (2) | 1.6% (44) |
| Asian American | 9% (3) | 5.0% (147) |
| Hispanic American | 3% (1) | 1.4% (37) |
| American Indian | 3% (1) | .3% (8) |

Among the School's 23 state-funded non-tenure-track faculty, 83 percent (20) are women and 12 percent (3) are faculty of color. Of these, 6 percent (1) is Asian American and 12 percent (2) are African American. Of the University's total non-tenure track faculty (N=573), 40 percent (228) are women and 10 percent (53) are faculty of color. Of these, 3 percent are African American, 2 percent are Hispanic, and 6 percent are Asian American.

Of the five research faculty in the School, 80 percent are women and 20 percent Asian American. Of research faculty in the University (N = 601), 25 percent are women and 18 percent are faculty of color; of these 4 percent are African American, 2 percent Hispanic, 15 percent Asian American, and 2 percent American Indian.

Each year the Assistant Provost for Equal Opportunity and the Vice President for Minority Affairs meet with the Dean to review the School's progress in hiring women and minorities, given their availability in the national pool of social workers with doctorates. Typically we have met the goal, according to the availability of the pool, in terms of Asian American and American Indian faculty, but not in terms of women, African American or Hispanic faculty. Even though 45 percent of the tenure-track faculty at the School are women, this is below the 58.4 percent availability rate. The recruitment of women and minorities will continue to be a priority in hiring efforts.

Compared to other social work programs nationally, as reported in the annual CSWE Statistics, our School exceeds the CSWE average in terms of percentages of women, American Indians and Asian Americans. Women and faculty of color are also represented in leadership positions within the School. Of the seven major administrative positions, five are filled by women: Dean, Associate Dean for Research, Director of the BASW Program, Director of the Ph.D Program, and Director of Practicum. Two of these seven positions are filled by faculty of color. Multicultural teaching, practice and research experience are expectations for both positions for which we are currently recruiting. Overall, the School appears to be successful in recruiting and hiring women and faculty of color, especially American Indians, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders.

Retention of Underrepresented Faculty Groups.

Since 1989, 16 state-funded faculty have been promoted and/or tenured and three research faculty have been promoted. Of the state-funded faculty, four or 25 percent were faculty of color and seven or 43 percent were women; of the research promoted faculty, two were women. No women or faculty of color have been denied promotion or tenure in the past ten years.

Of concern, however, is the number of faculty of color who have been successfully recruited away by peer institutions, such as the University of Michigan, UCLA and University of North Carolina. The Executive and Diversity Committees have initiated processes to address the issue of retention. For example, the Executive Committee in 1993-94 interviewed all faculty of color regarding their experiences at the School and the University and developed a series of recommendations, some of which have been incorporated in the promotion and tenure policies and procedures related to scholarship and service. The Diversity Committee developed personnel recommendations to be considered by the Executive Committee in 1996-97, including a review of teaching evaluations in terms of rank, gender, race and sexual orientation and equities related to internal service. The Deans Office, specifically through the Associate Dean for Research, is attempting to strengthen senior faculty's mentoring of junior faculty and to better integrate new faculty into ongoing funded research activities. To improve the organizational environment to support diverse perspectives, numerous workshops have been offered in the past ten years on cultural diversity, gay, lesbian and bisexual issues, adult learners and culturally competent practice.

Despite the loss of four outstanding (tenure-track) women faculty of color in the past five years, the School has been able to retain two women through competitive offers made by the Provost's Office. Currently, the School is faced with retaining five outstanding faculty who are being actively recruited. Of these five, two are faculty of color, and three are women.

Our School has developed a number of retention initiatives related to promotion and tenure, workload assignment and remuneration. These include:

- Based upon Executive Committee interviews noted above, the Personnel Policies and Procedural Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, and Continuation of Employment were revised to recognize explicitly the role of faculty of color in mentoring students and providing service in their respective communities. This also included an expanded definition of scholarship to acknowledge the importance of collaborative scholarship. The Executive Committee currently is reviewing committee assignments and developing recommendations regarding community service to ensure equity across ranks and along other dimensions, such as gender and race.
- In 1996, the faculty approved the Executive Committee's recommendations regarding the need for caution in interpreting the Social Science Citation Index, since a number of newer journals related to race and ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and progressive practice are not included in the Index
- The faculty of color meet on a regular basis to provide support and information to each other.
- The Dean and Associate Deans annually review the salaries of faculty of color and women compared to the rest of the faculty. Although the School has utilized merit funds and those from the Provosts Office to address gender inequities, problems remain at the associate professor level, where three women appear to lag behind peers judged to be of similar merit. At the assistant professor level, two women faculty, who fall below the median salary, appear to be affected by the highly competitive national market whereby new hires come in at higher salaries. The Provost's Office is currently conducting a salary analysis in terms of gender, which will be considered in the next salary increase, hopefully in 1997-98.
- The School's faculty workload policy is constructed to achieve equity among faculty in teaching across large and small, day and evening, and required and elective courses. All new junior faculty are given lighter teaching loads, along with research assistants for the first two years, to

facilitate their scholarly production in anticipation of their tenure review. The norms and expectations for faculty participation in committee and administrative work (for junior faculty, no more than four committees a year) also reflect considerations of equity

- As noted above, our School is at a disadvantage in being able to recruit and retain outstanding faculty of color, since peer institutions typically are able to offer higher salaries. The need for more central resources for retention is critical, especially in anticipation of a relatively modest salary increase for the 1997-99 biennium.

IV. STUDENTS.

4.1 Baseline Information.

Ph.D. Program. Admission to the Ph.D. program is based on: 1) academic and professional credentials (master's degree in social work, social welfare or a related field, undergraduate and master's GPA, GRE, prior professional and research experience), 2) indicators that career goals are consistent with the Ph D. program's objectives and that the applicant is ready to undertake doctoral work (an essay that addresses commitment to research appropriate to social welfare, clear explication of how interest in research developed, and how applicant intends to use research skills, writing samples, letters of reference); and 3) match between the applicant's substantive areas of interest and currently available faculty resources. Two or more years of post MSW practice experience is considered advantageous and is highly important for those who seek academic positions in social work following graduation. Also considered are financial resources (how many students can we fund for the coming year) and the School's goal of supporting diversity. Factors like GRE's and GPA's typically have a very restricted range among those who are admitted to the program; thus, other factors come to the fore as being correlates of program success. These include students' ability as "self-starters," their capability to function in a disciplined and relatively independent manner, and clarity of their post-graduate career goals.

Our experience argues against overreliance on any one factor in the admissions decision. For example, we do not have mandatory levels for the GRE's, although the program has found the quantitative scores to be a predictor of students' success in the statistics course and the verbal (and TOEFL) scores to be important considerations for reading and writing at the doctoral level, especially for international applicants. The average entering GPA has remained relatively stable, from 3.72 in 1993 to 3.79 in 1994 and 3.68 in 1995. The cumulative GRE for the 1993-95 entering students was 1756, 1679, and 1796. There is some variation from one year to the next in the individual test scores and the averages of each section, but we have not noticed a marked upward or downward trend. Compared to national averages of GREs taken from October 1992-September 1995, our students' scores are above the national averages of 1595 and considerably above the national averages for a sub-sample who intend to go to graduate school in social work of (1393).

MSW Program. Admission to the MSW Program is based on a baccalaureate degree from a recognized accredited college or university; a minimum GPA of 3.0 during the last two years of undergraduate education; the GRE; employment experience in human services; and completion of an admissions essay that addresses three major areas: social work as a career, social problems and diversity. Reviewers rate the essay's substantive content, such as current knowledge of social work, commitment to the social work profession, and experience with diverse populations and the applicants' writing ability. In addition, Washington State Law RCW 43.43.830 through 43.43.845, the Child/Adult Abuse Information Act, requires that students who expect to do volunteer or

professional work in agencies that serve children or vulnerable adults must have a criminal background check. Therefore, all applicants must complete the Washington State Criminal Background Check form and a personal disclosure statement.

Applicants accepted for the Advanced Standing MSW Program may complete the requirements in three quarters of academic work. Those who have graduated from an accredited baccalaureate program within the past five years from the date of application with a 3.0 grade point in all required social work courses may apply for Advanced Standing. The same admissions criteria and procedures for selection are used in reviewing applicants for Advanced Standing, however, applicants must also submit information from their undergraduate social work background for evaluation of course work taken in the past five years.

All MSW applications are reviewed by at least two faculty; if the two overall scores do not agree within the specified degree of agreement, a third reviewer rates the materials. All three scores are then averaged to yield the admissions score. Applicants are not considered further if the admissions score does not meet the basic level of qualification. Applicants who score at a predetermined level significantly above the basic qualification level are immediately offered admission (approximately one-half of the offers). The remaining offers are on a space-available basis to those who meet the basic level of qualification and are added to a wait list.

The School has written policies and procedures regarding the transfer of credit and use of proficiency exams at the MSW level. Students who have completed courses from accredited baccalaureate programs in social welfare may request to waive by examination or be exempted by educational credential from certain courses within the Foundation (first year) curriculum. Students with equivalent course work from other disciplines may petition to exempt from SocW 502/503; SocW 504 and SW 505. Students may also attempt to waive SocW 505 by examination. The percentage of students who waived or exempted any courses in 1995-96 was 41 percent. Forty percent of students requested course exemptions; of these, 91 percent were granted. Only 5 percent of total students passed the research waiver exam. There are no exemptions or waivers for the BASW or Ph.D. programs. Transfer students are accepted into the BASW and MSW programs, but not the Ph.D. program, because of the highly structured nature of its first year.

The baseline information for MSW students shows an increase in the number of applications in 1995, resulting in a ratio of 3 to 1 of applications/acceptances. There has been a steady increase since 1985, and each year we have had to deny admission to many qualified applicants. The GPA of the entering class has increased slightly from 3.39 in 1985 to 3.45 along with the average entering GRE. In general, GRE and GPA are adequate predictors of academic success in the MSW Program. On the other hand, because of the level of maturity, experience and pragmatic analytical thought often conducive to success in a professional degree program, the School places a high value on the admissions essay in predicting success in the MSW program.

Because of the nature of the social work profession and the importance of preparing a diverse pool of graduates, the School occasionally petitions to request an exemption from Graduate School standards for otherwise qualified candidates who do not meet the GPA or GRE requirements. In 1995-96, 19 petitions were filed, of which 16 or 84 percent were for applicants of color. In such instances, greater weight is placed upon the applicant's admissions essay and work-related experience. Exceptions to the GRE are not considered at the doctoral level.

BASW Program. Admission to the BASW program includes completion of a minimum of 65 college level credits by the time of enrollment in the program and a minimum of a 2.0 GPA, with greater weight given to those who have at least a 2.5 GPA as an indicator of the level of motivation and academic ability needed for reasonable probability of success in the program. Other factors considered are the applicant's background as it relates to social welfare, a written statement describing the development of his/her interest in social welfare; relevant volunteer, practicum or paid employment experiences and any honors received; and the School's commitment to diversity. Applicants may consult with the Director of Admissions regarding any special circumstances that may be considered within the context of the admissions process

In the fall of 1995, the School changed the admission period from twice a year to once a year in order to accommodate additional BASW curriculum requirements and to reduce the admissions workload associated with two entry points. As described under 4.2, this may have had an unintended consequence of slightly reducing applications, at least temporarily

The University's Office of Undergraduate Admissions forwards transfer applications that meet the University's admissions requirements to the BASW Admissions Committee. This committee then sends the form to the University's Office of Undergraduate Admissions with the recommendation for admission or denial

4.2. Enrollment patterns.

Enrollment in both the Ph.D. and MSW programs has remained relatively stable over the past ten years, which reflects the lack of state-funded growth in our graduate programs and the resulting enrollment limits set by the Graduate School.

Ph.D. Program. At the Ph.D. level, the Steering Committee has made the decision to admit only the number of students for whom financial assistance can be guaranteed for their first two years and where student substantive interests can be matched with faculty expertise. Adequate financial and faculty resources to support Ph.D. students have been found to be related to students' successfully completing the program. Therefore, the Ph.D. program is deliberately kept small. The baseline information for Ph.D. applications over the past 10 years shows a largely stable application level of between 34-41. The rate of applications to offers has been roughly 3 to 1. Over the past 10 years, approximately 2-4 admittees per year elected not to enroll, typically deciding to go to a different program or not to pursue doctoral education.

MSW Program. For the past five years the overall graduate enrollment target, set in coordination with the Graduate School, has been 138. The number of applications for admission has risen steadily during the past ten years. For Autumn 1996 admissions, 608 applications were processed. The large number of applicants allows us to be selective and ensures that our students will be highly qualified. Our selectivity is evident in Appendix A, Basic Program Data, which indicates that in 1995, 640 applications were received, 203 offers extended. Of the offers, 118 students matriculated. Data are not yet available for the 1997 admissions review, but our inquiry rate is only slightly below last year. Basic program data (Appendix A) show slight variations in enrollment patterns. These can be explained by the fact that students who are on the 6 credits free state employee benefit plan are not counted in the Graduate School statistics. On July 1, 1995, the School's Evening Degree Program was transferred for budgetary purposes to the University's Evening Degree Program, although it continues to be administered through the School. This then affects how evening students are reflected in our enrollment data. The number of evening students admitted has remained

relatively constant, varying between 24- 27 head count over the past ten years. All evening students are part-time students in years 1 and 2, but register for full-time status in year 3. The number of part-time students in the day program is relatively small, ranging from 0 to 4. Part-time student enrollment patterns have not changed substantially since the inception of the Evening Degree Program in 1981.

BASW Program. As noted above, the BASW program was reduced by 50 percent in the 1981 budget cuts. Since then, the BASW application rate has grown steadily since 1985 to a high of 168 in 1995 and then a decline in 1996-97 to 125. Until recently, approximately 125 students applied each year for 55 positions. In 1996, we received permission to increase enrollment to approximately 65 positions which would bring the total number in the major to 140 in autumn 1997. The acceptance rate ranges from 38 - 54 percent, with 45 percent as the average. As noted above, the 1996 decline may be temporary and related to the change in admission deadlines. It is, however, of concern in light of the 1997-98 funding of 10 additional FTE students. The new BASW Program Director is working actively with undergraduate advisors across campus to inform them of our program and of the potential career directions for graduates. Our BASW admission requirements, compared to other departments, and the possible addition of prerequisites may deter some students from applying. Nevertheless, our faculty place a strong value on the "gatekeeping" function of the admission process in a professional program.

Summer Quarter Enrollment. The summer term is not considered part of the regular academic year schedule. MSW and BASW students are not typically enrolled during the summer, unless they are completing a block field placement. In summer 1996, the MSW evening degree program did offer two courses, a pattern we plan to continue for evening students. Ph.D. students often take courses through other departments during the summer (e.g., to fulfill their external course requirements for research methods and social sciences courses) or graduate tutorials and dissertation credits. Ph.D. students also often work on their research practica in the summer.

4.3 Graduation Patterns:

Ph.D. Program. There have been no significant changes in the number of degrees granted. The attrition rate of student withdrawals over the past 10 years is only about 11 percent, and there is no trend in the data during the period. The average length of time required for degree completion is 17.8 quarters or about 4.4 years. Both of these figures are favorable with respect to experiences in other departments. However, the Steering Committee is concerned that pressure on students to get through the program relatively quickly may negatively affect the depth and thoroughness of their preparation. Thus, we are more explicitly striving to balance academic excellence with efficiency in time to completion.

Quality in the Ph.D. Program is monitored through six primary mechanisms: advising, formal review of program of study, written and oral examinations, formal review of dissertation prospectus, defense of the dissertation, and alumni surveys, including information on employment. With regard to advisement, each student is assigned a faculty advisor, based on mutual areas of scholarly interest, at the beginning of the program. Students are encouraged to meet at least twice with the advisor in the autumn quarter and then quarterly thereafter. These advising sessions are intended to foster planning discussions that are helpful to the student's development (e.g., selection of external courses, constituting a supervisory committee, forecasting directions for dissertation research, preparing oneself for the job search) in addition to resolving any concerns or problems. The advisor and student are expected to complete annual end of the year written summaries (related to timely

progress, any areas of concern to the student, advisor, or both; assessment of the degree to which the student has developed skills and knowledge commensurate with his/her goals and studies to date) and forward these to the Director.

In addition to the advisor's feedback, the Director convenes first year instructors at the end of the spring quarter of the first year or early in autumn quarter of the second year to discuss their collective impressions of first year students. This is to help identify any special needs that may have been overlooked in individual courses. The focus is less on specific course content and more on meta-skills, such as conceptualization, writing, reasoning and critical thinking, and continuing fit of student interests with faculty resources. If concerns arise in this meeting, the Program Director contacts the student and/or advisor to initiate discussion. If significant difficulties are observed, the Director and the Associate Dean for Academic Programs meet with the advisor and student to formulate a plan.

MSW Program. Day students typically complete the program in 7 quarters full-time (counting summer quarter), evening students in 11 quarters (counting summer quarters). The attrition rate has been around 4 percent, with no apparent upward or downward trend over time. (Analysis of graduation rates must take account of evening students who typically take three years to graduate.) The relatively low attrition in the MSW Program can be attributed to our careful faculty-controlled admissions process to ensure a highly qualified student body, to improvements in faculty teaching in recent years, and to the major curriculum change and enhancements for student support (e.g., advising, financial aid).

Evaluation of a student's academic performance in the MSW Program is accomplished through assessment of the student's work in individual classes and his/her cumulative GPA. In addition to grade performance, the School requires that students with multiple incompletes or "X" grades in the Professional Foundation courses must successfully complete the courses prior to beginning the Advanced Curriculum. The program adheres to Graduate School policies for good academic standing—a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or above and a minimum of 2.7 in each course counted toward the MSW degree. If the School receives Graduate School notification of students in academic difficulty, the Director of Student Services first contacts the student, and also attempts to talk with the faculty advisor. The Associate Dean for Academic Programs then follows up with a letter to the student. On the basis of a review of the student's cumulative GPA, the Associate Dean may recommend to the Graduate School one of the following: no action, warn, probation or drop. The student may appeal the decision to the University, consistent with the Graduate School's Academic Grievance Procedures, or the faculty member or the Associate Dean may convene the School's Committee on Students. The Committee on Students is charged with the responsibility to investigate and decide on matters related to students' academic and non-academic performance problems.

BASW Program. Consistent with University policy, BASW students must maintain a 2.0 cumulative GPA to remain in good academic standing. Students earning less than this are provided a warning, placed on probation or dropped from the University. BASW students who earn higher than a 3.5 cumulative GPA receive a congratulatory letter and certificate from the Dean. BASW students typically complete the program in two years. Approximately 15 percent withdraw or transfer after starting the program.

4.4 Underrepresented Groups

The School implements its strong commitment to diversity through recruitment efforts and policies regarding admission and financial assistance. The School seeks to recruit a diverse student body with regard to traditionally underrepresented racial and ethnic groups, gender, disability, ethnic or national origin, religion, and sexual orientation. In accordance with current University and federal policy, specific recruitment goals by protected category are not set. Rather the overall approach is congruent with the University's affirmative action policy.

Relevant policies and procedures include the following.

- Anti-discrimination policies of the University and the School are clearly stated in the School's admissions bulletin and the Ph.D., MSW, and BASW student program manuals.
- Affirmative action policies, set forth by the Schools Admissions Policy Review Committee in 1987, explicitly consider diversity as a factor in the selection of students. The value placed on diversity is stated in the application materials for all three programs, and students are asked to describe life and work experiences in ethnic and/or sexual minority communities wherever appropriate in the application materials.
- A Recruitment Committee formulates strategies to recruit students of color and to support the value of a diverse student body. Three Minority Information Specialists (MSW Research Assistants) are funded by the School to assist with recruitment for all three programs. These specialists provide individual support through the application process, such as being available to talk about the School, the curriculum, the admissions process and any obstacles to applicant's career advancement. The Director of Admissions, Minority Information Specialists and members of the Recruitment Committee recruit at universities, community colleges, high schools, conferences and community events. The School's faculty of color are routinely included in recruitment activities and participate in admissions decisions. At the undergraduate level, the School participates in the University's "Transfer Opportunity Program" where students of color from western Washington community colleges are brought to campus to meet with department personnel. Close ties are maintained with the University's Undergraduate Advising Office and the Office of Minority Affairs and its counselors.
- As noted above, the School petitions the Graduate School for admission of approximately 20 to 25 MSW applicants of color who meet admission criteria with the exception of the GRE and GPA.
- After students are admitted, several mechanisms help with retention. The Students of Color Network offers social support and serves as a resource, especially during the transition to graduate school. The School annually sponsors the Bridge Program, an innovative orientation program for newly admitted MSW students of color. Of the students who have participated in the BRIDGE program, 96 percent have graduated from the MSW program which is comparable to those for the MSW program as a whole.
- Curriculum policies of all three programs require that content on diverse populations, including those that have been disadvantaged and oppressed, be included in courses, in accord with course objectives.
- In the School's annual fund-raising efforts, student financial assistance has been the highest priority for the past nine years. In the 1996 telepledge drive, nearly 90 percent of the total donations were targeted for students, largely students of color.
- At the Ph.D. level, all students are provided with financial assistance for the first two years of the program. Sources of support include the Boeing Endowment and Naomi R. Gottlieb

Endowment Fund, and state funds for RAs and TAs. Affirmative action policies are considered in awarding such support. In addition, the Ph.D. Program Director assists minority applicants to apply for NIMH Minority Fellowships through CSWE.

- The School provides several tuition scholarships to qualified MSW students who have a combination of academic strength and financial need as assessed by the Office of Financial Aid. In 1986, the faculty voted to target the majority of our MSW financial aid to students of color and students with disabilities, although all students are informed of the existence of scholarship support and the opportunity to apply. The financial aid packages available through the School include a Minority Social Work Student Scholarship for three quarters of resident tuition; approximately seven one-quarter tuition scholarships; three Research Assistantships which are used to support the Minority Information Specialists, and thirty quarters of tuition allocated across twenty-two students and funded by the School's endowment funds (the Social Work Group Fund, the Minority and Disabled Student Fund, and the Edith and Ludwig Lobe Fund for students who have been disadvantaged by race, gender or poverty. Of the MSW students receiving financial assistance through the School (separate from the federal government) in 1995-96, 40 or 82 percent were students of color. Of the federal funding, 61 percent went to MSW students of color. At both the Ph.D. and MSW levels, we have benefited from minority student support through the Graduate School.
- The primary source of financial assistance to BASW students is federal loans through the University's Financial Aid Office. The School has established the Mildred Buck Loan Fund to assist BASW students with short-term loans. Of the 87 BASW students receiving financial aid in 1995-96, 57 percent of these were students of color. Research grants and stipends at some field placements also provide a limited source of support for qualified BASW and MSW students

In summary, all students have access to information about the available program resources or opportunities, including information about financial aid and employment

Ph. D Student Characteristics. Of the 35 doctoral students enrolled in 1996-97, 7 (20%) are from groups under-represented in higher education and four others (11.4%) are international students from Korea. Of the 7 from under-represented groups, one is African American, three are Asian American, and three are Latino-American. Additionally, 66 percent are women. Of the 8 doctoral students who graduated in 1995-96, 3 (37.5%) were from under-represented groups; one African American and two Asian Americans, and five (62.5%) were women. Based on our observation of other doctoral programs, we believe that we do better than most with respect to graduation of under-represented students of color. For example, CSWE data indicate that of all social work doctoral degrees awarded in 1992-93, 65 percent were women and 16 percent minorities.

The Ph D. Program continually strives to increase enrollment of students of color. Its diversity plan for recruitment and retention includes designating one of the School's three minority recruitment specialists to help in the recruitment of Ph.D. students; utilizing currently enrolled Ph.D. students to contact prospective minority applicants in close coordination with the active recruitment follow-up efforts of the program director; emphasizing the program's multicultural commitment in all flyers and announcements; systematically networking with alumni, colleagues in other Universities, and community leaders to identify exceptional candidates; providing financial support for all students of color during their first two years in the program and actively assisting them in locating support for subsequent years; and fostering opportunities for the mentoring of students of color by faculty of color.

MSW Student Characteristics. The characteristics of students by race and disability who were accepted into the MSW program over the past four years are shown in Table 2

| Student Characteristics | 1993-94 % | | 1994-95 % | | 1995-96 % | | 1996-97 % | |
|-------------------------|------------------|-----|-----------|----|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|
| | African American | 8 | 11 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 8 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 5 | 7 | 14 | 17 | 11 | 16 | 15 | 29 |
| Hispanic American | 9 | 13 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 10 |
| Native American | 6 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 7 |
| Disabled | 6 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 9 |
| Women* | 85 | 116 | 77 | 97 | 80 | 112 | 85 | 166 |

*Women may also be disabled or of color.

The percent of African American and Asian/Pacific Islander MSW students has remained relatively constant or increased, while the percent of Hispanic and Native American has decreased slightly. The percent of students of color in the day program in 1996-97 is 32 percent and increases in the evening part-time program to 37 percent. These figures compare favorably to the fact that persons of color constitute only about 14 percent of Washington State's total population

Table 3 shows that the School's enrollment of minority and women graduate students is a higher percentage than that in the total University in fall quarter 1996.

| Graduate Student Characteristics | School of Social Work | | University | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| | n | % | n | % |
| African American | 18 | 7.4 | 226 | 2.5 |
| Native American | 7 | 3.0 | 126 | 1.4 |
| Asian American | 33 | 13.5 | 858 | 9.4 |
| Hispanic American | 13 | 5.3 | 292 | 3.2 |
| Total Minority | 71 | 29 | 1,502 | 16 |
| Women (minority) | 52 | 21 | 819 | 9 |
| Women (other) | 144 | 59 | 3,693 | 40 |
| Total Women | 196 | 80 | 4,512 | 49 |

The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) uses 10 clusters or geographic regions for comparing social work programs nationally. Washington is in Region 10 along with Alaska, Idaho and Oregon, with Portland State as the only accredited graduate program in the region that reports data to CSWE. Table 4 shows that our School's enrollment of minority students is equivalent to that of Portland State for all groups, with the exception of Asian Americans, where the percent is more than three times as high as that at Portland State.

**TABLE 4
STUDENTS OF COLOR BY REGIONAL MSW PROGRAM**

| Program | Total | African American | | Asian American | | Hispanic American | | American Indian | |
|---------------------------|-------|------------------|-----|----------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| MSW Program | | | | | | | | | |
| Portland State University | 161 | 10 | 6.2 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 3.7 | 9 | 5.6 |
| University of Washington | 207 | 11 | 5.3 | 16 | 7.7 | 9 | 4.3 | 9 | 4.3 |

BASW Student Characteristics. Students of color have formed 40 to 50 percent of the BASW students. Of the BASW students matriculated in 1995-96, 45 percent were students of color; of those entering in Autumn 1996, 48 percent are students of color. The percent of applicants of color accepted into the BASW program over the past four years is shown in Table 5.

**TABLE 5
CHARACTERISTICS BY RACE AND DISABILITY
ACROSS PAST FOUR YEARS OF BASW ADMISSIONS**

| Student Characteristics | 1993-94 % | | 1994-95 % | | 1995-96 % | | 1996-97 % | |
|-------------------------|-----------|----|-----------|----|-----------|----|-----------|----|
| African American | 7 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 12 | 7 |
| Asian American | 33 | 21 | 26 | 16 | 34 | 23 | 23 | 13 |
| Hispanic American | 5 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 5 |
| Native American | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| Disabled | 5 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Women* | 85 | 57 | 91 | 55 | 78 | 52 | 85 | 48 |

*Women may be of color or disabled

Table 6 shows that the School had a proportionately larger percent of undergraduate minority students and of women than the total University in winter quarter 1996.

| Student Characteristics | BASW Program | | Other UW Undergraduate Programs | |
|-------------------------|--------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| | n | % | n | % |
| African American | 13 | 11 | 855 | 3.4 |
| Native American | 5 | 4.2 | 403 | 1.6 |
| Asian American | 35 | 29 | 5,530 | 22 |
| Hispanic American | 7 | 5.8 | 959 | 3.8 |
| Total minority | 60 | 50 | 7,747 | 31 |
| Women (minority) | 47 | 39 | 3,938 | 16 |
| Women (other) | 48 | 40 | 8,861 | 35 |
| Total Women | 95 | 79 | 12,799 | 51 |

Table 7, the School's enrollment of undergraduate minority students compared to those other Region 10 institutions, shows that the School is as successful, and in some cases, more successful, in attracting undergraduate students of color compared to other programs in Region 10.

| Undergraduate Programs | Total | African American | | Asian American | | Hispanic American | | American Indian | |
|------------------------|-------|------------------|-----|----------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| U of Alaska-Anchorage | 84 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3.5 | 1 | 1.2 | 7 | 8 |
| U of Alaska-Fairbanks | 68 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 1.4 | 1 | 1.4 | 5 | 7 |
| Idaho State | 85 | 4 | 4.7 | 2 | 2.3 | 1 | 1.1 | 0 | |
| Eastern Washington | 86 | 5 | 5.8 | 5 | 5.8 | 5 | 5.8 | 8 | 9 |
| Pacific Lutheran | 47 | 4 | 8.5 | 4 | 8.5 | 3 | 6 | 0 | |
| U of W/SSW | 78 | 7 | 9 | 21 | 27 | 2 | 2.6 | 2 | 2.6 |
| Walla Walla | 36 | 1 | 2.8 | 0 | | 1 | 2.8 | 1 | 2.8 |

4.5 Nontraditional Students.

Of the current Ph D. cohort, the average age is 32; of the MSW cohort, the average age is 31; and of the BASW cohort, it is 26. In all three programs, age has remained relatively constant or declined only slightly since 1989, the first year in which statistics were kept. The School has attempted to

support non-traditional students through the Evening Degree Program, ensuring that the library, computer and media resources are available in the evenings, and offering more events and classes in the late afternoon.

Because of the age of our students, many of them have family and employment responsibilities. This can create scheduling problems and also limit the time they have available to be involved in other activities at the School, such as the student association or school-wide committees. On the other hand, they bring rich backgrounds of employment and academic experiences to their courses (a growing number of graduate students have graduate degrees from other fields) and many of them are extremely involved in the organizational life of the school, despite their other commitments.

V. (A) UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM INSTRUCTION

5.A.1 Degree Programs/Options

A primary objective of the BASW program is to prepare students for entry-level positions as generalist practitioners, working with a diverse range of populations-at-risk in publicly funded services. To graduate with a BASW, students must complete 180 credit hours, 72 of which are in the major, including 12 credit hours of supervised practicum and an additional 15 of social welfare related electives. Collectively, these 72 credit hours are referred to as the professional foundation curriculum.

The professional foundation curriculum begins in the junior year, follows a prescribed program of study and provides integrated and sequential learning opportunities for acquiring social work knowledge, skills, and values. It is organized around five traditional content areas that are integrated throughout the curriculum: Human Behavior and the Social Environment; Social Welfare Policy and Services; Social Welfare Research; Social Welfare Practice; and the Practicum. Content on values and ethics, diversity, populations-at-risk, and social justice are also infused throughout the foundation curriculum.

Students complete the program during their senior year. Only those who have completed the junior year practice courses may participate in the senior year courses. Students take 400-clock hours (12 credit hours) of a supervised field practicum from the fall through spring quarter. At the same time, they participate in a practicum seminar (SocWf 405) where practice theories are discussed and applied to the practicum. Students complete the program by taking at least two Social Welfare designated electives. There is no evening degree program or specializations in the BASW Program.

Table 8 shows the typical foundation curriculum program of study for BASW majors. See Appendix C for a full description of each course.

| TABLE 8 ORGANIZATION OF THE BASW CURRICULUM | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|---|
| | Autumn | Winter | Spring |
| Junior year | | | |
| HBSE | Psych 306 Developmental Psychology | Soc 352 Sociology of the Family | SocWf 419 Adult Dev & Ag. SocWf 404 Cult. Div. & Just. |
| SWPS | SocWf 300 SocWel Pol: Hist. Econ 100 Principles of Economics | SocWf 320 SocWel Pol: Contemp | |
| SocWf Practice | SocWf 310 SocWel Pract. I | SocWf 311 SocWel Pract. II | SocWf 312 SocWel Pract III |
| SocWf Research | | SocWf 390 Soc Welfare Research | |
| Elective | | | Elective |
| Senior Year | | | |
| Practicum | SocWf 415 Fld Practicum | SocWf 415 Fld Practicum | SocWf 415 Fld Practicum |
| Practicum Seminar | SocWf 405 Prct Seminar | SocWf 405 Prct Seminar | SocWf 405 Prct Seminar |
| Electives | Elective | Elective | |

5.A.2 General and Service Education

Accreditation standards, the highly sequenced nature of our curriculum, and the lack of additional faculty FTE's to teach general education offerings affect the extent to which we can offer service courses to other disciplines. Accreditation standards prescribe that social welfare practice courses (SocWf 310, 311, 312), including the practicum (SocWf 415) and accompanying practicum seminar (SocWf 405), be closed to non-majors. With permission of the instructor, however, non-majors may take the following non-practice courses: SocWf 320, SocWf 404, and SocWf 419. In addition, three introductory level courses are open to non-majors: SocWf 200, 300, 320. In 1995-96, the largest

percentage of non-majors was enrolled in SocWf 300 (36%) and SocWf 200 (35%) SocWf 200, Introduction to Social Work, typically attracts students who are exploring a career in the human services, broadly defined. This course describes social work as a profession and outlines social work roles and functions in the development of social policy and the delivery of social services. When the faculty member who developed this course retired in the early 1990's, we were unable to identify a state-funded faculty member to teach the course. However, an auxiliary faculty member offered it in fall 1996. In the future, we intend to hire an auxiliary faculty member or advanced doctoral student to teach the course because it does perform an important service. Consistent with the Faculty Senate Resolution on Cultural and Ethnic Diversity, we are considering requesting funding from the Provost's Office to add sections of the course on Cultural Diversity and Justice, thereby making it available to non-majors.

5.A.3 Interdisciplinary Programs.

The BASW foundation curriculum is interdisciplinary in nature. The Human Behavior and Social Environment requirement consists of four courses: Psychology 306; Developmental Psychology; and Sociology 352, Sociology of the Family; and two completed within the program. The Social Welfare Policy and Services requirement consists of three courses, one of which is taken outside the program (Economics). Students are expected to take 15 credit hours of social welfare related electives and are strongly encouraged to take these in departments including psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, political science, African American studies, American Ethnic Studies, American Indian studies, Asian American studies, Chicano studies, or Women studies. Taking advantage of the rich liberal arts courses available campus-wide, students typically take at least 10 credit hours of electives outside the School.

The accreditation review raised questions about our reliance on Psych 306 and Soc 352, because our students are often unable to access those courses when needed. On the other hand, the instructors of those courses emphasize the value of the interdisciplinary mix of students and of social work students bringing practice and policy perspectives to the class discussions. Both departments have been very cooperative in seeking ways to increase access to these courses for social work majors, but they inevitably face the constraints of high student demand. At the same time, the BASW Curriculum Committee is considering the advantages and disadvantages of our teaching the Human Behavior and Social Environment content in-house as compared to relying on the sociology and psychology courses. In addition to ensuring access, courses offered by social work faculty would relate theories of human behavior to social work practice.

5.A.4 Success

A number of measures are used to examine the success of the BASW program: the UW Alumni Survey, Employer's Survey, Baccalaureate Program Director's (BPD) Survey of Alumni, Student Evaluation of Courses, Practicum Instructor's Evaluation of Student Performance, Student Self-Assessment of Social Work Skills, and Video Assessment of Student Interviewing Skills. These measures are more fully reported in the CSWE reaccreditation report which can be made available to site visitors. The principal findings, which illustrate the success of our program and its graduates, are:

- BASW student satisfaction with their social work courses is very good. Data from the UW Office of Educational Assessment indicates that since 1991-1992, BASW majors

were more satisfied with their courses than students taking other 300-400 level courses. This is based on comparisons of mean scores for the four general evaluation items used on the UW course evaluation forms.

- Alumni of the BASW program appear consistently more satisfied with their UW education than other majors with regard to readiness for a career, readiness for advanced education, defining and solving problems, and speaking effectively. They are also satisfied with their ability to write effectively and critically analyze written material in other majors.
- Although better data on employment are needed, almost 60 percent of the alumni surveyed through the BPD Alumni survey held social work positions or were enrolled in graduate education.
- Potential employers rate our program favorably. Most believe our students are particularly well trained to work with diverse, at-risk populations.

Results from the BPD Alumni survey, the Practicum Instructor's Evaluation, Video Assessment of Interviewing Skills, and Student Self Assessment of Knowledge and Skills indicate that our students are prepared to conduct generalist practice with a range of client systems; demonstrate a professional use of self; practice effectively within the structure of organizations and service systems; use social work values and ethics, work with diverse populations; understand the ways in which discrimination puts people in need of services; focus on the strengths of clients; apply critical thinking skills; use the scientific method to evaluate their practice; use information technology ethically, and communicate effectively. These data also indicate that our BASW students acquire knowledge regarding the history of the American social welfare system, economic inequality and the distribution of poverty in US society, and the bio-psycho-social variables that influence individual development. In summary, the faculty are very satisfied with the success of our graduates. In the future, we intend to gather systematic data on employment to better monitor this indication of success.

V. B) GRADUATE CURRICULUM INSTRUCTION

5.B.1 MSW Degree:

The MSW program is divided into two curriculum levels, the foundation and the advanced. In addition to classroom studies, MSW students complete 1040 clock hours of supervised field practicum at both the foundation and advanced levels. The total number of credits required for graduation, including the practicum, depends on the enrollment option. All courses are offered at 3 credits except for the practicum which is usually 4 credits per quarter.

Enrollment Options in the MSW Program

1. **Two Year Day Program.** The MSW Day Program is designed as a two-year (six academic quarter) full-time program of study combining classroom and field practicum work. The Professional Foundation is completed in the first year. The second year concentrations (the Advanced Curriculum) provide instruction in four specialized areas of practice. Day program students must complete 74 credits for the MSW degree, including a foundation (360 clock hours) and concentration (680 clock hours) practicum.

2. **One Year Day Program, Advanced Standing.** An Advanced Standing Program permits a limited number (approximately 25 per year) of graduates of accredited baccalaureate programs in social work to complete the requirements for the MSW degree in three quarters of full-time academic work: Eligibility for advanced standing requires that 1) course work sufficient to warrant exemption from most of our Professional Foundation requirements, and 2) graduation from an accredited social work baccalaureate program within the past five years, with a GPA in these courses of 3.0 or better. Students are required to complete 36 credit hours for the MSW degree, including 720 clock hours of concentration practicum
3. **Three Year Evening Program.** An Evening Program structures classroom and practicum requirements for the MSW degree over three years. Evening students (approximately 25 a year) complete the Professional Foundation in two years of part-time study, and the Advanced Curriculum in a final year of full-time study. Course work is offered in a late afternoon and evening schedule. Evening students must complete 74 credits for the MSW degree, including 320 clock hours of foundation and 720 clock hours of concentration practicum.

Descriptive Overview of the MSW Curriculum

The mission, goals and curriculum objectives provide an underlying philosophy that gives the MSW Program its integrity and distinctiveness. Teaching, research and service that support agency-based practice with the poor and oppressed in publicly funded services are key elements of this philosophy. The themes of strengths and empowerment, diversity, social and economic justice, planned social change, and reliance on social work values and ethics follow directly from this philosophy, as do reliance on scientific inquiry, use of information technology, and knowledge development and dissemination.

The MSW foundation year consists of four required practice methods classes that systematically address individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities and a fifth that allows for greater focus on one of these. These required practice courses are supported with basic content on social welfare policy, human behavior and the social environment, cultural diversity and social justice, and research. A practicum allows students to apply theory and knowledge from the foundation in the field. Table 9 shows the sequencing of courses in the Professional Foundation. The sequencing in the evening degree program is the same but extends through two years. See Appendix C for a fuller description of each course.

TABLE 9
MSW FOUNDATION – DAY PROGRAM

| | |
|--|---|
| <u>Autumn Quarter</u> | |
| SocW 501 Social Policy and Economic Security | 3 |
| SocW 502 Human Behavior and the Social Environment I | 3 |
| SocW 504 Cultural Diversity and Societal Justice | 3 |
| SocW 510 Practice I: Introduction to Social Work Practice | 3 |
| SocW 515 Practicum Orientation | 1 |
| <u>Winter Quarter</u> | |
| SocW 503 Human Behavior and the Social Environment II | 3 |
| SocW 511 Practice II. Intermediate Direct Services Practice | 3 |
| SocW 512 Practice III: Managing Agencies for Service Effectiveness | 3 |
| SocW 515 Foundation Practicum | 4 |
| <u>Spring Quarter</u> | |
| SocW 505 Foundations of Social Welfare Research | 3 |
| SocW 513 Practice IV: Community Change Practice | 3 |
| SocW 514 Foundation Practice Skills. | 3 |
| SocW 515 Foundation Practicum | 4 |

The Advanced or Concentration Curriculum is designed to provide in-depth education in advanced practice. Students complete 35 credits of classroom study and practicum in one of the following four areas. Children, Youth and Families; Health and Mental Health; Multi-Ethnic Practice; or Social Work Administration. The concentrations were created around the need for a high level of coherence, the faculty's expertise, and the needs of the social service community. A systematic process was used to articulate the concentrations, including the development of a Curriculum Advisory Task Force, from 1990-91. This task force heard testimony and recommendations from social work practitioners, based on employment and practice trends in their sectors. The faculty then spent nearly two years planning the new concentrations, which were set in place in 1993-94.

Concentration in an area of practice broadens and deepens knowledge and skills and is characterized by a level of critical thinking which ensures that practitioners know the how and why of their interventions. Advanced practitioners use supervision and consultation and can work in relative autonomy because they have a personal frame of reference that enables them to make effective professional judgments, inferences, and decisions. Effective practice in an area of concentration requires social work practice skills, an understanding of policy issues, and an ability to contribute to social work knowledge. To ensure this, each concentration requires students to complete courses in advanced policy, research, practice methods and a field practicum. An understanding of social and public policies is central to practice in a concentration. Students must not only be familiar with the major policies influencing practice, but also be able to analyze existing policies and participate in the development and implementation of improved policies. Effective practice also requires an ability to contribute to the development of practice knowledge within an area of concentration. Students should be able to use computer technology, evaluate research studies and apply them to practice, and have skills to evaluate their own practice and the programs used to deliver services. The heart of effective practice is the ability to assess and intervene in the problems and issues presented by client systems. Practice methods courses taken concurrently with supervised field experiences ensure that the necessary assessment and intervention skills are learned by students.

| TABLE 10 ADVANCED CURRICULUM MODEL (DAY) | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Advanced Practicum | Advanced Practicum | Advanced Practicum |
| Advanced Practice I | Advanced Practice II | Advanced Practice III |
| Advanced Policy | Advanced Research | Advanced Selective |

Regular Day Program students spend the second year of study in one of the concentrations, Advanced Standing students join the second year day program students and may choose among the four concentrations. Limited resources allow only one concentration for evening students -- Children, Youth and Families. However, since the CYF curriculum is flexible and offers selectives that are cross-listed with other concentrations, evening students gain exposure to these other options. Evening students who want another concentration must switch to the day program in the third year.

As shown in Table 10, students are expected to be in the practicum during the entire second year, and to support their practicum with an advanced policy course, an advanced research course, and depending on the concentration, two or three required practice courses. Students complete the program by taking one or two concentration-approved selectives

Research Experience: Candidates for admission to the MSW program are not required to have completed undergraduate courses in statistics or research methods. In the MSW program, all students are required to complete a foundation course in research methods (SocW 505) and an advanced research course as part of the concentration. Students are given the option to complete a thesis

Internship. As noted above, all MSW students must complete a practicum as part of their foundation and concentration. A wide range of social service agencies in King and adjacent counties are used. Only those that can provide supervision by an MSW are selected. Although the Practicum Coordinating Committee determines placements, the decision is also based on student's interest as expressed by completion of an in-depth questionnaire as well as previous experiences in the social work field. Students are referred to a prospective placement for an interview during the quarter they are to be placed, and also participate in School and agency-based orientation activities. During the foundation year, Students attend placement two days during the foundation year, three days a week during the concentration or advanced practice year. Day and advanced standing students generally complete these requirements during the academic year. Evening students often complete these during the summer in combination with the academic year.

5.B.2 Doctoral Degree

Ph.D. Program Curriculum and Requirements. The Ph.D Program requires two years of full-time residency, defined as nine or more credits per quarter for the Autumn, Winter, and Spring quarters of each of two successive years. Students are required by the University to complete a third year, either on a full-time basis or a part-time equivalent of full time. The first year of the Program is the most heavily prescribed with required courses. Students confer closely with advisors and members of their Supervisory Committees to choose courses in their second year that will lead to a coherent program of study and prepare them to meet their career goals. As a preliminary step toward

general examinations, the student develops and presents, usually in winter quarter of the second year, a Program of Study proposal. This proposal then guides several months of intensive individualized study which culminates in the general examinations. After the general examinations and all course requirements are successfully completed, the student is advanced to candidacy for the Ph.D. Completion and successful defense of the dissertation are required before the Ph.D. can be conferred.

Required courses in the Social Welfare Doctoral Program must be taken on a graded basis unless offered only as Credit/No Credit, and are as follows: (See Appendix C for more detailed descriptions)

1. Introduction to Advanced Research Methods and Design (SocWL 580-581, 6 credits), first year.
2. Readings in Social Welfare (SocWL 600A, 1-3 credits), first and second years
3. Research Issues and Priorities in social Welfare (SocWL 598-599, 6 credits), first year.
4. Analytical Perspectives on Social Welfare Policy (SocWL 552, 3 credits), first year.
5. Seminar in Contemporary Social Welfare Policy (SocWL 553, 3 credits), first year.
6. Fundamentals of Social work Statistics I and II (SocWL 587-588, 8 credits) or Biostatistics 511-512, first year.
7. Two quarters of advanced quantitative methods to be taken in the first and/or second years (6 credits). These are to be selected in consultation with the student's faculty advisor and should be relevant to the student's anticipated research in a substantive or interventive area. Typically these advanced statistical courses are selected from courses offered in other UW units, such as EdPsy 593 (Experimental Design and analysis), EdPsy 594 (Advanced Correlational Techniques), EdPsy 575 (Structural Equation Modeling), and EdPsy 576 (Hierarchical Linear Modeling).
8. Two quarters of at least 500-level social science courses to be taken in the first and/or second years. Selected with the assistance of the student's faculty advisor, these are courses found in the College of Arts and Sciences or in one of the professional schools related to the substantive/interventive content of the student's anticipated program of study.
9. Doctoral Research Practicum (SocWL 582-583, 6 credits).
10. Teaching Practicum (SocWL 584, 3 credits). This one quarter requirement is generally taken in the second year.
11. Social Welfare Seminar (SocWL 558, 4 credits). Credit/No Credit only. Taken in the Winter and Spring quarters of the first and second years
12. Dissertation (SocWL 800). After the student has successfully completed the general examinations and has been advanced to candidacy for the Ph.D., the student registers for this course. If the student is devoting full time to dissertation research, the student should be registered for 9 credit hours. If the student is not registered for dissertation, the student must obtain on-leave status from the University. In all cases, it is required that the student be registered in this course in the quarter that the dissertation is completed. It is also required that the student complete a total of 27 credit hours over at least 3 quarters to complete the SocWL 800 credits.

In addition, students are also encouraged to take tutorials (SocWL 600A) with faculty who serve on their Supervisory Committee or other appropriate faculty members in order to define and prepare for content for their general examinations. Students are not required to complete the MSW, but must have a masters in social work, social welfare or a related field as a basis for admission. The MSW degree is strongly recommended, however, for students who intend to teach in social work programs. Some students who enter without the MSW complete the MSW in conjunction with the Ph.D.

Curricula of Major Concentrations or Specialization Tracks

Students in the Ph.D. Program develop individualized programs of study based on their substantive area of interest for their general examination.

5.B.3 Instructional Relationship to Other Programs

Ph.D. Program Relationships. Ph.D. Students are especially encouraged to seek out faculty from other academic units to enrich the interdisciplinary base to their training, and often seek out faculty from other units for independent tutorials and to serve on their Supervisory Committees. In addition, they are required to take theory (two cognate courses that bear on their substantive area of interest) and methods (two advanced quantitative) courses in other departments. These may be taken in any University department, including Social Work, but should ordinarily be at the 400 level or above. The greatest barrier to doctoral students taking such course work, however, is the refusal of some faculty to admit them to their class sections. As resources become tighter, our students are experiencing increasing difficulty gaining access to courses outside social work. Students in other University programs, particularly Public Affairs, Education and Nursing, occasionally register for and attend Social Welfare courses in their areas of interest.

MSW Program Relationships. MSW students have no electives, but students who choose to take a course overload and can identify courses that fit their practicum schedule may take courses in other departments, typically Public Affairs, Nursing, Education, and Public Health. Three to six students a year participate in the concurrent MSW-MPH degree, and 15-20 register for the Collaborative Practice Seminar through the Training for Interprofessional Practice Project involving Nursing, Education, Public Affairs and Social Work. The greatest barriers to MSW students taking advantage of interdisciplinary opportunities are our curriculum structure (lack of electives, sequenced courses, practicum three days a week) and accreditation requirements that practice courses must be taught by faculty with an MSW.

Minor Fields of Study or Program Options in Social Work. Rather than specify minor fields of study or program options, the Ph.D. program is an individualized program of study shaped to the student's areas of substantive social welfare and interventive interest. Program options within the MSW Program include a three-year concurrent degree with Public Health.

Social Work Courses which are Requirements or Prerequisites within other graduate degree programs. Ph.D. students must complete the two Social Welfare Statistics courses before taking advanced research courses in other departments.

5.B.4 Teaching and Research Participation

Students in the Ph.D. program acquire knowledge and experience in teaching and research through course work, practica, graduate assistantships, and a teaching initiative, "Preparing Future Social Work Faculty." In addition, the Director and Lead Teaching Assistant, who coordinate all teaching activities, provide further opportunity to develop skills through a two-day orientation for incoming students, doctoral seminars in the first and second years, annual workshops, informal meetings with students, and a Colloquia Series on teaching and research issues. A Collegial Support/Consultation Group among students is also in the early stages of development.

The goal of the teaching practicum is to provide Ph.D. students with supervised teaching experience in a classroom setting. The student receives instruction and feedback from a faculty supervisor who is responsible for the course in which the practicum takes place. The student and the faculty supervisor establish learning objectives such as constructing a syllabus, preparing lectures, developing classroom speaking skills, facilitating group discussion and participation, use of small groups in the classrooms, developing practical and engaging lesson plans and outlines, managing problem situations, writing examinations, and evaluating student outcomes. These learning objectives are developed into a learning contract, and a paper that summarizes the learning experience and that is evaluated by the faculty supervisor. In the third or fourth year of the program, students may be offered the opportunity for a more autonomous teaching experience similar to that of auxiliary faculty. These arrangements are negotiated individually by the Associate Dean for Academic Programs, with input from the Program Director, and are dependent on funding availability and match of student's experience and knowledge with the courses in question.

For research training, students take two required statistics courses and two methods courses in Social Work. They must then take a minimum of two additional advanced research courses outside the School. The required two-quarter research practicum is arranged and conducted in a manner similar to the teaching practicum. The fundamental relationship between the faculty supervisor and the student is one of mentorship. The goal of the research practicum is for the student to further synthesize the various phases and components of social work research and acquire hands-on research experience prior to the dissertation. Learning objectives are developed between the student and the faculty supervisor and described in a research practicum contract. The learning objectives are to facilitate the student's achievement of specific levels of research expertise as articulated by the Guidelines for Research Skill Acquisition in the Ph.D. Program, Ph.D. Program and Policy Manual. Research training is also one component of the program of study and qualifying examinations. Students develop a program of study proposal that identifies specific research learning objectives and work closely with one or more Supervisory Committee member on these objectives in preparation for their exams.

Graduate assistantships in teaching and research are distinct from but complementary to the teaching and research practica. They provide the faculty with teaching and research support, and Ph.D. students with financial assistance along with preparation for future teaching and research positions. Remuneration is based upon University-set salaries for graduate assistantships. Except in rare instances, all Ph.D. students spend their first two years in TA or RA positions which are typically 15-20 hours per week. During their third year, a majority are in RA positions. Third or fourth year students may be hired as auxiliary faculty to teach MSW or BASW courses. Teaching assistants are assigned annually on the basis of curriculum needs and student career interests. A workload conference is held each spring with current Ph.D. students to clarify past teaching experience and future goals. TAs are expected to attend orientations provided by the Graduate School through the Center for Instructional Development and Research, and all assistants are expected to attend relevant meetings (e.g., among instructors of the different sections of the same MSW and BASW courses) and skill-building opportunities as suggested by the faculty supervisor. Supervision of TA's and RA's is performed by the faculty supervisor, who is expected to appraise goals, objectives, expectations, and procedures; provide necessary orientation; and hold regular student-faculty meetings for ongoing supervision of the teaching or research process.

5.B.5 Funding.

Financial support for doctoral students during the 1996-97 academic year includes the following:

- Eight PDTA's, five funded with permanent state funds; two funded from the School's Unit Reserve; and one funded by an award from the Office of Educational Assessment
- Ten PDRA's funded as follows: One with permanent state funds; one full plus one partial from the Graduate School Recruitment Award allocation; one partial by the Minority Education Division of the Graduate School, two from the School's Unit Reserve; one by the School's newly-awarded Research Development Center Grant, five by other grants within the School; and one by another UW department.
- Five fellowships funded as follows: One non-resident tuition fellowship from the School's Boeing Endowment Fund; one resident tuition fellowship by the School's RSA; one stipended fellowship by another University department; and one fellowship through the Warren G. Magnuson Fellowship Fund.

Because formal data regarding the level and type of student supports at peer institutions are not available, we have relied on information gleaned by the Program Director through national conferences and discussion with other directors, recruitment competition for applicants whereby we learn about specific packages, and informal feedback by our students who are aware of opportunities with other programs. Our impression is that our peer institutions have more stable funds for fellowships that do not necessarily include a work component and for aggressive recruiting of top candidates, including covering the costs of campus visits. Although our School has made innovative use of the Unit Reserve, has secured permanent state funding for 2.0 FTE TA's, plus .70 FTE RA's, and has begun to build endowments for Ph.D. student fellowships, we lack funds for dissertation support. In addition, because the funding is dependent on the Unit Reserve and externally funded research and training grants, we are unable to predict the funding base from year to year. Expanding the base of Ph.D. student support, through private endowments and state-funded TAs, is one of our highest priorities both for the 1997-99 legislative package and for our development efforts.

5.B.6 Success

Ph.D. Program. The Ph.D. program has a stable successful history of placing its students in academic positions. Our graduates are actively sought by other social work programs nationally. The Program Director routinely receives inquiries about students who are "on the market." A CV booklet of doctoral candidates is distributed to social work programs nationally to provide Deans/Directors and Search Committee Chairs with information about graduating students. More difficult, although still largely successful, have been experiences of graduates who choose to remain in the Seattle/Puget Sound area. Some of these students have entered research positions on campus, some into positions in the public sector (e.g., Public Health, Department of Children and Family Services), some into agency-based research and consulting, and some are employed as part-time lecturers and affiliates with the School. Five graduates have been hired as tenure track faculty within our School, four after they had established national reputations at other social work programs. Three doctoral graduates on our research faculty are PI's or co-PI's on federally funded research projects.

Four surveys have been undertaken to assess systematically success through the perspective of our Ph.D. graduates, current students, and deans at peer institutions whom we regard as job market referents regarding the employability of our graduates. Instruments and summaries are available for review by the Team during the Site Visit. In this section, we highlight our success in terms of

outcomes (e.g., competitiveness of our graduates, placement in the job market) and follow with alumni and current student satisfaction with the program components. Faculty views about success and future of the program are described under Summary Section 10.1.

1. Deans/Directors at Peer Institutions: A recent phone survey of deans/directors in 11 peer institutions regarding the stature of our program yielded uniformly positive findings and underscored the respect for our program. When asked how our graduates compare to others in the national pool each year, they rated our graduates very highly, describing them as consistently well prepared both for faculty roles and in pursuing independent programs of research that are meaningful to the profession. Particular note was made of the extent to which graduates are equipped to undertake sophisticated research, have begun to amass a record of scholarship and professional presentation, reflect understanding of practice and interdisciplinary research, and appear realistically prepared for the culture of academia and working within research universities. In addition to our graduates' characteristics, these respondents commented on the strengths of our faculty and program (e.g., faculty excel in grant procurement, publishing, and visibility/leadership roles). When asked what characteristics they believe will be priorities in hiring outstanding job candidates over the next 10 years, the following were noted: research skills/competencies and preparation for teaching, scholarship and grantwriting skills, good theoretical background and interdisciplinary perspective, policy analysis capability, and two years post MSW practice experience to meet the CSWE criteria for teaching practice courses.

Relatively recent revisions within the Ph.D. program, such as strengthening systematic teaching preparation, requiring theory courses in allied social science disciplines, increased supports related to scholarship and grant development through the office of the Associate Dean for Research, expansion of policy analysis training, and an increase in the scope of research methods taught, will help ensure that our graduates retain their competitive edge in future years. Ongoing efforts are needed to develop continuous research competencies, given the changing nature of available methods. The highly skilled level of our faculty, combined with resources such as funded research and the NIMH Center for Prevention Research, are important assets in this regard. As one dean stated, "of UW graduates over the last 15 years, we find a lot of folks at the top with significant impact on the field." This summarizes well one marker for success: our program's long-term commitment to and impact on the field.

2. Doctoral Graduates: Survey questionnaires were sent to all graduates with a response rate of approximately 50 percent, which is higher than typical for alumni surveys. Overall, the findings were positive and, in general, enhancement efforts are already underway in areas indicated as warranting improvement. One essential criterion of success is what percentage of graduates obtain the kind of position they seek upon graduation. Nearly all (92%) indicated this to be the case, with 73 percent of these in an academic setting and the majority of the remainder in administrative and research consultation roles. Relative to national norms and other doctoral programs on campus, our students typically complete their programs in a timely manner (49% in 3 years, 84% within 4 years). The majority of respondents either rated the program as excellent (54%) or good (38%) in overall quality relative to its objectives. The following reflect percentage of respondents who rated specific program components to be good or excellent: scheduled courses within the program (85%), individualized tutorials (85%), theory courses outside the School (91%), research courses outside the School (86%), research practica (73%), teaching practica (77%), research assistantships (84%), and teaching assistantships (80%). In rating faculty, the following percentages agreed or strongly agreed that: faculty were current in their knowledge, training, and expertise (91%), faculty were available to provide tutorials (96%)

and to serve on supervisory committees (93%) Nearly all (93%) said that at least one professor served as a mentor to them and 96 percent said they developed a close professional relationship with one or more faculty (M=3.3).

Areas warranting improvement include preparation for teaching (only 40% rated this as good or excellent), faculty advising as preparation for post graduation employment (57% rated this good or excellent), ability to obtain funding from the third year forward (21% had difficulty), availability of courses during the summer that facilitated progress without having to wait (24% expressed difficulty), and some shortcomings were noted with respect to student services and related informational supports. In the past two years, substantial steps have been undertaken to strengthen teaching preparation as well as advising and professional development for post graduation careers (e.g., development of an advising form and procedures, strengthening of the proseminars for first and second year students, development of workshop and colloquia series). Recently, the Ph D. Program has been allocated a .5 FTE program coordinator (through internal reallocation within the School) to augment student advising. Increases in recent years of externally-funded research assistants and state-funded teaching assistants have added stability to the funding base of our students and enriched the hands-on teaching and research experiences available to them

- 3 Current Doctoral Students:** Survey questionnaires were sent to all current doctoral students; 15 responded (approximately 50%). Because the student body is at varying points of completing the program, ratings at any point in time are inevitably based on less complete information and experience (e.g., “insufficient experience upon which to base a response” or “doesn’t apply”). The majority (86%) indicate their intent to apply for a university position upon graduation and only one respondent expressed doubt about obtaining the type of position he/she desires upon graduation. Nearly all (93%) said that at least one professor served as a mentor to them and 100 percent said they developed a close professional relationship with one or more faculty (M=3.1). In rating faculty, the following percentages agreed or strongly agreed that faculty were current in their knowledge, training, and expertise (67%); faculty were available to provide tutorials (87%) and to serve on supervisory committees (80%). All agreed that their funding for the first two years was adequate; six (40%) anticipated shortfalls in their funding from the third year onward. A majority rated the overall quality of the doctoral program as good to excellent (80%). On a scoring range of 1=Excellent and 4=Poor, average ratings of quality across the following program components are: courses within the program (2.33) and tutorials (2.15), theory courses outside the School (1.78), research courses outside the School (2.60), research practica (1.79), teaching practica (2.31), research assistantships (1.75) and teaching assistantships (2.22). As did the alumni, students saw supports such as student services, library and computer resources to be good, although mixed opinions were expressed about the adequacy of office space and clarity of procedures related to program of study and obtaining types of assistantships.

Because responses were anonymous, it is impossible to determine the stage in the program of any given respondent and, thus, what aspects of recent changes they have experienced. Open-ended comments suggest that students note program efforts to strengthen teaching preparation, funding beyond the first two years, and instruction in a broader range of research methods than previously available. The following were noted as program strengths: faculty (reputation, knowledge, mentorship); research emphasis; commitment to funding students; flexibility of program and opportunities for hands-on training, balance between teaching and research; openness to suggestions for change; and planned developmental approach related to program of study and dissertation. Suggestions for improvement included adding social theory and

research methods courses (although students differ in what these should include, e.g., alternative paradigms and qualitative methods skill development, policy research, writing for publication, and grant development skills), streamlining of procedures related to the program of study, general examination, and dissertation; increasing student and faculty diversity and use of team teaching in courses; incentives to promote more uniform involvement of faculty; greater teaching preparation, helping students develop market transferable skills (e.g., from academia to public and corporate settings); and increased funding for later years in the program.

- 4 Applicants: Our most recent applicant pool for the doctoral program was also surveyed. Thirteen out of a total of 34 applicants responded. Over half the respondents (58.6%) rated the program's reputation and its faculty as the most important factors in deciding where to apply. Other factors included location, funding possibilities, and specific features of the program. Nearly all applicants who had contact with our faculty as part of their information-gathering process rated this contact to be excellent. Applicants noted personal contact by the director, receiving information quickly, and well organized materials as assets to their application process.

Overall, we are pleased with the success of our Ph D. Program. The input obtained indicates that it is a strong and vital program. The strength of our faculty resources is widely recognized and our graduates are consistently sought out for employment positions. Some areas of concern are already being addressed and differences are observable (e.g., in the extent to which preparation for teaching is recognized and valued, resources are allocated, and students are assisted in obtaining training). One of our greatest ongoing challenges is related to funding. Although we are praised for the financial assistance provided for students during the first two years, we admit only the number of students for whom we have funding; thus, funding tends to drive the size of our program. Furthermore, students face very uneven experiences after their second year, which is one of the primary reasons for delays in program completion. In addition, more students would undertake original research (versus, for example, secondary analysis of available data sets) if they could secure needed resources. In a January 1997 meeting of students with the Director and the Dean, issues were raised about lack of clarity of some of the more individualized program components (e.g., advising, individual tutorials, teaching and research practica) and uncertainty about how to work most effectively with faculty in these areas. In response, the Director and the Program Coordinator are developing procedural guidelines to clarify normative standards and activities to assist both faculty and students in working as efficiently and effectively as possible.

MSW Program. According to our annual alumni survey, the MSW program is highly successful at placing its graduates. Alumni are surveyed six to nine months after graduation. Among the questions asked is whether they are presently employed in a social work position. The responses are quite consistent across the years, with over 70 percent reporting full time employment and over 90 percent reporting full time or part time employment. Consistent with the School's mission, over 75 percent of our graduates are employed in the public and private non-profit sectors.

Results of an employer's survey from spring 1995 suggest that our graduates are well regarded by the regional community. Seventy-five percent of the employers rate our program, based on their experience with our graduates, as good to excellent. Of those employers who have observed the level of preparation of our MSW graduates over the past ten years, 56 percent indicated that our graduates have improved in their preparation while an additional 35 percent stated that their level of preparation has stayed the same.

Student and alumni satisfaction with the curriculum appears high. A number of instruments were used to tap student satisfaction for the recent reaccreditation review. These included student course evaluations, student focus groups, the annual survey of recent graduates, and the UW Annual Report on graduate student evaluations of teaching. Collectively, these reports indicate that students are generally satisfied with their education. For instance, students consistently evaluate most of their courses at the "very good" level. Mean scores on the four general evaluation items on the UW Standardized Educational Assessment Form generally fall between 3.8 and 4.2¹. This compares favorably with UW programs. In three of the last four UW Annual Reports, the average rating for social work 500 courses was higher than the ratings of other university 500 level courses taken by non-MSW students.

Alumni also look back with satisfaction on their education. In the annual survey of MSW alumni, over 70 percent generally respond that the program prepared them for their first social work position. Over 70 percent also consistently rate the value of their MSW education as good or excellent. The required social work practice with individuals, families and groups courses and the practicum experience are specifically highly valued. In the 1995 survey, for instance, over 90 percent of the graduates reported that the first two foundation practice courses, the required concentration practice courses, and the foundation and concentration practicum experiences prepared them for their first practice position. Other courses that are also highly valued are Cultural Diversity and Social Justice (SocW 504) and the concentration practice electives.

The MSW curriculum was completely modified after a two year planning process that included students and community leaders. During the years of preparation (1991-1993), student dissatisfaction with the old curriculum was increasing. The new foundation curriculum was implemented in 1993-94, the new concentration curriculum in 1994-95. Since then, student satisfaction with the curriculum has been gaining steadily. As described in 5.B.1, the new foundation curriculum aims to prepare students to work with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Over 80 percent of the 1995 graduates reported that they were prepared to do so, and over 70 percent their readiness to work with families and groups. The new advanced curriculum prepares students to work with relative autonomy in one of four areas of advanced practice. Over 90 percent of the 1995 graduates reported that they were prepared for work in their concentration. No significant differences were reported across concentrations.

The new curriculum has given greater emphasis to preparation for work with diverse populations-at-risk. The results of the most recent alumni survey indicate that graduates believe they are well prepared in this regard. Over 60 percent of the 1995 graduates report that they were very well or extremely well prepared to work with "diverse clients, colleagues and community members," "to have concern for populations-at-risk and reducing discrimination," and "to advance economic and social justice through planned change." When combined with those who believed they were adequately or well prepared, the percentages exceed 90 percent. Results from the employers survey corroborate the responses of alumni. UW social work graduates have an excellent reputation among employers with regard to their ability to work with the poor, racial and ethnic minorities, women, lesbians and gays, people with disabilities, and clients from other at-risk populations.

¹ Scores range on a scale of a low of 0 (very poor) to a high of 5 (excellent). The four items are: 1) The course as a whole was...; 2) The course content was...; 3) The instructor's contribution to the course was...; and 4) The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was...

Although student satisfaction is generally high, the results of focus groups conducted annually since 1993 suggest areas of concern related to the implementation or delivery of the curriculum. Students praise the mission, goals, and objectives of the curriculum but believe faculty could do a better job in achieving them. In almost every focus group, students expressed concern with uneven teaching, with not being sufficiently challenged in some courses, and with inadequate depth of some courses. These concerns are largely expressed with regard to the survey-oriented foundation year courses.

Faculty have acknowledged student concerns about teaching competence and educational challenge. A Committee on Academic Excellence was established in winter 1996. Their report was approved by the faculty in October 1996. The Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Student Affairs and the MSW Curriculum Committee were charged to implement recommendations regarding ways to improve teaching methods and the evaluation of students, and to develop mechanisms for faculty discussion about what constitutes academic challenge, including the issue of grade inflation, and adult learning.

Overall, we are satisfied with our graduates' success. Most graduates are employed in a social work position within a short time after graduation. Employers appear pleased with our graduates, and many believe that the program has improved over the past ten years. Our courses are rated fairly highly and our alumni believe that their education prepared them to practice in public and not-for-profit services. There is concern, however, that our teaching is uneven and that our courses may not always be sufficiently challenging for the high caliber of students we attract to the program. The faculty are committed to responding to this challenge and we are hopeful that we can address this concern for future cohorts of students.

VI. RESEARCH

Our School is rated highly in virtually all published national rankings for the quality and quantity of its research (described below in section 8.5), and the doctoral program is perceived nationally as among the top four or five for training future researchers. Because both the BASW and MSW Programs are professional degree programs, there is less emphasis on research training. However, both BASW and MSW students are expected to be knowledgeable about basic research processes and are required to take research methods in their foundation year. In addition, MSW students take an advanced research course in their concentration.

6.1 Funding.

External Funding. Since Nancy Hooyman became Dean in 1987, the amount of external funding for research and training has increased dramatically from less than \$3 million per year in 1988 to over \$8.9 million in 1996. For fiscal year 1996, the School had active research grants totaling more than 6.7 million dollars from federal sources alone (see Appendix E). Most of these federal grants were from the highly competitive NIH including NIMH, NIDA, NIAAA, and NICHD, or SAMSA. Moreover, in fiscal year 1996, a time when most units on campus experienced a decrease or leveling of external funding for research, the School was one of only three units on campus whose external funding increased. Thus, we compare very favorably with other units on campus with regard to our ability to compete successfully for external funding. Further, in a 1996 national survey of social work programs conducted by the National Association of Deans and Directors and the Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research, our School ranked number one in the amount of its external funding for research, illustrating that we compare very favorably with other schools of social work.

In September 1996, our School was awarded a highly competitive Social Work Research Development Center grant of over two million dollars from NIMH, one of only five schools of social work in the nation to receive such an award since 1992. The purpose of the grant is to provide the infrastructure to assist faculty, especially junior faculty and those with limited mental health research experience, to develop the research expertise needed to make major contributions to knowledge in the area of prevention of mental illness. It will link a critical mass of investigators at our School and in the wider university community with national and international developments in prevention science, and provide additional infrastructure for the support of research (described in more detail in Section 9.4). This support is expected to stimulate more externally funded research projects, specifically RO1's.

Our School has also been successful in recent years encouraging and supporting junior faculty's attempts to obtain external funding for their research. Of our 7 tenure-track assistant professors (one of whom joined the faculty only this fall), one has received a NIDA minority investigator award (Seyfried), two received funding for research development plans through the NIMH Center grant (Kemp, Seyfried), two are investigators on a proposal currently under review at NIA (Fredriksen, Sohng), and one is preparing a proposal that is expected to be submitted to NIH later this year (Fredriksen). Of our 4 research assistant professors, two are Principal Investigators on federally funded research grants (Ryan, Semke), one recently received an NIH federally funded minority investigator award and also has a pilot study funded under the Center grant (Harachi), and two have grant proposals currently under review for which they are the Principal Investigators (Harachi, Arthur). As these junior faculty mature, we expect that they will become very competitive for external funding for their research.

In addition to research assistantships, several of our doctoral students have obtained funding to support their dissertation and collaborative research with faculty. Since 1992, over 20 students have received awards to support their dissertation research, including the NRSA award, the Fahs Beck Dissertation Award, NIH dissertation award, UW Graduate School Fellowships, and the Magnuson Award through Health Sciences. We suspect our doctoral students would be quite competitive for NIH dissertation funding, few apply, however. The major reason is the lengthy time of nearly a year, and sometimes longer, between proposal submission and receipt of funding which can delay progress toward the degree. This is compounded by the fact that our doctoral program is designed for dissertation work to be initiated in the third year so that students must have a clear dissertation focus early in their program in order to submit a proposal to be funded in their third year. The Ph.D. Steering Committee is currently considering ways to facilitate students' applying for funding for their dissertation research and for postdoctoral research.

Beginning a record of publication is a priority for Ph.D. students. Students are required to write a summarizing paper for their research in a publishable format and papers for their program of study, and in all instances, are encouraged to pursue publication with the supervising faculty member. A Doctoral Student Writing Award was recently instituted, as a result of a gift by a Visiting Committee member. This competition will be continued to provide visibility to the importance of scholarship among doctoral students. Students are also strongly encouraged to submit papers for presentation at professional conferences, and can request travel support for such presentations. Although student participation in such activities is uneven, predictably it increases at later stages in the program. Visibility about student presentations and publications is provided through announcements in the doctoral program newsletter, and we are considering sponsoring an annual research fair to display students' work.

Internal Funding. Our School has been successful obtaining funding from various internal sources at the UW. Since 1992, when we first started maintaining records on such funding, eight faculty members have received funds to support their research from UW sources including IESUS, ADAI, Graduate School Fund, Royalty Research Fund, Provost's Fund, and the Center for AIDS/STD Research. Two of these eight have received funding from more than one source, so that a total of 10 research projects were supported with internal funding during this time frame. Given that only a small number of projects are funded each cycle, and that virtually all are campus-wide competitions, our faculty have competed reasonably well for internal funding. The problem with obtaining internal funding for research has more to do with the limited amount of such funding for faculty at UW, rather than lack of success for our faculty who have applied.

For a number of years, our School had its own Research Development Fund through an allocation of RSA funds that supported faculty-initiated pilot projects and other small studies. Unfortunately, budget cuts over the past six years and competing needs for reallocation of RSA resources have made it impossible to maintain that source of internal funding for research. This has occurred at a time when pilot studies are becoming more important in order to compete successfully for federal funding, and competition is fierce for other UW sources of pilot study. The deans have, on an ad hoc basis, funded specific requests to support data input and analysis or research assistants for projects that have high institutional priority and for which no other source of funds is available. Securing a stable on-going source of money to support pilot projects is a priority in the next five years.

6.2 Current Research.

Our School's basic and applied research draws on a variety of disciplines including economics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and political science. The primary emphasis of most of our research is on prevention, including the design and testing of interventions, and ethnic and cultural issues in service delivery. Most faculty engage in ongoing research and space permits listing only a few examples; however, a list of all funded research projects since 1986 is included in Appendix E. In addition, our "Current Research Report," which describes research activities in the school for the 1995-96 academic year, provides a more comprehensive picture of recent research, and is available to the Site Team upon request. Examples of recent research activities include:

- a) Our School is the home of the internationally known Social Development Research Group (SDRG), headed by Professors David Hawkins, Director, and Richard Catalano, Associate Director. The group has expertise in prevention science and in translating the results of basic research into applied intervention trials. It is an interdisciplinary team of more than 40 researchers and staff and has a substantial funding base from external sources, primarily federally-funded research grants. SDRG offers excellent opportunities for doctoral student training and junior faculty development. Dr. Hawkins has been selected for the University's Annual Faculty Lecturer, a highly competitive campus-wide award, in 1997.
- b) As a major site on the UW campus for AIDS behavioral research, our School is widely recognized both on and off campus for its expertise in this area. Drs. Baker, Balassone, Beadnell, Gillmore, Hoppe, Morrison, Norman, Richey, Roffinan, and Ryan currently have or have had federally-funded research grants to study the etiology of AIDS risk behaviors and to design and test interventions to reduce the risk of AIDS in vulnerable populations. In addition, Dr. Icard has received a Royalty Research grant to study innovative methods to recruit African American families for AIDS prevention interventions; Mr. Lemke has funding from King County

and private foundations to provide AIDS prevention services that are being evaluated at the local community and state level; and Dr. Fredriksen is preparing a FIRST award proposal to be submitted to NIH to study AIDS caregivers. These projects have resulted in numerous publications and presentations at professional meetings, a completed dissertation and one underway, and research opportunities for several doctoral students.

- c) Our School is also known for our research on interpersonal violence. Drs. Paula Nurius and Jeanette Norris and a former doctoral student have been funded through the UW Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute and the NIMH to study sexual violence among acquaintances and dating partners. These studies have resulted in a number of publications and presentations at professional meetings, RA's for four graduate students, and a dissertation that was completed Spring 1996. This research is an extension of Dr. Nurius' highly regarded work that seeks to elucidate the cognitive mechanisms by which individuals perceive and interpret their experiences. Dr. Jon Conte has received external funding from both public and private sources to study child sexual abuse, has published extensively on this topic, and is widely recognized as a national expert in the area. He is also editor of the Journal of Interpersonal Violence, a major journal in the field which is housed at our School. Drs. Catalano and Hawkins have funding from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the Office of Minority Programs to test the effectiveness of neighborhood programs to prevent violence and other health compromising behaviors among minority youth. These studies are providing a rich array of research opportunities for doctoral students.
- d) In 1995, Drs. Bending, Seyfried, Sohng, Richey, and Uehara, along with a group of doctoral students, formed a Multicultural Social Work Research Group (MCRG) to develop mechanisms to encourage and support scholarship and professional development among faculty and doctoral students who are committed to multicultural research. The group, which has grown in size, meets regularly and already has published a collaboratively written article on multicultural social work research in a peer review journal, and has another accepted for publication. MCRG currently has five writing groups of five to six Ph.D. students and faculty, each producing articles for peer review. It has begun to develop collaborative relations with other units on campus that promote multicultural research and increased collaborative multidisciplinary research is an intended outcome.
- e) As noted above, our School was recently awarded an NIMH Social Work Prevention Research Center grant (PI Lewayne Gilchrist) to foster the research capabilities of faculty and doctoral students whose interests are related to prevention of mental illness. Our School was the only school to be awarded a Center this round.

In summary, our School is nationally known for both the quality and quantity of its scholarly research. We have been increasingly successful in the past 10 years competing for external funds for research, including the recent awarding of a prestigious NIMH Social Work Prevention Research Center. Our major challenges include 1) our need to retain our prominent researchers who are frequently sought after by peer institutions and to compete effectively for the most promising new young scholars, given the resource limitations within UW, 2) how to protect faculty time for scholarship and research, given increasing external pressures for heavier teaching and service work loads; 3) how best to encourage and maintain a culture in which the production of knowledge is viewed as a top priority, especially in the face of competing demands; 4) how best to anticipate and

deal with the possible declines in federal funding for research over the next 5 - 10 years; and 5) how not only to maintain our position as a nationally prominent school, but also to improve our position in light of the restrictions on funding for higher education generally in this state.

6.3 Interdisciplinary Projects.

Because of the inherently interdisciplinary nature of human services of our faculty, who have doctorates in social work or social welfare, economics, education, political science, psychology, and sociology, and of our faculty's research interests, many interdisciplinary research endeavors have occurred over the past ten years. Our School strongly supports and encourages such collaboration. Even when faculty from other departments are not involved in a research project, the project typically draws from other disciplines in its conception, methods, and dissemination. Examples of recent interdisciplinary projects include:

- a) The Children's Health Awareness Project, funded by NIDA, is an interdisciplinary research project to study children's knowledge of AIDS and AIDS-risk behaviors. The project involves Dr. Elizabeth Wells, PI, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences and Social Work faculty who serve as Co-PI's (Drs. Gillmore, Hoppe, and Morrison), a doctoral student from Sociology and an MSW student. This study is also collaborating with the Seattle School District to provide information that the District can use to improve its AIDS education efforts.
- b) The Health Habits Project, funded by NIAAA, is an interdisciplinary research project to study the nature of the link between substance use and sexual risk taking. It involves Social Work faculty (Drs. Gillmore and Morrison, PI and Co-PI, respectively), a senior scientist from the UW's Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute (Dr. Leigh, Co-PI), a social welfare doctoral student, and has also involved two minority undergraduate students through the Early Identification Program, one of whom is still with the project.
- c) Project Aware, funded by NIMH, is an interdisciplinary research project to study women's recognition of and response to sexual violence from dating partners. The project involves both Social Work faculty (Dr. Nurius, PI), psychology faculty, a scientist from the UW's Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute (Dr. Norris, Co-PI), and has provided research experiences for several Ph.D. students.
- d) Drs. Robert Plotnick, Social Work; Shelly Lundberg, Department of Economics; and Daniel Klepinger of Battelle Human Affairs Research Center have recently collaborated on an NICHD-funded project on adolescent fertility and human capital, and have co-authored several publications based on this research.
- e) Dr. Roger Roffman, Co-PI, along with psychologist Dr. Jeffrey Kelly from the University of Wisconsin, have an NIMH-funded study of community interventions to reduce AIDS risk behavior; this has resulted in co-authored publications and presentations at professional meetings.
- f) Dr. Rona Levy is collaborating as a Co-PI on a research project, funded by the National Institute of Nursing Research, to investigate the effects of cognitive-behavioral techniques to control irritable bowel syndrome with researchers from Nursing (Dr. Margaret Heitkemper, PI, and Dr. Monica Jarrett).

- g) Drs. Mary Lou Balassone and Fred Connell (Public Health) recently completed a project funded by the State Legislature to evaluate the effectiveness of a new state program that attempts to improve access to prenatal care
- h) Drs. Hooyman, Sohng, and Fredriksen of Social Work, and Dr Kiyak, a psychologist and Director of the Institute on Aging, and Dr. Lye from Sociology, along with a social work and a sociology doctoral student, recently collaborated on a grant proposal, currently under review at the NIA, to study cross-cultural differences in grandparenting.
- i) The recently funded Social Work Center for Prevention Research, described above, has an explicitly interdisciplinary focus and will involve faculty from several other units on campus including Education, Nursing, Psychology, Sociology, as well as nationally known scholars across disciplines who will be invited to lead seminars, provide consultation, and share research findings with center participants

Our School also strongly encourages research collaborations with community and state agencies. Our success in this area is illustrated by the five years of funding from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation on family preservation, the numerous agency-based projects of the Northwest Institute for Children and Families, and the joint faculty appointment and research projects (see 6.4 and 7.2) with the Casey Family Program. Nevertheless, such partnerships are challenging because agencies rarely have sufficient funds to adequately buy out faculty time for faculty and student participation, and faculty are heavily committed. In addition, agency deadlines and timelines for research often do not fit well with academic schedules (e.g., an agency will call and want a faculty member to collaborate on a research project that must be started within a week or two). Such barriers are currently being addressed campus-wide by the President's Task Force on Public Service and Outreach.

6.4 Technology Transfer

Our mission statement emphasizes as one of our primary goals, enhancing "... the quality of life for all with special attention to the poor and oppressed. We focus our energies on achieving excellence in...teaching, research and scholarship, and community service. The full exercise of these functions allows the School to provide leadership in the development of social welfare policies and publicly funded programs and services at the local, regional, national and international levels." Consistent with this mission, we have several mechanisms through which research findings are transferred to public local, state, and national agencies, and private not-for-profit human service agencies. Moreover, the majority of our faculty (71%) are serving or have served in major consultative roles at local, state, and national levels. However, we transfer very little technology to the for-profit sector because of the nature of our School's mission. As a whole, these interactions have not had drawbacks, but instead have provided excellent paid training opportunities for graduate students. Recent examples of technology transfer include:

- a) The School's Continuing Education Program supports a large number of workshops, inservice training, and certificate programs that serve as a vehicle for transferring information to the practice community. Graduate students may attend without fee in exchange for helping with logistics such as registration. The biggest challenge faced by Continuing Education is finding convenient on-campus space appropriate for the programs' self-sustaining nature.

- b) The Northwest Institute for Children and Families provides training for and consultation with child welfare professionals at the local, state, and national levels to improve the effectiveness of services to children and families. Recently, the Institute received national recognition for its "Walk a Mile" project in which state legislators were paired with welfare mothers. Legislators commit to living for one month on an amount of money equal to one month's welfare benefits. Welfare recipients, in turn, agree to visit with legislators and learn about the legislative process. The Institute has supported nine doctoral student research assistants totaling 14 years of support.
- c) Washington State Families for Kids, another innovative project, funded by the Kellogg Foundation, pairs public and not-for-profit agencies related to permanency planning for children in the foster care system.
- d) The HIV/AIDS Project Development and Evaluation Unit translates research findings into AIDS prevention programs in the local community. One of its recent projects, the "Friend-to-Friend" project, adapted findings of research into a program in which key opinion leaders from different social groups were recruited and trained to act as sexual behavior change agents to their peers to reduce the risk of HIV infection among gay and bisexual men in Washington State.
- e) The Children's Health Awareness Project routinely provides research findings regarding children's risk for AIDS to the Seattle School District for use in its health curricula. The district has provided access to the children for this NIDA-funded longitudinal study, and receives useful data in exchange, thus the collaboration has been mutually beneficial. Two graduate students have been supported on this project.
- f) An interdisciplinary panel of UW researchers, chaired by Dr. Plotnick who is an expert on welfare policy, held a briefing with legislative and senior state government staff on welfare policies as it relates to Aid for Families with Dependent Children in April 1996. In October, Dr. Mark Ezell, an expert on corrections, participated in a similar interdisciplinary panel on juvenile justice. Such interdisciplinary panels are intended to be ongoing University efforts to provide background information and to offer analyses that can improve policy formulation on a range of issues facing Washington State. Such briefings not only place the UW in a positive light from the point of view of state legislators, but provide faculty with the opportunity to make contacts with key people in state government and glean a better sense of the types of issues most salient in current state politics. Thus, such collaboration is mutually beneficial to both the state and the UW.
- g) Dr. Gilchrist led an interdisciplinary team of faculty in a formal evaluation of changes in the state's mental health service delivery system for adults. The benefit to the state was the provision of a careful evaluation of these changes. There were some drawbacks, however, including the fact that the state does not allow indirect costs. Moreover, the culture of the legislature is very different from academic culture regarding timing, process, design, and reporting of research findings, which resulted in more time spent on political and process issues than on conceptual ones. Nonetheless, the project was mutually beneficial. Three MSW graduate students were supported as data collectors, and a series of articles were co-authored by the UW faculty and state officials.
- h) Dr. Weatherley worked closely with Australia's Social Security System to study client compliance and make policy recommendations and thus contribute to a major policy debate in Australia. Additional benefits were to strengthen a comparative global perspective in Dr.

Weatherley's teaching and research on social welfare policy as well as to expand his network of collegial contacts. The major drawback was the start-up costs; e.g., the time invested to familiarize oneself with another country and its welfare system.

- i) Dr. Balassone worked extensively with the Seattle/King County Department of Public Health to evaluate the Seattle School District's school-based clinics at a time when there was considerable skepticism and debate about such clinics. The evaluation demonstrated a number of positive benefits from these clinics, and led to a substantial increase in the amount of funding to support them. A drawback of this collaboration was the lack of funds to conduct the evaluation. Since Dr. Balassone donated her time, it was difficult to fit this intense project in with a full academic load of teaching and research.

In summary, our School has been successful in transferring and disseminating research findings to local, state, and national agencies (and in a few cases, to other countries), but we would like to do an even better job in this area. Although the faculty believe that the benefits of their involvement outweigh the costs, one of the challenges to effective transfer of knowledge is releasing faculty time for such endeavors, since most publicly supported and non-profit agencies typically do not have sufficient resources to buy faculty release time and cannot provide other incentives, such as stock options or patents, that are possible in other fields. The Associate Dean for Research is beginning to initiate faculty discussion on these issues in order to finding ways to better support and encourage such activities.

VII. SERVICE

Our School's goals emphasize the necessity of faculty and students actively participating in University and community service at the local, regional, national and international levels. This service orientation to address central societal problems is congruent with the higher priority placed on public service by President McCormick and the President's Task Force on Public Service and Outreach. The faculty's community service activities contribute to the School's ongoing vitality and often represent planned mutually beneficial exchanges between the School and the practice community.

7.1 Consulting.

Consulting services, defined as those provided for remuneration, were provided by the faculty in both the public and professional arenas. Of 54 faculty of various ranks, 55 percent provided consulting services within the professional realm while 19 percent provided consulting services in the public arena. Examples of faculty consultation with local organizations include the Casey Family Program, the Children's Alliance, the Department of Social and Health Services, the King County Children, Youth and Families Commission, King County Health Department, HIV/AIDS Planning Council for King County, the Veterans Administration, King County Mental Health Resource Coalition and the King County Cross-Cultural Mental Health Alliance. Examples of faculty consultation on a national level encompass the National Education Goals Panel; The White House Office of Policy Development; Committee on the Prevention of Mental Disorders, Institute of Medicine; National Council on Research in Child Welfare; National Evaluation of Family Preservation Programs; federal funding agencies such as NIMH and NIDA; Boysville of Michigan, including a national institute sponsored by the Albert E. Treischman Center in Boysville; the National Center on Asian American Mental Health; and the US Department of Health and Human Services.

7.2 Community Service.

Across all faculty ranks, our faculty contribute substantially to community service, defined as service without pay. Of 54 faculty, 66 percent contributed time to public activities and 37 percent toward professional activities. Fifty-four percent of the Social Work faculty provided over six hours a week toward public activities and 19 percent over six hours toward professional activities. More significant than the numbers involved is the impact that faculty's service has had at the local, state and national levels.

As noted under 6.4, Technology Transfer, many of the School's applied research projects illustrate community partnerships and represent efforts to disseminate findings and establish ongoing relationships with community agencies. These projects serve to move faculty and students out from the classroom into the community as well as to bring practitioners into the School where they can interact with faculty, students and staff and learn more about our mission, goals and objectives. Such interactions tend to lead to new and innovative reciprocal relationships between the faculty and the practice community and to support both the University and the School's goals of public service and outreach. In addition to projects noted under 6.4, other projects include:

- Partnership for Youth involving collaboration with local businesses, service agencies, and thirteen academic units, targets street youth and families in the University district
- Casey Family Partnership targets youth in long term foster care, foster families, and the Casey Family staff through the Seattle division of the Casey Family Program.
- A project with Rehabilitation Medicine which targets health and mental health care professionals in King County who are caring for disabled persons of color.
- The Northwest Coalition against Malicious Harassment Education Project for students in public schools, K-12
- The Center for Career Alternatives Youth Violence Intervention Program Evaluation for minority youth at risk of or participating in gang activities.
- The Raising Healthy Children Project aims to reduce drug use and delinquent behavior among Renton and Edmonds School district children.
- The Minority Youth Health Project which targets minority youth in the greater Seattle area who are at risk of health compromising behaviors.
- The Supported Parenting Initiatives through the Center on Health and Human Disability which provides outreach to parents with developmental disabilities.
- The Mental Health Systems Evaluation Project for those receiving services through the Community Psychiatric Clinic, the agency managing publicly funded mental health services for the North Central region of King County.
- The Community Intervention to Reduce AIDS Risk which targets low income women residing in public housing projects.
- The Phone Counseling in Reducing Barriers to AIDS Prevention which targets men who engage in high risk sexual behavior that increases their risk of AIDS.

Faculty are also actively involved in informational and advocacy activities concerning emerging policies within the state and nationally. As noted above, two faculty have participated in an interdisciplinary panel of University faculty that briefed legislative and senior state government staff in the areas of social welfare policy and juvenile justice. Approximately nine faculty have been involved in a state-wide consortium regarding public child welfare that meets with DCFS officials and with state legislators regarding changes needed in services for children. Numerous faculty meet with legislators, their staff and state officials on policy issues as needed. Legislators and their staff

are also invited to panels on current social issues sponsored by the School's Visiting Committee, where faculty and alumni present their relevant research and public service activities. Several faculty have participated on the Board of the Washington State Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers and thus are frequently involved in policy-related activities through this organization. The Dean chairs a national legislative coalition of the five social work leadership and professional organizations that have sought to influence federal policy, and provides periodic updates on the coalition's national legislative agenda to faculty. Several faculty have testified before Congressional bodies on the policy implications of their research. Twelve faculty serve as reviewers for juried social work journals and six serve as reviewers for juried journals outside of social work. Faculty serve on a wide range of national boards and commissions, including the Board of the Association for Community Organization and Social Administration, the Society for Research in Social Work, the Council on Social Work Education's National Research Advisory Committee for the Minority Doctoral Fellows Program, and the Board of the National Center on Asian American Mental Health Research.

7.3 Continuing Education.

Our School has offered a permanent, year-round program of professional continuing education and contracted training programs since 1973. Social Work Continuing Education (SWCE) currently services over 2,000 human service professionals each year. CE offerings include non-credit (100 contract hour) certificate programs, short courses, conferences, and workshops. SWCE also provides training institutes and workshops for state social services staff, under contracts with the DSHS Mental Health Division, Aging & Adult Services, Economic Services Administration, and the King County Division of Mental Health. Training contracts for the 1995-1997 biennium are: Aging and adult Services Training Program, Economic Services Administration CSO Social Worker Training, Certificate Program in Geriatric Mental health, Certificate Program in Ethnic Minority Mental Health, Certificate Program in Children's Mental health, Certificate Program in Treatment of Long Term Psychiatric Disabilities, Certificate Program in Mental Health Clinical Supervision, and Skills Enhancement, Work with Ethnic Minority Children and Older Adults. Each of these courses is evaluated in writing by participants in terms of content, format, and instructor's teaching effectiveness.

Since the University requires that Continuing Education be entirely self-supporting, participant fees provide about 45 percent of SWCE's annual income with the balance coming from training contracts. Over \$1.2 million in income was generated in the 1993-95 biennium over 425 training days from 4,500 registrations. None of our CE courses are offered through UW Educational Outreach. According to a recent survey of social work programs nationally, our CE program is one of the largest in the country, and one of the few that remains totally self-supporting.

VIII. EVALUATION

8.1 Faculty.

There are three primary mechanisms by which faculty are involved in monitoring their colleagues teaching, administrative tasks, community, and professional activities, research and publications.

1. All faculty are expected to utilize for all classes the Standard Student Evaluation Forms developed by the Office of Educational Assessment. Merit funds are only given to faculty who have current teaching evaluations on file. The Dean and the Associate Dean for Academic

Programs annually review these teaching evaluations and meet with faculty who have received consistently low ratings to develop a plan for teaching improvement. Such plans include consultation with the Center for Instructional Development and Research, which has been an excellent resource for both junior and senior faculty.

2. The annual peer review process is the basis for merit decisions but also is conducted in years when no merit funds are available. All state-funded faculty, except the deans, are required to participate in this peer review process. (The research faculty have a similar process in which they rate each other, but with different criteria that take account of their primary research responsibilities.) Faculty are required to complete a two page Faculty Activity sheet listing their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and community service for the past two academic years. These Faculty Activity Sheets, in addition to student evaluations and copies of publications from the past two academic years, are then made available in open personnel files for all faculty to review and to rate on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). Inclusion of student teaching evaluations and course materials in the faculty member's open review files insures that faculty are informed about each other's course content and teaching effectiveness. This gives a basis for assessing the faculty member's capacity to formulate and transmit ideas for the advancement of learning related to social work practice and for curriculum development. Inclusion of the faculty member's scholarly materials in the open review file provides a means to determine the extent to which faculty are augmenting the profession's knowledge base through contributing to policy documents, position papers, and program or agency manuals, through presentations at workshops and conferences, and through research and scholarly publication.

The Executive Committee is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the peer review process. On the basis of these faculty ratings, the Deans' Office compiles an overall rating for teaching, research, and community service. These ratings then guide the Dean's decision-making regarding the allocation of merit funds and other special salary adjustments. In considering merit increases, the Dean also takes account of the faculty member's teaching load, service within the School and the community, and other organization considerations. In recent years, the Executive Committee has recommended that the Dean give greater weight to service within the School than has been the case in the past. The Associate and Full Professors also meet with the Dean to review the overall ratings by rank and to recommend how merit funds are allocated.

3. The other primary mechanism for faculty monitoring of instruction and curriculum development is through the School's policies and procedures for self-assessment and collegial assessment of teaching. The components of this policy are as follows:

As noted above, all faculty are required to have students complete the Office of Educational Assessment Standardized Student Evaluation Forms. Faculty who are being reviewed for merit and promotion and tenure must include these standardized forms for each course in their materials for review; in addition, they may supplement their materials with other kinds of student evaluations.

All faculty, including research faculty, part-time lecturers, faculty on partial retirement, and faculty without tenure who teach at least two courses (including independent studies and tutorials), are required to participate in the annual faculty self-assessment of teaching and submit the material to the Deans' Office in the fall of each year. The self-assessment instrument contains four parts: Teaching Behavior Checklist; a written summary of areas of teaching strength and areas where improvement is desired; action plans for improving teaching, and progress toward goal attainment in the areas where improvement was sought.

Each year, one-third of the faculty, on an alphabetical basis, are required to complete the collegial consultation process. The faculty member selects at least one colleague to review the annual self assessment materials, teaching materials such as source syllabi and classroom exercises, and in most instance to observe his or her classroom teaching. The colleague selected is asked to write up his/her assessment

8.2 Students.

Ph.D. Program. Section 4.1 addresses the use of standardized measures (GPA, GRE) for admissions decisions. Ph.D. students must obtain a grade of 3.0 or better in all required courses, which is monitored by Student Services and the individual advisor. Ways in which program objectives are translated into outcomes and means of assessing student progress have been addressed in Section 2.1. Ways that students are evaluated and monitored with respect to their teaching and research preparation and their progress toward the degree were described in Section 4.3.

Despite these evaluative efforts, there are areas of student performance and development that would benefit from a more systematic, precise evaluation. These are related to the more individualized components of the program: graduate tutorials, dissertation credits, and performance in the teaching and research practica. For each of these, written plans (e.g., learning contracts, program of study statements, dissertation prospectus) and products (e.g., papers, responses to sample exam questions) are required to assess what students have learned. How routinely and meaningfully these are undertaken is difficult to determine, however. Use of external faculty reviewers for the program of study, public presentations, and the dissertation colloquia serve to amplify the seriousness of preparation for these program components and provide input from the broader University community. In addition we are currently developing evaluation measures to be used for the practica and means for students to provide anonymous evaluation of their tutorials, practica and dissertation supervision. We are also seeking to provide more thorough definitions of the expectations associated with each program component as well as procedural details for how to complete each component.

Overall, we believe that our students are very well prepared at the point of graduation; the extent to which they are sought by employing institutions is one indicator of their level of preparation. Nevertheless, there are areas of concern about “how good they are,” which are reflected in Section 10, Summary. A major emphasis is to operationalize academic excellence as a central referent point (for example, balancing this with time efficiency in program completion), which is a consistent theme in all degree programs.

MSW Program. Our admissions process, which is structured to ensure a highly qualified and diverse student body, is described under 4.1. A number of factors are considered, including undergraduate GPA, GRE, undergraduate major, and social services work experience; an essay that addresses social work as a career, social problems, and diversity and allows reviewers to evaluate writing and critical thinking skills as well as the fit between student interests and the program’s mission, goals, and objectives. A recent Washington State law requires that students who expect to work in agencies that serve children or vulnerable adults must have a criminal background check. The background check provides the School additional important information regarding the suitability of students for professional practice. Since the admissions process is extremely thorough and carefully executed, it is rare that students are terminated from the program for academic or non-academic reasons. Likewise, on average, only five students a year withdraw on their own volition. The average cumulative GPA of graduates from 1993-1996 is 3.83; this has raised concern among

our faculty about grade inflation. Similar to many groups of faculty across campus, we are engaged in discussions about grading. Despite these concerns, our overall impression of our MSW students is extremely positive, an impression that has grown even stronger in recent years.

Some areas for improvement in our admissions process have also been identified. For example, applicants are not required to have successfully completed courses in biology and statistics. We do require all those admitted without biology content to complete a course, over and above regular MSW expectations, prior to their graduation from the program. This policy is difficult to administer and has been the cause of considerable dissatisfaction for students who expect the School to make such courses available to them. Similarly, although MSW students must complete two research courses as part of their degree, the absence of a background in statistics on the part of many students precludes the possibility for more advanced in-depth learning. These issues are being reviewed by the MSW Curriculum Committee as part of their larger review of academic standards.

Admission to the Advanced Standing Program could also be improved. Initiated only two years ago, the program has not been systematically evaluated. Some faculty have the impression, however, that advanced standing students do not perform as well as their peers who have completed the first year in our program. Likewise, there is evidence that a *de facto* advanced standing program is emerging. An increasing number of students with BASW degrees are being admitted to the regular day program. Upon arrival, however, they petition and receive approval to exempt all foundation courses. Presently, such students are not allowed to enter directly into the concentration area (second year advanced standing). Although some take a leave of absence, most spend their first year taking the few electives available, independent study courses, or courses outside the School. A faculty work group is being formed to address issues related to advanced standing.

BASW Program. Section 4.1 described the BASW admissions process, which is competitive, given the large number of applicants. Although no one factor will exclude an applicant, the Admissions Committee also considers a GPA of at least 2.5, the applicant's background related to social welfare, a written statement of interest in social welfare including relevant volunteer or paid experience, and commitment to diversity. All applicants, regardless of whether they are UW students or transfer students, are reviewed using the same standards.

We are quite satisfied with the quality of BASW students. The relatively high GPA (average GPA is 3.25 from 1994-96 admissions) of applicants assures that most can meet the academic challenges. Students transferring from Community Colleges sometimes have difficulties but these are usually transitional. The average GPA of BASW graduates since 1993-94 is 3.24.

We are considering increasing the requirements for the program, however, to ensure an even more qualified student body. Presently, introductory courses in Psychology (101) and Sociology (100) are recommended for majors. Although most majors do complete these recommended courses, some do not. For this reason, we are discussing requiring these courses for admission to the program.

Students from all three degree programs are expected to adhere to the Standards for Essential Abilities and Attributes for Admission and Continuance in the School of Social Work, a body of professional standards approved by the faculty as a whole and monitored by the Committee on Students. These standards encompass both academic and nonacademic behaviors, and are expected to be part of faculty evaluations of applications for admission and of classroom and practicum performance. They were developed by the faculty in 1995 because both faculty and students had become increasingly concerned about students who might meet the academic criteria for graduation,

but who evidenced problematic behaviors in the classroom and the practicum that raised questions about their readiness for professional practice. An underlying assumption of these policies is that the School has a major responsibility for the safety and welfare of clients with whom the student will come into contact both before and after graduation. The Standards attempt to balance the programs' responsibilities to its students, potential clients/consumers and the field of practice.

8.3 Major Competency.

Ph.D Program. Section 5.b.6 reported the results of surveys regarding satisfaction among alumni and current students. Other mechanisms for input by students include: student representatives on the Ph.D Steering Committee; first and second year doctoral student seminars with the Director and lead TA, informal student sessions or brownbags with the Dean and Director; and meetings of the lead TA with small groups of students to assess their teaching preparation needs and issues, which are then conveyed to the Director. Graduation patterns and post-graduation trends are addressed in sections 4.3, 5.B.6, and 9.2.

MSW Program.

Assessment: The competency of MSW students to practice with relative autonomy in an area of concentration is assessed in a number of ways. Academic capacity is assessed by tracking grades, including incompletes. No foundation year student is allowed to progress into the advanced year until all foundation year courses are completed successfully. Of the total credit hours completed for graduation, 18 must be graded. Graduates must receive credit for all required hours and must have a minimum grade point average of 3.0 and no courses below 2.7 in all graded courses. The MSW Curriculum Committee is currently reassessing its policies with regard to graded courses. In focus groups, students have indicated that they would like greater challenge in the curriculum, including increasing the number of graded courses required for graduation. Academic ability is also assessed by examining the quarterly evaluations provided by practicum instructors. A separate instrument is used in the foundation and concentration years. Practicum instructors use a seven point scale (poor to excellent) to rate students across a number of curriculum objectives, including the ability to work under supervision.

Thesis. MSW students may opt to complete a Master's Thesis or a Thesis Alternative. Capable and motivated students can work independently on a subject of their choice during any part of the two-year master's program. Students must identify a research problem or issue, develop an appropriate research design, typically empirical, and collect, analyze and interpret data. The thesis requires supervision by a three-person advisory committee, and usually a minimum of three quarters work. A thesis alternative does not require that students complete four major empirical tasks (e.g., problem formulation, research design, data collection, analysis and interpretation). Students doing a thesis alternative may be involved in only part of the empirical process, and may work collaboratively with other students in contrast to individual work on a thesis. The title of the thesis alternative research project does not appear on the student's transcript.

Student Satisfaction: See 5.B.6., Success, MSW Program.

Trends in postgraduate academic and career placement: As noted above, the MSW Program conducts annual surveys of recent graduates, with the return rate ranging between 35 and 60 percent. The surveys of 1992, 1993, and 1994 graduates were mailed nine months after graduation. In each of these years, over 95 percent of the respondents were employed in social work positions, with the

vast majority working full time (71% to 94% depending on the year). The 1995 graduates were surveyed six months after graduation and 89 percent of those responding indicated they were employed in social work (77% full time).

The UW Office of Educational Assessment also conducts periodic surveys of MSW graduates. The survey of 1995 graduates found that 95 percent of those responding were "working and not planning full-time school." Only 3 percent were "unemployed" while 2 percent were "attending or waiting to attend school." Seventy-one percent of those employed were working full time within their career field and 51 percent reported monthly incomes between \$2,100 to \$2,999. Consistent with the School's mission, over 75 percent of our graduates are employed in the public and private non-profit sectors.

BASW Program.

Student Assessment. BASW students are assessed as follows. Student grades are monitored and all students are evaluated by practicum instructors. In addition, two specific instruments were designed in 1993-94 to assess preparation for entry-level professional social work practice. Both of these were implemented in 1994-95 and have continued to be used since.

Video Skills Assessment: BASW students must submit a videotaped interview session in the fall and spring of their senior year. The videotape lasts ten minutes and shows students conducting simulated or role play interviews with other students. In each tape, two students present a scenario in which one is a client and another is a social worker. The performance of the "social worker" is then rated by a trained MSW graduate assistant using a five-point scale that ranges from "skill not displayed" to "student is adept in use of this skill." In spring 1996, the modal rating was 4.5. The results are useful for evaluating basic skills in interviewing, which is an essential tool of social work practice regardless of social service setting.

Practice Skills Inventory: Senior year BASW students evaluate their practice skills in the fall before they enter the practicum, and in June, at the end of their practicum. Students rate themselves with regard to several curriculum objectives (generalist practice skills, the professional use of self, the ability to work with others, values and ethics, bio-psycho-social assessment skills, and oral and written communication skills). In the fall of 1996, the instrument was revised to include skills in working with organizations, communities, and in the development and implementation of social policy. A five-point scale that ranges from "no knowledge and skill" to "advanced knowledge and skill" is used in the evaluation. There are substantial gains in the student's skills assessments from early in junior year to graduation. All areas (values, work habits, problem-solving, assessment, etc.) show increases between September and June.

Thesis: The BASW program does not offer a thesis or major course.

Student Satisfaction See 5.A. 4, Success, BASW Program.

Trends in postgraduate academic and career placement. Regrettably, the BASW Program does not have good data on post graduation activities. A survey was sent to 1993, 1994, and 1995 graduates. However, only 41 of 150 surveys were returned, largely because of incorrect addresses for alumni. Of those graduates who responded, 17 (41.5%) were working in social work positions while 6

(14.6%) were enrolled in MSW programs. Some 44 percent were neither employed in a social work position nor undertaking graduate education. Tracking BASW alumni after graduation clearly represents a challenge for the program.

8.4 Curriculum/Instruction.

Ph.D. Program. Several levels of input are used to monitor the Ph.D. Program and gauge its quality. Every standing course is evaluated using standard university evaluation forms. In addition, forms have been developed for students to provide evaluation on courses taken outside the School in order to provide input to doctoral faculty and students regarding the merits of external courses. Student feedback about the program is also regularly obtained through the Winter and Spring proseminars for first and second year students. The Ph.D. Steering Committee provides evaluation in a variety of ways: 1) setting standards for and review of all new course offerings; 2) annual discussion with all first year instructors; 3) monitoring of course syllabi; 4) periodic review of various program components (e.g., assessment of how evenly faculty are participating in the program through tutorials, committees, and standing courses, adequacy of School and university resources for qualitative methods training, how meaningful our current structures are for fostering interdisciplinary theory training); and 5) periodic discussion meetings or internal e-mail surveys of faculty and/or students regarding certain aspects of the program. We have also recently conducted a survey of all alumni and all current students regarding program quality (see 5.B.6. section on success) and have previously undertaken career studies (e.g., survey of where graduates are placed, examples of their scholarly products). The Ph.D. Program Director regularly participates in the national organization - Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education (GADE). In fact, each of the past three directors has served on the steering committee for that group. The small size of this organization permits it to use a "working sessions" format for its annual conferences. These sessions provide regular opportunities to assess and upgrade various components, such as teaching and research practica, qualifying exams, and criteria for quality dissertations.

As noted under Sections 4.3 and 8.2, individual students' academic performance and progress toward a degree are monitored primarily through annual advising. Students and faculty advisors are required to fill out an annual evaluation and planning form together. This has the dual purpose of assessing progress and helping the student anticipate and prepare for future steps. The Office of Student Services routinely surveys student records to determine if there are incompletes or lapses in registration to reduce the chance of student "drift" or obstacles to timely progress. Overall, the rate of student retention is high and progress timely. Currently the School has undertaken the task of operationalizing how we define academic excellence in each of our degree programs and what achieving this standards requires. In doing so, the Steering Committee has developed a summary of the program's strengths, limitations, and growth-oriented objectives. Later this year, the Steering Committee will set up meetings with doctoral faculty and students to prioritize these objectives and identify implementation strategies. A major issue in these discussions will be what constitutes academic excellence and what resources or structures are needed to achieve and sustain excellence outcomes for the future.

In section 8.2, we noted the need for better evaluation of the less visible program components (e.g., tutorials, dissertation work). Significant progress has been made in specifying guidelines and expectations for our teaching and research practica. Based on faculty and student input, we are developing written norms and guidelines for tutorials, advising, and supervisory and dissertation committee work.

MSW/BASW Programs. The MSW and BASW Programs also use a number of methods to evaluate the quality of courses and instruction. The MSW and BASW Curriculum Committees oversee course content by setting standards for the development of new courses and by periodic monitoring of syllabi. As described under 8.1, all instructors are required to have students evaluate their courses in order to meet criteria for tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases. Most faculty use the Office of Educational Assessment evaluation forms. Periodic focus groups are also held with MSW and BASW students and with practicum instructors to monitor and assess curriculum goals and objectives. The annual survey of recent MSW graduates also evaluates the curriculum by asking questions about the usefulness of each course in preparing them for practice.

As will be noted in 8.6, the MSW and BASW programs are independently evaluated every eight years for reaccreditation by the Council on Social Work Education. As part of this process, the programs must submit an in-depth self-study focusing on six evaluative standards: Program Rationale and Assessment; Autonomy and Resources; Non-Discrimination; Faculty; Students; and Curriculum. This self-study is available to the Graduate Program Review Site Team.

The outcomes of curriculum evaluations are described in sections 5A.6 and 5B.6 and summarized in 10. Here we outline how faculty use the results of evaluative efforts for purposes of program renewal. For the MSW program, an entirely new curriculum was developed as a result of the evaluation that took place during the 1989-90 reaccreditation process. In the subsequent three years, faculty, building on testimony from students and community leaders, created the present curriculum which was inaugurated in the fall of 1993. Since then, faculty have used the results of focus groups with students and practicum instructors to modify the curriculum further. For instance, a fifth foundation practice course (SW 514) was developed in the Spring of 1996 and will be required of students in the Spring of 1997. Likewise, the MSW alumni survey is being reorganized in order to be more useful to the Executive, Curriculum and Diversity committees.

In the past two years, significant changes have been introduced in the BASW Program curriculum, largely as a result of the reaccreditation review and the leadership of a new Director. A third required practice course (SocWf 312) has been added to ensure that students are better prepared to work with communities and organizations. A course on cultural diversity and justice (SocWf 404) is also now required to ensure that students are better able to work within a multicultural society. Faculty are currently evaluating the Human Behavior and Social Environment requirements and structure.

As a result of systematic evaluation, the School has placed renewed emphasis on instructional competency at all levels. The MSW Curriculum Committee has assumed leadership in working with faculty to improve teaching, including discussions of grade inflation, the setting of standards around grading and feedback on written assignments.

Student Progress: All students, regardless of academic level, are subject to the UW Student Conduct Code. In addition, social work students may be terminated based on documented evidence of criminal conviction and for failure to comply with the NASW Code of Ethics or unprofessional conduct as specified in RCW 18.130.180. As noted under 6.1, the School recently developed a set of "Standards for Essential Abilities and Attributes for Admission and Continuance in the School of Social Work." These standards describe desirable physical, cognitive, emotional and character requirements necessary to complete the course of study and participate fully in all aspects of social work education and the practice of social work. The standards are based on the assumption that the acquisition of competence is a lengthy and complex process that will be subverted by any significant

limitation of the student's ability to participate in the full spectrum of the experiences and requirements of the curriculum. Required abilities include: motor abilities, sensory abilities, communication and interpersonal skills, self-awareness, professional commitment, objectivity, empathy, energy, acceptance of diversity, and professional behavior. (The full statement of the "Standards" is available through the School's Office of Student Services, and has been reprinted in all student manuals.) Students who present serious limitations can be brought before the newly formed Committee on Students. It is expected that all issues can be resolved at the level of this committee. Students who question a decision made by the Committee, however, may appeal through the mechanisms established by the University.

Students may also be terminated for failure to meet or maintain academic grade point requirements. These requirements were addressed in 8.3A. Here we address the procedures by which academic progress is monitored in the BASW and MSW programs. Sections 4.3, 5B4, 8.2 and 8.4 specify the means through which Ph.D. students' progress is monitored.

Quarterly grades are reviewed by the Associate Dean for Academic Programs working with the Director of Student Services. Together they identify MSW students whose grades fall below 2.7 or who appear to be accumulating a number of Incompletes or No Grades (X's), and BASW students whose grades fall below 2.0. Following University guidelines, they make a determination to provide a written warning, often inviting the identified students to discuss the matter with them. In serious cases, the student may be placed on probation and not allowed to continue until all courses have been made up. Should this fail, a student may be terminated.

Although we are satisfied with our student body and terminate few students, our renewed emphasis on academic excellence has led faculty to make earlier identification of students with potential academic problems. Though the number of students identified in the professional programs is very small (3-5 a year), a significant proportion are students of color. Unfortunately, the University has very few academic enhancing resources available for graduate students. If we are to continue to provide access for a wider range of students, such resources will have to be developed internally or funded centrally.

8.5 Research.

Our School has achieved national prominence for the quality and quantity of its research, and includes among its faculty a number of nationally recognized scholars whose work places them on the cutting edge in their areas of research. Evidence for these claims is provided by:

National Rankings: Our School has consistently been ranked in the top 10 schools of social work over the past decade. Currently, on most measures, it is ranked in the top 5-6 programs nationally. Examples include:

Our School was ranked number 6 out of 119 graduate social work programs in the nation in a 1994 U.S. News and World Report.

In a series of articles in the Journal of Social Work Education, Vol. 31, 1995², our School ranked 8th out of 245 social work programs on the number of articles published in six social work journals.

² Bloom, M. & Klein, W. C. (Fall 1995) Publications and Citations: A Study of Faculty at Leading Schools of Social Work. Journal of Social Work Education, Vol. 31, No. 3, 377-387.

surveyed for the study. Because about 60 percent of our faculty's scholarly work is published in interdisciplinary or other professional journals, this underestimates our total productivity. In the article published by Green et al., in which both social work and non-social work journals were included, our School ranked second on publication productivity out of 45 schools of social work with active doctoral programs.

Based on earlier published rankings, Bloom & Klein (Journal of Social Work Education, 1995) selected the schools, including ours, that were ranked in the top 10 social work programs in the nation and examined their scholarly productivity. Compared to the other schools in the top ten, our School was above average on number of publications per faculty, percent of faculty who were publishing, and number of citations per faculty. We were about average on the percent of our faculty whose works were cited, and we ranked fifth on "critical mass," a global measure of scholarly activity.

In a 1992 publication evaluating the productivity of graduates of social work doctoral programs, our School ranked second for papers published in peer reviewed social work journals, third for papers in peer review other journals, third for chapters published, and fourth for papers presented at social work conferences.

In a 1996 national survey of externally funded research in social work programs conducted by the National Association of Deans and Directors, our School ranked number one in terms of the amount of federally funded research. A comparison of on-campus federally-funded research in 1995-96 showed that our School experienced one of the largest percent gains in terms of the amount of federal funded research over 1994-95.

Based on data provided by the UW Office of Research, the Institute for Scientific Information assessed the impact of scholarly work relative to all other work in the same field by examining citations to published works. Using a formula that takes into account the number of schools of social work with authors, the number of authors in each school, and the number of citations to authors' published work to derive the expected number of citations in several categories, our School exceeded the expected number of citations for published articles, proceedings papers, reviews, editorials and meeting abstracts. We were, however, at or slightly below expected citations for book reviews, meeting abstracts, and one type of proceedings papers. On average across all categories, the actual number of citations exceeded the expected number.

National leadership: Based on the quality of their research and national reputations, several faculty are serving or recently have served on standing NIH study sections that review grant proposals, National Academy of Sciences Panels, and recently have been or are editors or associate editors of major journals. Many faculty serve as consulting editors, guest editors, and virtually all faculty serve as reviewers for major journals.

Green, R.B., Baskind, F.R. & Conklin, B. (Fall 1995). The 1990s Publication Productivity of Schools of Social Work with Doctoral Programs: "The Times, Are They A-Changin'?" Journal of Social Work Education, Vol. 31, No. 3, 388-401

Kirk, S A & Corcoran, K. (Fall 1995) School Rankings: Mindless Narcissism or Do They Tell Us Something? Journal of Social Work Education, Vol. 31, No. 3, 408-414.

Ligon, J., Thyer, B.A & Dixon, D (Fall 1995). Academic Affiliations of Those Published in Social Work Journals: A Productivity Analysis, 1989-1993. Journal of Social Work Education, Vol. 31, No. 3, 369-376.

On the basis of our continued and growing success obtaining highly competitive funding for our research, our consistently high national ranking, the high demand for our Ph.D. students, and the administrative supports for research, we believe that research has been given high priority in our school. Nonetheless, faculty sometimes feel that too much of their time is devoted to committee work – time that could be used for enhanced research productivity and other related pursuits. Further, some faculty believe that higher priority should be placed on community service and teaching than research

On average, faculty devote approximately 40 percent of their time to teaching, 40 percent to research, and the remainder to service, although this distribution of effort varies by stage of academic career and by quarter, depending on individual faculty priorities, program demands, and the availability of research funds to buy out teaching time. The University Instructional Responsibilities policy specifies that faculty teach at least one course per year unless time is funded for research or administrative responsibilities. Our School's policy states that faculty may not buy out 100 percent of their time, except under special circumstances approved by the Dean. With no buy-outs, the expected course load is five courses per year, however, most faculty teach three to four courses a year because they are allowed to reduce their course load through several mechanisms including publications from the prior academic year, doctoral student supervision (involvement in six or more tutorials, three research practica, four teaching practica or a combination of these), administrative responsibilities, and grant buy-outs. Planning and evaluation of the distribution of faculty efforts for research, teaching, and service are conducted through: (a) policies and procedures for merit, promotion, and tenure that articulate the importance of each; (b) annual conferences for all assistant professors, culminating in a written report from the Dean; (c) a workload policy that rewards research productivity through reduced teaching loads; (d) individual discussions by each faculty member with all three deans about workload for the next two years, including scholarly plans; (e) meetings of assistant professors with the Associate Dean for Research to review their research plans; (f) periodic review and discussion of these policies with the School's Executive Committee; and (g) (optional) faculty development conferences with senior faculty.

8.6 Accreditation.

The BASW and MSW programs were last reaccredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) in 1990. Reaccreditation is required every 8 years. In August 1996, the School submitted its self study documents to CSWE, followed by a site visit in October 1996. The role of the site visitors is to clarify any issues raised in the self-study and to take note of program strengths and limitations. Although site visitors do not make recommendations, the five-person team was positive in their review of the program. The final reaccreditation decision will be made by the CSWE's Commission on Accreditation during their February 1997 meeting.

8.7 Role within Region.

Our School is regarded as the regional institution for social work education. It is the only social work program within a research university in the Northwest that offers the continuum of social work education: BASW, MSW, Ph.D and Continuing Education. Eastern Washington University emphasizes preparation for generalist practice largely in rural areas. Although individual faculty members are involved in research, Eastern does not have a research infrastructure comparable to ours, and the teaching load is considerably higher. Walla Walla is a small program in a private institution and serves students primarily from Southeastern Washington State. Portland State has recently developed a doctoral program and is strengthening their administrative support for research;

in fact, an NIMH Social Work Research Development Center has also been funded there. However, Portland State's programs are not ranked nearly as highly as ours. For example, its masters program did not fall within the top 25 ranking in the 1994 edition of US News and World Report. There is also a relatively new graduate (MSW) program in Boise. Wyoming and Alaska currently offer only undergraduate degrees, although both are seeking candidacy to offer masters programs. Our program is therefore distinctive in the Northwest for its continuum of degrees and its strong research focus, and it attracts strong and diverse pools of student and faculty applicants.

Partly because of our respect for each program's distinctiveness, we have developed several successful collaborations with the other programs in Washington State. For the past five years, we have collaborated with Eastern, Walla Walla and Heritage College (undergraduate program only) in a state-wide consortium designed to improve the preparation of social workers for public sector child welfare. This partnership has involved the State Division of Children and Family Services and the Washington State Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers. Portland State, which has developed a state-wide distance learning program, has provided us with consultation regarding our plans for a distance learning MSW program. Of the programs in the region, competition most often occurs with Portland State, and there is some concern about how their state-wide distance learning program may affect applicant demand from southwest Washington for our program.

As noted under 8.5, our School is consistently ranked among the top programs nationally. The greatest threat to our strengths is the stagnant faculty salaries at UW.

IX. DEVELOPMENT

9.1 Faculty Distribution.

Ph.D. Program. At this level, there are no problems with class size because of the relatively small size of each cohort. The greatest challenge in covering formal classes is when senior faculty are on sabbatical or are funded by grants, since auxiliary faculty are not utilized to teach doctoral level courses. For example, in 1996-97, two of the senior faculty who typically teach the doctoral first year required policy courses were on sabbatical, creating difficulties. The greatest challenge at the doctoral level relates to workload distribution in terms of supervisory and dissertation committees. Our current workload system provides the opportunity to buy down one course based on research productivity, tutorial work or supervision of teaching and research practice with Ph.D. students, or some combination of the two. In most cases, the faculty who are most productive in terms of their research are also heavily involved in doctoral student supervision. Since they can only buy-down one course, they often end up carrying disproportionately heavy loads of doctoral committees. Given current faculty FTEs, we do not anticipate being able to give more workload credit for doctoral work, unless more faculty resources are available across all programs or if the overall teaching load is increased across all faculty.

MSW Program. At this level, the greatest challenge is to maintain class sizes appropriate for teaching practice knowledge and skills. Such classes need to be small enough to provide students with the opportunity to try out skills within the classroom and to ensure that the faculty member becomes well informed about the students' professional development. Problems of class size have been intensified by the loss of 4.64 FTE faculty positions in the past three biennia due to budget cuts and the recent death of a practice instructor (this position will not be replaced by the University). When faculty move into administrative positions, are on sabbatical or unpaid leaves, or on funded research and therefore not available for teaching, we typically utilize auxiliary faculty or advanced

level doctoral students to cover their courses. This can, however, result in some uneven sizes among practice courses, since students typically first seek out the state-funded practice instructors.

Another challenge at the MSW level is obtaining funding for practicum coordinators. When the School implemented the policy that all practicum liaison work would be performed by practicum coordinators rather than distributed among faculty as a whole, this placed a heavy burden upon the 3.6 FTE Practicum Coordinators who must meet frequently with students to set up and monitor their placements, visit the agencies, and meet with the practicum instructors. Some of the practicum coordinators are responsible for liaison work with 80 students. During the recent reaccreditation site team visit, members from other universities were very concerned about the practicum coordinators' heavy workload. This workload will increase when a coordinator currently on partial reemployment chooses full retirement, since funding will revert centrally and not be available to hire another coordinator. The 1997-99 legislative budget request includes funding for 1.0 FTE Practicum Coordinator, but we are not optimistic that this will be funded, given the low probability of new instructional funds for the Seattle campus.

Each year, as part of ongoing internal reallocation of resources, we review the enrollment for each of the four MSW level concentrations and reconsider our instructional needs and the kinds of substantive specializations needed from new faculty hires in order to sustain the integrity of the curriculum. In light of declining resources (given the 1% cut mandated for each biennium for the next decade), we cannot justify maintaining concentrations for which enrollment falls below 15 students. At the same time, we face tremendous pressures from the community and from students to maintain all four concentrations, especially the Multiethnic Practice Concentration which is distinctive among social work programs nationally, but often has lower enrollment than the other concentrations. Given these pressures in light of limited resources, the faculty are beginning to discuss whether there are less resource-intensive ways to organize the advanced year of the MSW Curriculum.

BASW Program. Faculty FTEs at the BASW level are adequate for the current enrollment. We would, however, face a severe staffing problem if a faculty member currently on the 40 percent option were to retire in full, resulting in a lack of faculty to teach the three-quarter practice methods sequence. For 1997-98, the BASW program has been allocated 1.0 FTE faculty and one PDTA to respond to a modest enrollment growth of 10 FTE students. The University's 1997-99 budget request to the Legislature includes an additional 1.0 FTE faculty for 10 FTE students, which, if funded, would result in an increase of 20 FTE BASW students. This increase has been supported by the University as a way to enhance access at the undergraduate level.

9.2 Demand.

Our School does not keep data on the demand for our graduates. Although we conduct periodic surveys of employers, we do not ask them to project demand for future social workers. Community needs assessments have just been completed in preparation for the possible funding of new distance learning on the Olympic Peninsula and UW-Tacoma based programs. Both assessments indicate a growing need for MSW trained social workers in western Washington. In the Tacoma area, just over a half of those surveyed believed that positions appropriate for MSWs increased in their organizations over the past five years and two thirds of these believed that positions for MSWs would continue to grow over the next five years. With regard to the Olympic Peninsula, respondents reported that the demand for social workers is expected to grow at a faster rate than the economy as a whole.

Data from alumni surveys indicate that Ph.D. and MSW graduates find employment with relative ease. Ph. D graduates typically find academic jobs outside the Seattle area, during the spring quarter of their last year, with employment beginning the following fall. The academic market for social work Ph D 's is predicted to remain strong for the foreseeable future, with more positions available than the number of graduates annually. In contrast, doctoral graduates who remain in the Seattle area face a more saturated market and often have to piece together a variety of part-time positions. As indicated in 5. B. 6, approximately 90 percent of MSW graduates find full time or part time social work employment within seven to nine months after graduation. Good data on BASW graduates are lacking, however, and as indicated elsewhere, we will work to strengthen our capacity to identify regional demand for BASWs. Such data are especially important in light of the projected pressures for access at the undergraduate level.

The School does not formally assist in the placement of our students but we do so in numerous informal ways. At the professional degree level, we have offered annually a series of career development workshops on resume writing, interviewing, how to approach the job search, and professional certification. We strongly encourage BASW and MSW students to utilize the resources of the University Placement Service. The Social Work Alumni Association has developed a career mentoring program where alumni volunteer to advise second year MSW students about career options. Employment of graduates often evolves out of students' practicum placements.

At the doctoral level, faculty provide invaluable assistance through mentoring and advising about the strengths and weaknesses of employment opportunities being considered by graduates. A booklet of the curriculum vita of students who will graduate in any given year is mailed to all social work programs (both graduate and undergraduate) nationally. The Dean and the Ph D Program Director annually receive numerous phone calls from counterparts at peer institutions inquiring about graduates and asking for recommendations. The relatively small size of our Ph D. program allows us to provide this kind of intensive personal career development support. In addition, the doctoral seminar for first and second year students addresses questions related to job hunting and professional presentations at national conferences. From their first year on, students are encouraged to attend professional conferences and network with Ph.D. students and faculty from other programs well in advance of when they are actually on the job market. The students who are most successful at securing placement at a prestigious peer institution are typically those who have made these informal contacts early in their program of study.

The Visiting Committee is not involved in a formal capacity in evaluating the quality of our graduates in the workplace. However, this Committee along with alumni provide informal feedback. The Visiting committee often becomes acquainted with graduate students and alumni through the quarterly Visiting Committee panels on current social issues which include faculty and alumni presenting research findings or community service programs.

9.3 CURRICULAR CHANGE.

Ph.D. Program. The Steering Committee periodically assesses course offerings and other program components to evaluate their adequacy. Over the past ten years, the following significant revisions have occurred:

- replacement of a course on social welfare history with one on policy analysis to strengthen these skills more uniformly among graduates.

- requirement of two theory-based courses to be taken in one of the social science departments or professional schools on campus; this is intended to foster interdisciplinary study and theory-guided research and scholarship
- incorporation of the first two required statistics courses into the School (previously students took courses through Biostatistics), this change better enabled the faculty to provide discipline-specific examples, include content related diversity, and establish planned linkages with other courses such as the required research methods sequence.
- requirement of a one-quarter teaching practicum; the underlying rationale was that our doctoral students needed stronger and more systematic preparation for teaching roles as part of their doctoral training.
- introduction of the Lead Teaching Assistant role and the “Preparing Future Faculty” initiative; this includes modification of the doctoral proseminars for first and second year students to include teaching preparation content, topical workshops on teaching throughout the year; regular meetings by the Lead TA with teaching assistants and doctoral students serving as auxiliary instructors (e.g., to assess their individual teaching enhancement needs, to serve as liaison to School and University resources).
- revision of the required in-house research methods courses to include content on qualitative research methods; this revision recognized that students need to have sufficient exposure to the current range of research methods to enable them to make judgments about what types of methods are appropriate to the research questions they will be pursuing in the future.
- addition of a required dissertation colloquium; this is presented to the School community to know what individual students are pursuing in their dissertation research, to read the prospectus for that research, and to provide input early enough in their dissertation research planning to permit modifications as the students and their committee deem useful.
- introduction of Doctoral Student Writing Awards; sponsored by the School’s Visiting Committee, these awards are another way to reinforce student writing for publication.

The Steering Committee recently reviewed several national sources to assess our doctoral program relative to national standards. These sources included the GADE Guidelines for Quality in Social Work Programs, the NIMH Task Force on Social Work Research Report, the NADD Task Force on Administrative Research Infrastructure Report, the Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research recommendations for the advancement of doctoral research training, and Priorities of UW as reflected by President McCormick. The Steering Committee’s assessment is that we have a strong and well respected program and that both our recent and anticipated changes are consistent with trends and developments in the field.

More extensive comment on program limitations and planned changes is provided in Section 10.1. Program quality and efficiency could be enhanced by additional collaboration with other University units. Based on the nature of research questions typical in social welfare, our students’ programs of study and dissertations are inherently more interdisciplinary in nature than many allied disciplines. Our faculty also has strong interdisciplinary representation. Access to courses in other disciplines has generally been favorable. However, as demand for graduate level courses has increased, they are beginning to experience faculty who will not permit them to register for their classes. In addition, we are noticing more cut-backs in the number and frequency of courses, reducing the predictability of what courses will be available in any given year. In conjunction with the School’s Center for Prevention Research (the Ph.D. Director sits on the Governing Board), a number of interdisciplinary

innovations are currently being planned, including a colloquium series of national and local scholars on various topics related to prevention research as well as a cross-listed seminar on prevention science

MSW Program. Each year the faculty evaluate various aspects of the curriculum. Since major revisions in the MSW curriculum in 1992-94, only minor changes have been made. This year, for instance, a fifth foundation practice requirement, SW 514, was added to the curriculum. Although there are no major proposals for altering the curriculum, the faculty are currently evaluating two components: 1) Some faculty believe that advanced standing students may not be sufficiently prepared for entering the program. As a result, a task force of the MSW Curriculum Committee is charged with designing an evaluation of the advanced standing program; 2) Students often complain about the lack of flexibility in the concentration year curriculum. The Chairs of the Concentrations are meeting to examine possible alterations in their structure to allow for greater choice among courses with the existing faculty resources allocated to the concentrations.

BASW Program. Two changes were made to the BASW curriculum 1996-97. A third practice course, SocWf 312, and a course on cultural diversity and justice, SocWf 404, were added to the required curriculum. In addition, the faculty are considering the following. 1) Restructure the Human Behavior and Social Environment requirements so that students will no longer be required to take Psychology, Sociology and SocWf 419, Adult Development and Aging. Instead, the BASW program may develop its own two-course sequence in HBSE. A major reason for this change is the recurrent difficulties in ensuring that students can enroll for the required Soc and Psych courses at the appropriate time; 2) Increase the research requirement (SocWf 390) from the present 3 credits to 5 credits. This would allow the instructors to give more time to quantitative procedures and the use of information technology; 3) Increase the number of hours students spend in the field practicum beyond the required minimum of 400 clock hours in supervised field instruction. Most other BASW programs require many more hours than this, which places our students at a disadvantage if applying to advanced standing programs.

Collaboration with other University Units. Collaboration with other units is extremely desirable. As noted under 6.3, many faculty collaborate in scholarly activities with faculty from other units. BASW students and Ph.D. students are required to take courses in other disciplines to fulfill their degree requirements. A three-year concurrent MSW and MPH degree is available to qualified students. We are also exploring a concurrent Law and Social Work degree. Our Dean is chairing a subcommittee of the Board of deans who are developing interdisciplinary teaching opportunities in the areas of ethics, administration, and children and families. Our administration faculty are eager to explore ways to collaborate with the School of Public Affairs' new program in Non-profit Management. As noted under 5.A.3., barriers to collaboration at the BASW and MSW level include the practice structure and accreditation standards which do not allow students from other units to take social work practice courses, although non-social work students may enroll in other social work courses. Our students find it difficult to take courses in other departments because of the requirement of practicum two to three days a week.

9.4 Research Development.

Our School supports and encourages research development through a variety of mechanisms, including, but not limited to:

- A .5 FTE Associate Dean for Research whose primary responsibility is to develop and maintain a viable infrastructure for the support of research
- **Announcement of Funding Opportunities** The office of the Associate Dean for Research regularly informs faculty and doctoral students of opportunities for obtaining research funds, including RFA's from various institutes; assists faculty with manuscript and proposal preparation, and insofar as possible, works with individuals to help identify potential sources of private and public funding.
- **Support for research activities** The Associate Dean for Research meets regularly with the research faculty to provide support for their research activities and to discuss policies supportive to them.
- **Central administrative support to investigators for developing grant proposals that include assistance with budgeting, editing, word-processing, grant forms, and moving the proposal through the University's process (i.e., Grants and Contract Services, Human Subjects Review).**
- **Merit salary increases that explicitly include research productivity as a primary consideration.**
- **Release time from teaching to enhance research productivity; junior faculty automatically are given reduced course loads during their first two years in order to devote time to developing a research program, and a reduced course load in year three at the discretion of the dean; all faculty may buy out teaching time with research grant funds; and the workload policy permits faculty to earn release time through research productivity (e.g., publications) and supervision of doctoral exams, dissertations and research and teaching practica.**
- **Research Assistants: RAs are provided to all new faculty (regardless of rank) for their first two years, and to other junior and sometimes senior faculty, when funds permit, to provide assistance with research endeavors. In addition, the deans may choose to fund research assistants for initiatives that are of high institutional priority, such as the School's Multicultural Research Group.**
- **Support for travel to professional meetings for both faculty and doctoral students.**
- **Computer supports for research include: (1) a fully equipped computer laboratory that includes 20 workstations in a Novell Netware Local Area Network (LAN); 2) two small satellite labs for faculty providing access to shared laser printers; 3) a portable 486 IBM-compatible computer available for checkout by faculty on a reserved basis to use while traveling or on agency visits; 4) workstations in their offices for all state-funded faculty. These are connected to the School's LAN and the University's backbone, providing faculty with a variety of statistical and other software easily accessible for research and other purposes, connection to the Internet, and access to multiple library and bibliographic resources; 5) 3.25 FTE computer support staff, who are responsible for the installation and maintenance of all hardware and software and who provide consultation and workshops on computer software; and 6) a computerized system for downloading and moving pertinent data from central databases into spreadsheet and database management applications designed specifically for grant and contract administration purposes. Plans for the remainder of the biennium include upgrading of all remaining 386 machines to 486 or Pentium Class machines**
- **Research Colloquia: In 1995, the Associate Dean for Research instituted the Issues in Social Welfare Colloquium Series to provide a regular, ongoing forum for presenting research findings to the School community and encouraging the exchanges of ideas. To date, these colloquia have been very well attended by faculty, staff, and students. In addition, ad hoc colloquia are offered throughout the year by researchers within the School as well as by visiting scholars. Some of these are co-sponsored with other departments. These provide valuable and lively settings for the discussion and debate of current research issues.**

- **Grant-writing skills:** In Spring quarter, 1996 the Associate Dean for Research instituted a grant writing workshop, which was attended by 9 faculty and 10 doctoral students. Based on the positive evaluations, we will continue holding annual grant writing workshops.
- **Indirect cost recovery:** Starting in fiscal year 1995, the School allocates a portion of the RSA (Research Support Allocation, indirect cost recovery returned to the School by the University) to Principal Investigators. These funds help ensure compliance with the federal A-21 regulation, and also can be used for a wide variety of research and development purposes (e.g., writing new grants, conference travel, consultants, software purchases, etc.), thus increasing investigators' flexibility in managing their research projects.
- **Journal article copying service:** A work study student is available to copy journal articles not located in the Social Work Library.
- **Library:** An excellent library which has been located within the school for over 30 years. The extensive library collection includes over 27,000 volumes. The Head Librarian of the School's Library is assigned full time. The library is open daily, including four nights a week and weekend afternoons. In addition to its extensive collection of books, journals, federal documents and pamphlets, the library houses a Computer-Based Reference Service, staffed by the Head Librarian, and the Psychlit database on CD-ROM. The library includes meeting and study rooms, reading carrels, and reading tables sufficient in quantity to accommodate the library needs of all undergraduate and graduate students and faculty. The library facilities are accessible to students or faculty with disabilities and include a room with specialized equipment for persons with physical disabilities.

Overall, our School strongly supports research development, as the above examples demonstrate. Nonetheless, there are impediments to research, including heavy committee work (due in large part to the number of committees and the frequency with which they meet); professional program requirements of beneficial, but time-consuming on-going liaison with human service agencies; an individualized Ph.D. Program with extensive tutorials, thus increasing the demand on faculty time; lack of financial resources within the school to fund pilot projects and doctoral dissertations, and the perennial problem at the UW -- space. In fact, due to space constraints, three of our larger research groups, SDRG (described above), the Innovative Programs Research Group (directed by Dr. Roffman), and the HIV/AIDS Prevention and Evaluation Unit (directed by Audie Lemke) are located in off-campus rental space. This has occurred, despite the conversion of storage and lounge space to offices and partitioning of larger offices to house two or three individuals. We anticipate some relief from the space problems with a planned addition to our building. However, construction is not scheduled to begin until at least January 1998, and is expected to take approximately one year. When completed, this will provide the School with additional office space for research projects and a large multi-purpose meeting room. Being able to house more research faculty and staff within the building supports our graduate instruction goals by making their expertise and resources more readily available to students and increasing the overall visibility of research within the school. However, even with the additional space, it will not be possible to house all research projects, given their number and size.

9.5 Funding Sources.

The permanent state-funded portion of the School's budget is slightly over \$5.6 million per biennium and currently supports 40.25 FTE faculty members and 21.70 FTE support staff. These totals include 4.54 FTE faculty and .75 FTE staff funded through the Evening Degree Program budget. The majority of the budget is for personnel, with permanent state-funded support for operations

during the current biennium equaling approximately 2.17 percent of the School's total state budget. In recent years, the operating budget support throughout the University has not kept pace with expenditures due to increased prices, workload increases and reduced state support. The way in which the School manages to cover growing operations costs and to ensure some flexibility in budgeting is through reliance on the Unit Reserve. As is the case throughout the University, the Unit Reserve is funded by recapturing unexpended funds from vacant positions due to resignations, retirements, sabbaticals, unpaid leaves and external funding on grants. Generally, allocations are made to supplement the permanent state funds for services, operations, computers, and temporary personnel, such as auxiliary faculty, Ph.D. Teaching Assistantships and Research Assistantships, and summer salary extensions for faculty who are performing short-term administrative or coordinating responsibilities. Through careful planning and monitoring, the Dean is able to utilize these recaptures in ways that greatly expand the School's teaching and research program and support curriculum, service, and research goals across all three degree programs.

The Unit Reserve has become even more important since 1991 with the loss of \$44,500 in general operating funds, especially in services and travel due to budget cuts. We currently rely on the Unit Reserve for approximately 88 percent of our operations expenditures. In 1993-95, we spent from the Unit Reserve more than six times the amount that was in our permanent base budget for operations support. At a time when the base budget, exclusive of RSA, was \$72,148, we expended a total of \$443,150 from the Unit Reserve. Limited state-funded operations support is the area of greatest concern in our budget. Operations support is critical because it impacts both the quality and quantity of instruction and the base from which external research and training funds are competitively sought. It is only through Unit Reserve recaptures that the School is able to support faculty travel, equipment purchases, and supplies that are essential to maintaining our regional and national leadership in social work education and research. Yet this method of supporting core services through recaptures to the reserve has obvious limitations; the amount in the Unit Reserve is unpredictable and constantly changing, making long-range planning difficult. As budgetary reductions over the past six years have been absorbed through the elimination of vacant positions, the size of the Unit Reserve has been reduced proportionately. If the Unit Reserve were to be drastically reduced in future years because of declines in federal funding and thus in faculty buyouts from grants, our operations funding would be severely reduced, thereby threatening our ability to function effectively.

The productivity of our faculty is also severely hampered by the limited number of staff. There is only .5 FTE word processing staff available to assist 40+ FTE faculty. Even though all faculty have computers in their offices, some faculty still require word processing assistance. In a 1992 University report, our School ranked 18th out of 23 units in terms of staff FTE per faculty and student FTE's. This situation has deteriorated in the past five years, with the elimination of 1.08 staff FTE as a part of the budget cuts. At the same time, the demands on fiscal administrative staff have grown with the increases in external funding and more UW procedures geared toward accountability. Securing adequate staffing for the BASW and Ph.D. programs has been a high priority. In September 1996, through internal reallocation, a .5 FTE Program Coordinator was hired for the Ph.D. Program. Funding for at least an additional .25 FTE for the Ph.D. Program and .5 FTE staff for the BASW Program is a high priority in our 1997-99 biennium budget request.

The externally funded portion of our budget has grown dramatically in recent years. For Fiscal Year 1996, total funds awarded for grants and contracts that support training or curriculum development are \$3.1 million; for research \$6.7 million (including both direct and indirect costs). Although expenditures for 1995-96 from grants and contracts constitute well over half of the total School expenditures (62%), the School does not rely on external funding for support of any of the core

instructional programs. Even training programs, such as the public child welfare training funds through Title IVE and IVB, are viewed as enhancements to the School's professional programs, not as essential. The School does benefit, however, from the involvement of faculty, staff and students on these research and training projects as well as from the RSA. The Dean determines the expenditure of RSA funds within the following two objectives: 1) allocating a portion of the funds to Principal Investigators to assure full compliance with Federal Circular A-21 regarding administrative costs and the generation of new grants; and 2) utilizing the RSA for expenditures related to the overall generation and support of research within the School, such as administrative and support staff, research assistants; editorial assistance, computer-based bibliography services, photocopying, and travel related to grants development and scholarly presentations. The RSA budget allocated to the School for the 1995-97 biennium is \$323,661.

Although research and training funds do not support any core instructional programs, the extent to which they provide funds for the School's Unit Reserve is of concern if federal funding declines dramatically in the next 5-10 years. As noted above, our primary concern is the extremely small percentage of the state budget that funds operations support and the increasing reliance upon the Unit Reserve, funded through salary recaptures, for daily operational expenses such as photocopying, supplies, services and travel.

Our school also benefits from gifts, bequests and endowments. We currently have eight endowments which are managed as a portion of the University's Consolidated Endowment Fund. The largest of these is the Social Work Endowment Group Fund established to provide MSW scholarship aid in the form of grants and gifts. The total in the principal accounts for all endowments currently is approximately \$1,300,000. The School receives funds from a variety of other sources such as donations from individuals through Annual Giving and income from the sale of publications. An organized attempt to gain support for the School through individual private donations is mounted annually by the School in coordination with the Central Development Office. The 1995 Annual Giving efforts raised \$109,613. These funds have been deposited in the Social Work Endowment Group Fund, which is used to support student scholarships (including the Naomi R. Gottlieb Endowment Fund for Ph.D. Students and the endowment recently established by Judy Kopp for MSW students); the Minority and Disabled Student Scholarship Fund; or the Social Work Development Fund, which provides the Dean with discretionary funds to support pilot projects, conferences, workshops and colloquia, and special events. Another source of discretionary funds is the Deans Club, which represents friends of the School who have donated \$500 or more annually. Currently, there are 38 members in the Deans Club.

Increasing the extent of private support for the School is a high priority for the next five years. The need for private gifts for student fellowship support is critical, given the endowments for student support available through many of our peer institutions such as Michigan. Because central funds for our Development Director were cut in 1993, we have not had staff support to assist the Dean with development efforts. Compared to peer institutions such as University of Michigan, U of North Carolina, Columbia, Chicago and Case Western -- all of which have 2-3 development staff for social work -- we fare poorly in terms of private support. We are pleased to have a new major gifts officer assigned to the School for one day a week by central development. This will increase slightly our ability to identify and cultivate prospects for major gifts. If this part time officer is successful, we are hopeful that her time could be expanded in future years.

9.6 Resource Trends

In the past decade, our School has taken a number of steps to improve efficiency and effectiveness through internal resource reallocations. Despite the lack of new funds specified for these changes, these steps have also allowed us to respond to and create new opportunities. A few examples of such internal reallocations are as follows:

- Prior to the MSW curriculum reform, our curriculum had grown and become extremely fragmented and costly. As a result of major changes, curricular integrity and coherence were enhanced, the number of specializations and minors in the second year was reduced, the number of course offerings was reduced from 139 to 106, first year courses were consolidated into foundation work, and the number of electives was severely limited. Overall, this streamlined curriculum has permitted better utilization of faculty and staff resources and reduced our reliance on Auxiliary Faculty. A negative consequence of this less resource intensive curriculum, however, is growing student dissatisfaction with the lack of curriculum flexibility, especially in the concentration year. For students who exempt or waive courses or want to take course overloads, the lack of electives is problematic.
- The Evening Program was moved for budgetary purposes to UW Evening Degree. This budget neutral transfer has provided a more stable resource base for that program than would have been possible under the School's budget. In addition, the UW Evening Degree has more resources for marketing and thus increasing the programs visibility than was possible through the School. Given the turnouts at recent applicant events for the Evening Degree, we anticipate a growing application rate in the future.
- Workload changes were introduced in 1995 to ensure coverage of required classes. Clear expectations were set that all faculty must first teach required courses before teaching selectives. The administrative allocations to the Ph.D. and MSW programs were established at 50 percent; the state funding of the position of Associate Dean for Research was reduced from 1.0 FTE to .50 FTE and the incumbent expected to teach at least one course; the Associate Dean for Academic Programs is expected to teach at least one course; the standard workload was increased to five courses per year (with the option of buying down to four courses based on scholarly productivity or service on doctoral committees); and workload credit for concentration chairs or standing committee chairs was eliminated. These changes in administrative allocations required that more responsibilities be delegated to faculty curricular groups. An outcome of the UW's Instructional Responsibilities Policy is that we can no longer provide a quarter free of teaching in the third or fourth year for junior faculty to assist with their preparation for promotion and tenure.
- To assure compliance with revised federal circular A-21, the staff positions of editor and word processor were reduced in order to provide RSA funds directly to PIs to support the generation of new research proposals and the fiscal administration of funded projects. Funds were thus reallocated to meet changing federal demands.
- Staff positions in the administrative offices were reorganized to strengthen fiscal support services, a change necessitated by the growth of external funding and the increased reporting and accountability requirements. Staff supports for the School's central reception/office assistance area were reduced accordingly.
- The School's Executive Committee is initiating a strategic planning process, which will help to set priorities and guidelines for future decisions regarding budgetary reallocations and reductions.

- The Deans Office has utilized a consultant to identify ways to improve efficiency and effectiveness in our Student Services unit through redefining positions and their attendant responsibilities. As part of the one percent reduction for July 1, 1997, we will be implementing changes in Central Administrative Support Services, while providing faculty and staff with improved copying and voice mail services to offset the lack of staff support.

These examples illustrate that we have engaged in a continuous process of assessment and reallocation, despite our relatively limited resources and the resultant strains on the system. Central Administration regards us as a unit that operates efficiently and effectively. The extent to which we teach and graduate a proportionately large number of students given our faculty FTEs is shown by 1993-94 data from the University Strategic Analysis Group. Although social work is considerably smaller than Education (70.5 FTE faculty) and Nursing (77.3 FTE faculty), we awarded more degrees in 1993-94 than Education, and nearly as many as Nursing and our student credit hours by enrollee status are nearly as high as Nursing.

Despite our ongoing attempts to improve the efficiency of resource use, the declining state budget, 601 and the impacts of the one percent cuts over the next five biennia are of tremendous concern. Our limited operations support, including classified and professional staff to support faculty productivity, is increasingly problematic, especially as vacant positions that have funded the Unit Reserve have been cut and we anticipate increasing competition for federal funding. Allocations of the RSA to Principal Investigators in order to meet A-21 Circular Revisions has reduced the amount of funds available to support both new research initiatives and general research enhancements, such as pilot funds.

The impacts of the stagnant salary base for faculty and staff are the most negative, especially in terms of morale. Already, we have lost four outstanding faculty to peer institutions which were able to offer much higher salaries and attractive recruitment packages. We are increasingly concerned about our ability to retain outstanding women and faculty of color at the associate professor level, especially in light of current recruitment efforts underway. The relatively low base for salaries and incentive packages combined with Seattle's high cost of living also make it harder to recruit new faculty. The declining operations support, threats to the Unit Reserve, and low salaries all heighten the challenge of providing faculty with opportunities through sabbaticals, leaves, administrative appointments and federal funding while still ensuring that the majority of the required courses at the professional level and all courses at the Ph D. level are taught by state-funded faculty.

Faculty and staff are being expected to work harder with fewer resources, respond to demands for access and public accountability, provide public service and outreach, and as faculty FTEs decline, teach more courses and serve on more committees. Although our School has managed in the past five years to acquire new resources through the Evening Degree, undergraduate access and minority faculty recruitment, there are limits to how much more faculty and staff can be expected to "do more with less" or "work smarter."

X. SUMMARY

10.1 Present Condition and Future Plans.

We close by identifying School-wide strengths, then the areas for development and enhancement for each of the three degree programs, and last, the challenges facing the School as a whole.

Major School-wide Strengths.

- The School of Social Work is consistently ranked among the top ten social work programs in the nation. In this regard, the School reflects the stature of the University of Washington with its internationally renowned research environment.
- The faculty of the School are recognized for their research productivity and are leaders in the development of empirically-based models of policy and practice.
- The strong research commitment of the faculty is evident in our being awarded a new NIMH Research Development Center which provides us with expanded resources for prevention research development and training in the area of mental health.
- The faculty are committed to teaching, research and community service and strive to build an organizational environment that respects group and individual diversity. In particular, the School is committed to developing social work practitioners, researchers, and educators who are culturally competent and can promote social and economic justice in an increasingly multicultural society.
- The large number of applicants for its three degree programs and the satisfaction of its alumni, and those who hire them testify to the quality of education received by students.
- Our School has been one of the most successful units on campus in attracting faculty, student body, and staff diverse in terms of race, ethnicity and sexual orientation.
- Our School is strongly supported by external constituencies, including agency-based practicum instructors, the Visiting Committee and the Alumni Board.
- Despite limited operations support, we have managed to develop excellent resources through the Social Work Library, computer facilities, media center, and the Office of Student Services.
- Faculty are actively involved in decision-making within the School, and the Executive Committee is providing leadership on strategic planning that will be a framework for future decisions about resource reallocations and reductions.

Ph.D. Program. Based upon evaluation data from multiple sources and input from other doctoral programs that we consider to be exemplars, we have identified the following strengths and areas for development and enhancement in the doctoral program.

Strengths:

- Our doctoral program is highly respected nationwide, with the Deans or Directors of peer institutions rating our graduates extremely high.
- Our alumni express a high level of satisfaction with their education.
- There are strong mentoring relationships between our faculty and students
- Our record for retention of doctoral students and job placement is excellent.
- Students have multiple avenues for individualizing their doctoral education.
- Students have strong resources for training in teaching preparation.
- Students receive strong training in developing their research skills.
- We are proud of our recruitment of a diverse student body, although this areas requires ongoing attention.

Immediate Challenges: Nationally, the field of social work is raising many of the same questions that we have identified through our extensive data-gathering process. These include: What are the primary roles we should be preparing Ph.D students to fulfill? How do we prepare students to

prosper within the realities of a scholarly life, given changes in higher education nationally? and How do we help our students achieve a life-long commitment to high quality research and knowledge building relevant to the profession?

Within this national context, our doctoral steering committee is actively working to develop a plan for renewal, including the identification of long term goals that look beyond the year 2000. The plan will emerge out of a dialogue between the Ph.D. steering committee and faculty, students and alumni so as to ensure as wide a participation as possible. By the end of the year, we hope this plan will be formalized, priorities for improvements set, and the beginning stages of the plan implemented. This plan will address some of the areas that we have identified as needing development and enhancement as follows

- Despite a long series of incremental cuts to the School's budget, the Deans have protected TAs for doctoral students, acquired 2.0 FTE new state-funded TAs and have recently reallocated a program coordinator for the doctoral program. However, these supports continue to lag seriously behind those typically available in our peer institutions and prevent us from pursuing activities that would expand our resource base, such as writing more training grants for student support and developing more systematic ties to other departments to foster interdisciplinary teaching and research.
- Accordingly, current interdisciplinary relationships need to be strengthened and new ones developed in order to increase our involvement with the research community at the University and research opportunities in the field
- As part of our ongoing efforts to create in-depth institutionalization of excellence throughout the program, academic excellence needs to be defined in concrete terms, particularly in the various structural components of the program and performance/outcome expectations set for students.
- Given the ever-increasing pressures for productivity on faculty throughout higher education nationally, students need to be ready to "hit the ground running" in their first academic positions. This entails building upon the strong components of their training to foster confidence and depth of preparation, including a beginning publication record, as independent scholars, teachers and researchers.
- As part of this preparation, training in analytical, conceptual, and critical thinking skills needs to be deepened. Graduates are somewhat uneven in their ability to undertake well conceptualized, theory-guided research and their disposition to think critically about issues and topics that are ideologically or personally important to them. More in-depth systematic preparation in pedagogy and teaching skills is also needed
- Although a core of faculty are highly invested in the doctoral program, ways to make fuller and more uniform use of our faculty resources need to be determined. This may include attention to program structure (e.g., less heavy reliance on individual tutorials and greater use of standing courses) as well as incentives for faculty involvement.
- Related to faculty resources is the issue of increasing complexity and diversity of training. The range of data collection and analysis techniques, for example, has mushroomed and grown in sophistication over the years. Our faculty need to identify ways to develop and more fully take advantage of university resources, continually upgrade their own methodological competencies, and make hard choices between breadth and depth of training.
- Increased student funding is critical both to compete effectively for the strongest applicants and to support students at the dissertation stage, especially students of color or those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds.

These challenges in themselves reflect many of the strengths of our program and are indicators of the commitment of faculty, students and alumni to ongoing program renewal and improvement.

MSW Program.

Strengths:

- Employers indicate that our program has improved over the past ten years, especially in terms of our preparation for practice, and the majority of our alumni feel that they are well prepared for practice.
- Faculty are committed to ongoing curriculum renewal, a new curriculum, instituted in 1993, has been generally positively evaluated by students, faculty and practicum instructors.
- Our required practicum and practice methods courses are evaluated most positively by students
- Our alumni, and those who hire them, indicate that our graduates are well prepared to practice with diverse populations-at-risk.
- The foundation curriculum assures that all students acquire basic skills in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities.
- We have developed four strong concentrations in Children, Youth and Families, Health and Mental Health, Multi-Ethnic Practice, and Social Work Administration.
- We have built a solid relationship with the social service community which has enabled us to develop a wide range of excellent practicum sites for students.
- We have used a number of instruments, including student focus groups and alumni surveys, to monitor on an ongoing basis program outcomes and students competencies.
- A group of BASW faculty has received funding from CSWE to develop intergroup dialogues, facilitated by trained peers, as a component of the Cultural Diversity and Justice courses.

Immediate Challenges:

- The Associate Dean for Academic Programs and the MSW Curriculum Committee are implementing the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Excellence, which were approved by the faculty in autumn 1996. These aim to enhance teaching methods, improve ways to evaluate students, and generate a dialogue among faculty and between faculty and students on guidelines for adult learning and academic challenge.
- The MSW Curriculum Committee is setting up procedures to evaluate the advanced standing program. Ways to better integrate Advanced Standing and Evening students into our programs also must be considered.
- Resources need to be found for improving the academic skills of promising students whose undergraduate education was deficient in certain areas.

BASW Program.

Strengths:

- The BASW program has a strong faculty who communicate and work effectively as a team.
- We offer a well organized curriculum that relies on the rich liberal arts offerings of the University.
- Students are effectively prepared for entry level professional generalist social work practice.
- The recent addition of Soc Wf 404 (Cultural Diversity and Justice) strengthens student preparation for work in a multicultural society.

- The recent addition of SocWf 312 (Social Welfare Practice) enhances student preparation for work with organizations and communities
- Our positive relationship with the social service community enables the development of a wide range of excellent practicum sites for students.
- The senior year seminar (SocWf 405) successfully integrates theory and practice.
- We have developed two instruments (The Skills Inventory and The Video Skills Assessment) that enables us to monitor student competencies.
- A group of BASW faculty have received funding from CSWE to develop intergroup dialogues, facilitated by trained peers, as a component of the Cultural Diversity and Justice course.

Immediate Challenges

- There is need to examine the effective use of non-social work courses as requirements and electives, especially for the Human Behavior and Social Environment sequence.
- The faculty are currently considering increasing the number of prerequisites for admission to the program.
- Content on small groups, organization and communities need to be systematically integrated into the Human Behavior and Social Environment sequence
- The possibility of requiring a course in statistics needs to be evaluated.

Challenges for the School as a Whole.

Our perception is that our School is the strongest that it has ever been in its 60-year history in terms of faculty scholarly productivity, extent of external funding for research and training, faculty, staff and student diversity, linkages to the community, and faculty commitment to quality teaching. However, there are a number of challenges that could threaten this positive trajectory.

- As noted under 9.6, the stagnant salary base of the past five years is the greatest threat to program quality. Although we are pleased that funds through Evening Degree and undergraduate access are allowing us to hire two new faculty for fall 1997, the salary base may be too low to recruit the best candidates. Our School's salaries have not kept pace with those of our peer institutions, and a growing number of faculty, especially women and faculty of color are being approached by other schools with attractive offers. The University administration is well aware of these salary problems, which must be addressed at the legislative level with funds for merit-based salary increases as well as a central pool to address gender inequities and competitive offers.
- After salaries, space constraints probably have the greatest impact on the ability of faculty and staff to be maximally productive. Although we were pleased when the addition to the building was funded for the 1995-97 biennium, we are frustrated by the slow pace of the planning process, with completion unlikely before 1999. In the meantime, more faculty and staff are sharing two to three to an office, meeting spaces are overbooked, more research projects are needing to be housed off campus, and no space is available to house the newly funded NIMH Social Work Research Development Center. We are currently engaged in discussions with the Office of Space Planning regarding the use of temporary on-campus space until the new addition is completed. However, our external funding base has grown so dramatically that even with the new addition, not all research projects can be located within the building.

- Although our doctoral program is highly regarded nationally, we lag behind peer institutions in support resources, especially for student funding. Many of our peers have recruitment funds for bringing applicants to campus and are able to offer more attractive fellowship support. Our funds for dissertation support are extremely limited. Increasing the permanent base for supporting our doctoral program is one of the highest priorities for the next decade.
- We are poised to be responsive to the increasing pressures for access. We established an evening degree program in the early 1980s, long before the rest of the University was even discussing such outreach efforts for placebound students. Shifting our program to the UW Evening Degree has allowed the infusion of some new resources for evening students. In 1992, discussions were initiated with the tribes and local service providers on the Olympic Peninsula about a distance leaning MSW program. In 1996, we piloted two MSW-level courses through Peninsula community College, and will pilot a third course in spring 1997. Expectations for such a program by students and practitioners on the Olympic Peninsula are high and will have to be addressed if a distance learning program is not funded. Similarly, an MSW program in Tacoma was proposed as early as 1992, and is currently a priority for the Tacoma campus. However, even if these programs are eventually funded by the Legislature, there are ongoing resource concerns. Support for faculty training and development in the use of new technologies for distance learning will have to be addressed. Professional accreditation issues must be resolved for both types of programs and will require new models for collaborative decision-making. The workload impacts on faculty, staff and administration need to be carefully monitored to prevent erosion of program quality. The potential workload pressures of these new programs make it imperative that the faculty review our current highly participatory governance structure and seek ways to increase efficiencies in terms of committee work.
- Although the Dean, through the Board of Deans, supported the mandated one percent cut for the next five biennia, how we will manage these cuts beyond 1997 is of tremendous concern. Smaller programs such as ours have few degrees of freedom in terms of absorbing such cuts. Future reductions can only be made through cutting existing faculty or staff positions, not through reducing funds in vacant positions or internal reallocations. Implementing and sustaining an ongoing, feasible planning process across curricular, research and service objectives is essential to managing this process to minimize negative impacts to both program access and quality.

Within this context of strengths and challenges, we close by summarizing objectives for the next 5-ten years.

- To build upon and expand the research productivity of our faculty and doctoral students. As we anticipate increasing competition for federal research dollars, we need the administrative infrastructure to both: 1) ensure that our faculty and students are preparing nationally competitive proposals, and 2) seek new sources of funding for research, including foundation and corporate support and endowments for doctoral student assistance.
- To further enhance our interdisciplinary teaching and research relationships. The Dean is chairing a subcommittee of the Board of Deans to identify ways to remove barriers to interdisciplinary teaching and to strengthen interdisciplinary relationships across units. The models being developed by this committee can serve as guides to expanding interdisciplinary opportunities for both MSW and Ph.D. students.
- To develop and implement a MSW distance learning program and a MSW program in Tacoma that meet the dual goals of access and program quality

- To increase financial support for students, especially doctoral students, in order to ensure the quality and diversity of our students. This requires an intensive development effort to expand private resources, but our ability to do so is limited by lack of full-time development staff.
- To define academic excellence in concrete terms for all three programs, especially in structural components of our programs and performance/outcome expectations of students.
- To recruit and retain a nationally renowned and diverse faculty who excel as scholars, teachers and researchers and lend their expertise to address critical social problems facing the state and the region

In sum, we are proud of our accomplishments and are committed to helping the University fulfill its mission to the State by building upon our School's strengths. But we -- and the University -- are at a critical turning point in terms of the degree of support needed from the State. We look forward to addressing these challenges for the future and welcome the Committee's comments and suggestions about how to achieve our goals within an environment of constrained resources.

Revised 1-30-97