

Social Work - Bachelor of Arts

Current Compliance Year: 2023-2024

Full review

Recent Recommendations

Feedback will include recommendations from the last Expedited Review or from your most recent review by your school or college. You may not see any feedback or recommendations until you have completed your first full or mid-cycle review.

Response to Previous Recommendations (if any):

The SWK Department's last program review was an expedited review in AY 2019-2020. Below is a response to the three recommendations from that report.

1. Develop plan for MSW cohort: The SWK program is continuing to explore the option of providing an online masters degree to complement the existing BSW program, one with a macro and social justice focus, highlighting [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] populations and climate and environmental justice. This avenue is different than what is offered at our sister social work program at UAA.

2. Pursue external grant support: The Department is currently overseeing two grants that support the Rural Cohort travel funding and the online program. One from UAA Health Initiatives and the other is the Alaska Mental Health Trust, both ending fiscal year 2024. The program also is overseeing a 23/24 TVEP grant that is supporting student travel for enhancing practicum placements. Another grant the program is overseeing is from the Department of Justice, Office of Victim's Advocacy to recruit and train victim's service professionals across the state. A majority of these participants are also getting their BSW degree through the SWK program.

3. Work to make full BA curriculum available online : As of Fall 2022 the program is offering a fully online BSW program. All courses can be taken asynchronously, including the field portion of the program, which is nine credits of practice and practicum. The 400 hours of practicum in a social service agency that is required for graduation will remain being completed on-site and in-person.

Student Learning Outcomes

The previous Student Learning Outcomes Assessment has been submitted as its own report. Going forward you will use the following prompts to discuss the success of your most recent SLOA plan and address your assessment activities since your last SLOA report (typically the past two years or since your last program review).

Learning outcomes feedback from last review: Feedback and recommendations may not appear until after your first full or mid-cycle review.

Strong

Discuss your SLOA findings, changes you are making and what you hope to see as a result:

The social work department meets two times a year for strategic planning. Program faculty and staff review assessment outcomes and discuss areas that need changes or updates, along with areas in the curriculum that may be lacking. For example, in 2019 we recognized a need for integrating more [REDACTED] scholarship and experiences throughout the curriculum. This brought about an intentional effort to ensure all courses included [REDACTED] scholars and experiences. This relates to Competency #2. For competency #5, policy practice has historically been at or below benchmark- however in the past few years we have incorporated more policy practice skills in the SWK 306, and made direct connections to policy throughout other courses. This has seen a steady increase in meeting and exceeding benchmark.

The updated SLOA for 2022-2023 is attached, along with the most recent assessment data for that same year. This data will be reviewed at our Spring 2024 strategic planning meeting, along with the conversion to the CSWE 2022 Educational Policy Accreditation Standards (EPAS) for all courses. Anecdotally, looking at our most recent data we know this group was most impacted by Covid-19 and our conversion to a fully online asynchronous program.

Discuss the curricular changes made based on assessing your SLO. If you haven't made any curricular changes, please explain why not and address what you did notice in the review, including strengths of your curriculum through the assessment of your outcomes:

2021-2022 SLOA & Data

For Competency #4 The SWK 375 Research Methods recently updated the textbook and changed its major assignment from a research proposal to a University of Alaska Fairbanks Baccalaureate Self-Study, Volume 1 | pg. 259 completed research project. Other courses in the curriculum have integrated and support research practices. SWK 320 and SWK 342 have added an annotated bibliography assignment. SWK 461 & SWK 464 incorporate assignments related to researching interventions. SWK 305 has an assignment called the Time Traveler, which requires researching specific political/social/economic. For Competency # 6 Engagement has been impacted by Covid19 and placements being virtual. As the University and SWK program get back to a more "normal" activity level the engagements score should increase. To help this increase, the program has discussed including more simulations in practice classes, specifically SWK 220 and SWK 460, to provide more ways to engage in skills.

For Competency #9 A new Field Instructor Training was developed and instituted in 2019 to help FI's understand competencies and evaluate student competencies in Field as well as identifying tasks that would meet each competency. SWK 463 also has a major assignment focused on organizational assessment which also supports evaluating practice.

Are communication outcomes embedded in the SLOA Plan?

As of 2017 all Baccalaureate programs were required to embed the communication outcomes within their SLOA Plans, this is optional for non-Baccalaureate programs.

Not Embedded

Student Success

To access the Student Success Dashboard please sign into a UA computer with VPN connection (if not on campus). You will need your UA credentials and it is best accessed with the most updated version of Chrome, Edge, Firefox or Safari browsers; Internet Explorer is not supported. You will need to filter the data to see your programs. If you need assistance in finding the data for your programs, please contact your data liaison or [Julia Manfredini](#) in the PAIR office.

Data Liaisons

Each school or college has a team of Data Liaisons to help you analyze the data provided in the portal and may be able to help you see your data in multiple contexts. You can find a list of data liaisons on the resources page for Program Review.

The college or school level committee will also have access to this data with the goal that by providing these visualizations data availability will be increased.

Data supplied within the dashboard linked below is intended for Academic Program Review and not for any other purpose.

[Student Success Data Dashboard](#)

Previous Feedback: Feedback and recommendations may not appear until after your first full or mid-cycle review.

Student Success Data Trends:

Increase in SCH, No change in pass rates, Decline in degrees awarded

If equity gaps were found in any of your disaggregated student success data, please explain how you plan to address those gaps. Please contact your data liaison or make an appointment with [Julia Manfredini](#) to learn more about analyzing your data.

The current institutional data has our 2023 majors at 133, at the time of writing the current data from Nanook Navigator identifies 220 majors. This discrepancy makes it hard to fully determine the equity gaps. One that we could determine was the low number of majors that identify as [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] students also appear to have low student persist. One way to address these gaps are for faculty to continue to work on inclusion of diverse content and activities into the curriculum and marketing materials. Hire and recruit adjuncts from diverse backgrounds. During our Spring 2024 departmental retreat we will continue to discuss equity gaps in the program.

Optional Data Explanation

Feel free to share more of your thoughts on the data provided.

High Impact Practices

According to the AAC&U, High-Impact Educational Practices "have been widely tested and have been shown to be beneficial to college students from many backgrounds." UAF is particularly interested in Undergraduate Research and/or Scholarly Activity because it is one of our mission fulfillment indicators, but all of these researched High-Impact Educational Practices should be reflected in your program's student learning outcomes and curriculum.

Previous Feedback: Feedback and recommendations may not appear until after your first full or mid-cycle review.

High-Impact Practices Used in this Program

Please use the following fields to discuss how your program is using the high-impact practices, successes and known issues and solutions, or ways you are considering incorporating them in the future. If you are not using any of the high-impact practices listed, please use the "Other or None of These," field to share what your program is doing to help students be successful.

High Impact Practices that currently apply to your program:

Internships, "Service Learning, Community-based Learning", Writing-Intensive Courses, Collaborative Assignments and Projects, Diversity/Global Learning

Collaborative Assignments & Projects

There are a number of opportunities for collaborative assignments throughout the curriculum. Two specific classes require group work in a variety of forms. In SWK 220 & SWK 320 students either self-select or assigned into a small group to do collaborative discussion boards, annotated bibliographies, ethical dilemma discussions; or practicing interviewing and engagement skills.

Undergraduate Research

The SWK 375 Research Methods Course is writing intensive. Students are required to write a research proposal discussing the topic and issue, a literature review, methods used to carry out the study, and in some courses a data analysis section if data collection was carried out. This course has also included undergraduate research mentoring for some students completing a research study and through to publication.

Diversity/Global Learning

The social work program infuses diversity & difference throughout the core curriculum. Intentionally incorporating [REDACTED] scholarship and perspectives throughout. This is especially seen in SWK 305 Social Welfare History and SWK 342 Human Behavior in the Social Environment II. Additionally, the social work program has a specific focus on rural social work practice and [REDACTED] this can be seen in various ways throughout our implicit and explicit curriculum.

ePortfolios

We do not currently use ePortfolios.

First Year-Seminars & Experiences

We don't currently have first- year seminars, however, we are developing an orientation to the SWK program course shell in Canvas that all students will be provided when entering the SWK program.

Writing-Intensive Courses

Our SWK 375 is considered a writing intensive course, with a literature review, research proposal and project to complete.

Service-Learning and/or Community-based Learning

SWK 103 Intro to Social Work, has a required 20 hours of volunteer service in a community agency or service project for identified community need. We have one active student club, OSSW (Organization of Student Social Workers) that incorporates service activities and community-based learning, this year they have brought in many guest speakers and panels of diverse social workers working with diverse populations and in diverse settings.

Internships

The social work program requires 400 hours of practicum in a community agency or organization.

Capstone Courses & Projects

SWK 461 and SWK 464 are our practicum courses connected to the 400 hours of field work in an agency, this is our capstone.

Other or None of these (explain)

Program Profile and Financial Data

The program review elements in this section usually stay consistent for departments. Any responses you provide will be saved for your next visit. So, when it's time for the next program submission, your previous narrative profile answers will be here, ready for editing. You can then decide if any updates are necessary, based on your needs for the next program review cycle.

Financial Data Resources

The Board of Regents shapes program review, through BOR Policy 10.06, to support budget increase advocacy in the state legislature. The standardized financial data template should be analyzed with your data liaison to assess your program's capacity and resource status.

To keep integrity and remain standard across all of UAF it is very important that you do not provide any additional or alternative data.

Financial Template

Your data liaison may have uploaded your template to the Google folder for this program, or you may do so now.

Previous Feedback: Feedback and recommendations may not appear until after your first full or mid-cycle review.

Cost Effectiveness

How does your department/program approach being cost effective?

The SWK program pays for approximately 2/3s of the program through tuition and fee revenue. Grants have been continuously sought out from UA Health Initiatives to support the rural cohort program and practicum placements. Other grants are sought out to support practicum travel for students and opportunities for students to gain specific skills. For travel to conferences UNAC travel awards are completed by all faculty members yearly. The program also collects student fees for travel to practicum site visits outside of Alaska. The program also collects course related fees to pay for technology like GoReact and Tevera.

Program's Value to Mission

The Social Work program graduates an average of 24 students yearly from across the state of Alaska and beyond. The program currently has approximately 200 majors and significantly adds to tuition revenue for the college. Through a grow your own approach the program adds to the health and social services workforce needs across the state. The SWK program has MOAs with close to 200 agencies across Alaska where student have completed internships and many of those agencies now employee program graduates. Approximately 21% of majors identify as [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. The program has a rural social work cohort program to support [REDACTED] students through culturally and contextually relevant teaching practices, which supports UAF's mission of emphasizing the circumpolar North and its diverse peoples. The mission of the SWK program is to promote the health and well-being of individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities, emphasizing the diversity and uniqueness of rural Alaska, as it interconnects with our global society. This mission connects to UAF's mission to educate and prepare students for active citizenship and lifelong learning and careers. Social work graduates have gained knowledge, skills, and values to work with people and communities in crisis and work in partnership with them to navigate challenges and enhance strategies focused on positive health and well-being, which supports UAF and the state as a whole.

Duplicative Programs

UAF Social Work is the only online asynchronous undergraduate social work program within the University. UAA offers a BSW, however it is only a campus program.

Community or Other Partnerships

The SWK program has a multitude of partnerships with agencies and organizations across Alaska and outside. A sample of agencies and organization are: Office of Children's Services; Resource Center for

Parents & Children; Denali Daniels & Associates; Tanana Chiefs Conference; North Slope Borough School District, Fairbanks North Star Borough School District; Lower Kuskowim School District; Fairbanks Native Association; Denali Center FMH; South Central Foundation; Commonhealth Health Corporation (Saipan); University of St. Louis Missouri; Denakkanaaga Elders Program; and Northern Mariannas College in Saipan.

Value of Service Courses (Optional)

The SWK program has a multitude of partnerships with agencies and organizations across Alaska and outside. A sample of agencies and organization are: Office of Children's Services; Resource Center for Parents & Children; Denali Daniels & Associates; Tanana Chiefs Conference; North Slope Borough School District, Fairbanks North Star Borough School District; Lower Kuskowim School District; Fairbanks Native Association; Denali Center FMH; South Central Foundation; Commonhealth Health Corporation (Saipan); University of St. Louis Missouri; Denakkanaaga Elders Program; and Northern Mariannas College in Saipan.

Post-Graduate Success

Our last full alumni survey was in 2019, with 111 alumni responding. Our graduates can be seen all over Alaska and outside, 38% reside in the Fairbanks North Star Borough, 35% in Alaska but outside of the FNSB, with a strong presence in Anchorage (7), Kodiak (5), Bethel(4), and Juneau (5); 25% in the Lower 48, and 2% in Canada or British Columbia. 59% of our alumni went on to graduate programs, of those 83% are receiving or currently working towards a Masters of Social Work (MSW) degree. Of those that received an MSW, 9% received a doctoral degree. The majority, 76% of our graduates are working in the social work field, and of those 29% are professionally licensed (12% LBSW; 11% LMSW; 6% LCSW).

An Class of 2022 Alumni Survey, was completed last year, and out of 13 respondents, 61.5% of them were currently enrolled in a graduate program; 7.7% had received licensure at the BSW level; and 54% were currently employed in a social work position.

Examples of graduate success include a graduate, who recently received a national community leadership award for her leadership and work helping others in the area of Human Trafficking, by the FBI. Another graduate is the Regional Director for the Fairbanks Office of the Office of Children Services for the Northern Region of Alaska. Another student is the self-governance liaison for the Norton Sound Health Corporation. There are many graduates who now lead social service programs around the state and are doing amazing work. Numerous graduates also practice clinical social work across Alaska and beyond.

Submission

Submitter & Collaborator Names

LaVerne Demientieff
Retchenda George-Bettisworth

College or School Review Committee

The college or school committees set the tone for helping each program feel seen during this process. We have provided you with strength-based feedback tags to attach to this program review. Please select as many as applicable.

Overall Recommendations

You may be asked to share your effective practices with other programs

Explanation of Recommendations

On the whole, the Social Work BA program operates effectively and efficiently for its size and investment. Its programs and curricula positively impact the campus and state communities. We as a committee considered some recommendations—"Address equity gaps," "Increase enrollment," and "Increase graduates"—but felt those suggestions were not totally warranted. For instance, any equity gaps are not an alarming trend, and the Department of Social Work has taken steps to design a more inclusive curriculum and reach a broader swath of students. Further, the very mission of the department seeks to empower rural and [REDACTED] communities. [REDACTED] while the Social Work BA could increase enrollment and graduates, its graduation-informed persistence seems fairly strong as is. In 2020, the number of majors (124) and degrees awarded (17) dipped fairly significantly, although that could be attributed to pandemic-era challenges. In 2021 and 2022, the number of majors (149, 145) and degrees awarded (23, 24) quickly rebounded. These data seem to indicate a strong program with consistent results—and a proactive approach to equity and student success. If anything, the faculty might benefit with greater resources to serve its large student population; that's to say, it might be difficult maintaining and improving the degree program without also increasing faculty and investments.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Feedback (tags)

Strong alignment with SLOA plan, Compelling learning story, "Clear, concise presentation of findings"

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Feedback (narrative)

The Department of Social Work's SLOA is clear and complete. The updates from AY2020–21 to AY2022–23 appear to be successful in diversifying the course content and refining the department's mission. The department seems responsive in engaging students in contemporary research, active learning, and applied practice. The department has been thoughtful and responsive in identifying and assessing its student learning benchmarks. Its SLOA plan was very complete.

Profile Feedback

Program is mission-centric to UAF or college/school, Program is unique in the state, Providing job placement for graduates, Strong post-graduation success for students, Strong ties to the community or industry

Financial Feedback

High Tuition Revenues, Productive Faculty

Student Success & Equity Feedback

The Student Success Dashboard shows consistency in the number of majors, the annual student credit hour load, the annual pass rate, and the graduation-informed persistence for students in the Department of Social Work. The only notable deviation came in a sharp decline of graduates from 2019 (32 graduates) to 2020 (17 graduates), although pandemic-era difficulties might be cited as a cause. The

number of graduates has remained steady the past two years of the review period: 23 graduates in 2021, and 24 in both 2022.

In the Department's overview of "Plans to Address Equity Gaps," they demonstrate practical, proactive plans to encourage greater equity and engagement in their curriculum. We as a committee see the Department of Social Work as particularly strong in serving underrepresented students and communities. As noted in the Program Profile, about 21% of Social Work majors identify as [REDACTED] or [REDACTED], and the department offers "a rural social work cohort program to support Indigenous students through culturally and contextually relevant teaching practices." Student and cultural equity is a key element of the Department of Social Work's mission, and they are succeeding in this endeavor.

High-Impact Practices Feedback

The Department of Social Work curriculum appears to prepare students very well for applied learning and career placement. Students are encouraged to collaborate with peers, conduct academic research, and develop their writing and communication skills. As early as SWK 103: Intro to Social Work, students conduct twenty hours of service within the community. The BA program requires 400 hours of practicum (which is to say internship), which are fulfilled in SWK 461 and SWK 464.

Elsewhere in the curriculum, SWK 375: Research Methods (a writing-intensive course) teaches students to evaluate and produce academic scholarship. Other courses emphasize perspectives from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. In fact, the Social Work program makes an emphasis of preparing students to serve rural and Indigenous communities—a valuable contribution to the needs of Alaska. This approach is woven through its entire curriculum.

Also of note, the department supports the Organization of Student Social Workers, a student group on the UAF campus that empowers undergraduates to conduct service projects and interact with practicing social workers. The department is also developing a Canvas shell to serve as an asynchronous overview for students entering the major.

Dean's Review Feedback

I concur with the review committee's positive comments and feedback regarding the Social Work BA program.

SWK is a consistently strong, strategic, and progressively student-centered program. Strengths are viewed across the program's curricula, SLOA, internships, practica, and focus on rural community cohorts.

Notably, the SWK was positively reviewed by their accrediting body, The Council on Social Work Education's Board of Accreditation - receiving 8 years of reaffirmed accreditation (ending Feb 2032).

I thank the SWK department for their unwaveringly thoughtful and caring efforts on behalf of their students and the communities/organizations/partners they serve.

Vice Provost Feedback

Your report shows strong alignment between the plan, the results, and the analysis done by the program. Provided 8 SLOs; NWCCU only requires 3-6 SLOs, we recognize that CSWE requires this many SLOs to meet their requirements.

HIPs - Provided overviews of these practices; could have used more details for each practice with specific examples. Not clear if these are required for all students or if students can choose from a group of options. Frequency of these opportunities? Required or optional? What proportion of students involved?

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
Bachelor of Arts Social Work
 College of Liberal Arts
 10/13/2023

Competencies	Assessment Measures and Procedures	Implementation (what, when, who)
1. Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) – Measure #1 Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI) – Measure #2 Competency #1 is operationalized by five (5) measureable practice behaviors. Two (2) behaviors measure values, two (2) are a direct measure of skills, and one (1) is a measure of the cognitive & affective process. Each behavior is assessed and an assessment score at or above the set benchmark (4) is considered to represent competency. The average of these 5 is considered the outcome measure benchmark for this competency.	Administered in the senior year practicum course. Measure #1 - taken by students at the time of exit, with the explicit purpose of testing knowledge. Measure #2 - Field Instructors assess individual students on the extent to which student has mastered each competency—measuring either values, skills and/or the cognitive & affective process. Aggregate scores of the 2 measures are used to determine the percentage of students meeting each competency (intended objective.)
2. Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) – Measure #1 Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI) – Measure #2 Competency #2 is operationalized by four (4) practice behaviors. Three (3) are direct measure of skills, one (1) measures values. Each behavior is assessed and an assessment score at or above the set benchmark (4) is considered to represent competency. The average of	Administered in the senior year practicum course. Measure #1 - taken by students at the time of exit, with the explicit purpose of testing knowledge. Measure #2 - Field Instructors assess individual students on the extent to which student has mastered each competency—measuring either values, skills and/or the cognitive & affective process.

	these 4 is considered the outcome measure benchmark for this competency.	Aggregate scores of the 2 measures are used to determine the percentage of students meeting each competency (intended objective.)
3. Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) – Measure #1 Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI) – Measure #1 & Measure #2 Competency #3 is operationalized by two (2) practice behaviors. Both are direct measures of skills. Each behavior is assessed and an assessment score at or above the set benchmark (4) is considered to represent competency. The average of the two is considered the outcome measure benchmark for this competency.	Administered in the senior year practicum course. Measure #1 - taken by students at the time of exit, with the explicit purpose of testing knowledge. Measure #2 - Field Instructors assess individual students on the extent to which student has mastered each competency—measuring either values, skills and/or the cognitive & affective process. Aggregate scores of the 2 measures are used to determine the percentage of students meeting each competency (intended objective.)
4. Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-informed Practice	Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) – Measure #1 Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI) – Measure #2 Competency #4 is operationalized by three (3) practice behaviors. All three measure the cognitive and affective process. Each behavior is assessed and an assessment score at or above the set benchmark (4) is considered to represent competency. The average of the 3 is considered the outcome measure benchmark for this competency.	Administered in the senior year practicum course. Measure #1 - taken by students at the time of exit, with the explicit purpose of testing knowledge. Measure #2 - Field Instructors assess individual students on the extent to which student has mastered each competency—measuring either values, skills and/or the cognitive & affective process. Aggregate scores of the 2 measures are used to determine the percentage of students meeting each

		competency (intended objective.)
5. Engage in Policy Practice	Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) – Measure #1 Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI) – Measure #2 Competency #5 is operationalized by three (3) practice behaviors. One measures the cognitive and affective process, one is a direct measure of skill, and one measures values. Each behavior is assessed and an assessment score at or above the set benchmark (4) is considered to represent competency. The average of the 3 is considered the outcome measure benchmark for this competency.	Administered in the senior year practicum course. Measure #1 - taken by students at the time of exit, with the explicit purpose of testing knowledge. Measure #2 - Field Instructors assess individual students on the extent to which student has mastered each competency—measuring either values, skills and/or the cognitive & affective process. Aggregate scores of the 2 measures are used to determine the percentage of students meeting each competency (intended objective.)
6. Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) – Measure #1 Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI) – Measure #2 Competency #6 is operationalized by two (2) practice behaviors. Each measure the cognitive and affective process. Each behavior is assessed and an assessment score at or above the set benchmark (4) is considered to represent competency. The average of these two is considered the outcome measure benchmark for this competency.	Administered in the senior year practicum course. Measure #1 - taken by students at the time of exit, with the explicit purpose of testing knowledge. Measure #2 - Field Instructors assess individual students on the extent to which student has mastered each competency—measuring either values, skills and/or the cognitive & affective process. Aggregate scores of the 2 measures are used to determine the percentage of students meeting each competency (intended objective.)

7. Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) – Measure #1 Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI) – Measure #2 Competency #7 is operationalized by four (4) practice behaviors. All four measure the cognitive and affective process. Each behavior is assessed and an assessment score at or above the set benchmark (4) is considered to represent competency. The average of these 4 is considered the outcome measure benchmark for this competency.	Administered in the senior year practicum course. Measure #1 - taken by students at the time of exit, with the explicit purpose of testing knowledge. Measure #2 - Field Instructors assess individual students on the extent to which student has mastered each competency—measuring either values, skills and/or the cognitive & affective process. Aggregate scores of the 2 measures are used to determine the percentage of students meeting each competency (intended objective.)
8. Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) – Measure #1 Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI) – Measure #2 Competency #8 is operationalized by five (5) practice behaviors. Two (2) measure the cognitive and affective process and three (3) are a direct measure of skill. Each behavior is assessed and an assessment score at or above the set benchmark (4) is considered to represent competency. The average of these 5 is considered the outcome measure benchmark for this competency.	Administered in the senior year practicum course. Measure #1 - taken by students at the time of exit, with the explicit purpose of testing knowledge. Measure #2 - Field Instructors assess individual students on the extent to which student has mastered each competency—measuring either values, skills and/or the cognitive & affective process. Aggregate scores of the 2 measures are used to determine the percentage of students meeting each competency (intended objective.)
9. Evaluate Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) – Measure #1	Administered in the senior year practicum course.

	Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI) – Measure #2 Competency #9 is operationalized by four (4) practice behaviors. One is a direct measure of skills. The other three (3) measure the cognitive & affective process. Each behavior is assessed and an assessment score at or about the set benchmark (4) is considered to represent competency. The average of these 5 is considered the outcome measure benchmark for this competency.	Measure #1 - taken by students at the time of exit, with the explicit purpose of testing knowledge. Measure #2 - Field Instructors assess individual students on the extent to which student has mastered each competency—measuring either values, skills and/or the cognitive & affective process. Aggregate scores of the 2 measures are used to determine the percentage of students meeting each competency (intended objective.)
--	--	--

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

Social Work Department, B.A.

College of Liberal Arts

AY22-23

Submitted by: Carol P Renfro

Contact Information: x7240

Date: 10/2023

1. Assessment information collected

The Council on Social Work education clearly outlines intended objectives social work programs are to assess. These objectives are referred to as competencies. There are a total of nine competencies. These competencies are consistent with our mission and goals. Each of the competencies describes the knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes that comprise the competency and is followed by a set of measurable behaviors that integrate these competencies. (See the attached description of Competencies and measurable practice behaviors.)

Intended Objective #1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior

Measure #1: Foundation Curricular Assessment Instrument (FCAI). This is a measurement of how well our program prepares students with the knowledge necessary for professional social work. Seventeen students completed the FCAI, and 86% of those students meet or exceed the set benchmark.

Measure #2: Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI). This is a direct measurement designed to assess students practice of each competency and related behavior. Twenty-three were assessed in AY22-23. Two of the 5 behaviors measure *the values*, two are a direct measure of skills and one measures the cognitive affective process. An aggregate score shows that 94% of students exceed this competency benchmark.

An aggregate score of the two measures shows that 92% of students assessed exceed the set benchmark for competency #1.

Intended Objective #2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice

Measure #1: Foundation Curricular Assessment Instrument (FCAI). This is a measurement of how well our program prepares students with the necessary knowledge for professional social work. Seventeen students completed the FCAI, and 91% of those students meet or exceed the set benchmark.

Measure #2: Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI). This is a direct measurement designed to assess students practice of each competency and related behavior. Twenty-three were assessed in AY22-23. Three of the 4 behaviors measure *skills* that comprise this competency, and an aggregate score shows that 91% of students assessed meet or exceed the set benchmark. Additionally, one behavior measures *the cognitive & affective process*, and reflects 96% of students exceed this competency.

An aggregate score of the two measures shows that 93% of students assessed exceed the set benchmark for competency #2.

Intended Objective #3: **Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice**

Measure #1: Foundation Curricular Assessment Instrument (FCAI). This is a measurement of how well our program prepares students with the necessary knowledge for professional social work. Seventeen students completed the FCAI, and 95% of those students meet or exceed the set benchmark.

Measure #2: Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI). This is a direct measurement designed to assess students practice of each competency and related behavior. Twenty-three were assessed in AY22-23. Both behaviors are a direct measure of *skills* utilized in a practice situation, and an aggregate score shows that 79% of students exceed this competency benchmark.

An aggregate score of the two measures shows that 87% of students assessed exceed the set benchmark for competency #3.

Intended Objective #4: **Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice**

Measure #1: Foundation Curricular Assessment Instrument (FCAI). This is a measurement of how well our program prepares students with the necessary knowledge for professional social work. Seventeen students completed the FCAI, and 64% of those students meet or exceed the set benchmark.

Measure #2: Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI). This is a direct measurement designed to assess students practice of each competency and related behavior. Twenty-three were assessed in AY22-23. All three behaviors measure the *cognitive and affective process*, and an aggregate score shows that 79% of students exceed this competency benchmark.

An aggregate score of the two measures shows that 71% of students assessed exceed the set benchmark for competency #4.

Intended Objective #5: **Engage in Policy Practice**

Measure #1: Foundation Curricular Assessment Instrument (FCAI). This is a measurement of how well our program prepares students with the necessary knowledge for professional social work. Seventeen students completed the FCAI, and 77% of those students meet or exceed the set benchmark.

Measure #2: Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI). This is a direct measurement designed to assess students practice of each competency and related behavior. Twenty-three were assessed in AY22-23. One behaviors measures *the cognitive & affective process*, one behavior measures skills, and one behavior measures values. An aggregate score shows that 77% of students exceed the benchmark set for this competency.

An aggregate score of the two measures shows that 77% of students assessed exceed the set benchmark for competency #5.

Intended Objective #6: **Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities.**

Measure #1: Foundation Curricular Assessment Instrument (FCAI). This is a measurement of how well our program prepares students with the necessary knowledge for professional social work. Seventeen students completed the FCAI, and 77% of those students meet or exceed the set benchmark.

Measure #2: Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI). This is a direct measurement designed to assess students practice of each competency and related behavior. Twenty-three were assessed in AY22-23. Both behaviors measure *cognitive and affective process*. An aggregate score shows that 96% of students exceed this competency benchmark.

An aggregate score of the two measures shows that 87% of students assessed exceed the set benchmark for competency #6.

Intended Objective #7: **Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities.**

Measure #1: Foundation Curricular Assessment Instrument (FCAI). This is a measurement of how well our program prepares students with the necessary knowledge for professional social work. Seventeen students completed the FCAI, and 91% of those students meet or exceed the set benchmark.

Measure #2: Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI). This is a direct measurement designed to assess students practice of each competency and related

behavior. Twenty-three were assessed in AY22-23. All four behaviors measure *cognitive and affective process*. An aggregate score shows that 87% of students exceed this competency benchmark.

An aggregate score of the two measures shows that 89% of students assessed exceed the set benchmark for competency #7.

Intended Objective #8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities.

Measure #1: Foundation Curricular Assessment Instrument (FCAI). This is a measurement of how well our program prepares students with the necessary knowledge for professional social work. Seventeen students completed the FCAI, and 86% of students meet or exceed the set benchmark.

Measure #2: Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI). This is a direct measurement designed to assess students practice of each competency and related behavior. Twenty-three were assessed in AY22-23. Two behaviors measure *cognitive and affective process*. An aggregate score shows that 78% of students exceed this competency benchmark. Three other behaviors are a direct measure of *skills*, and an aggregate score shows that 80% of students exceed the competency benchmark.

An aggregate score of the two measures shows that 81% of students assessed exceed the set benchmark for competency #8.

Intended Objective #9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Measure #1: Foundation Curricular Assessment Instrument (FCAI). This is a measurement of how well our program prepares students with the necessary knowledge for professional social work. Seventeen students completed the FCAI, and 59% of students meet or exceed the set benchmark.

Measure #2: Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI). This is a direct measurement designed to assess students practice of each competency and related behavior. Twenty-three were assessed in AY22-23. Three behaviors measure *cognitive and affective process*. An aggregate score shows that 62% of students exceed this competency benchmark. One other behavior is a direct measure of *skill*, and reflects 61% of students exceed the competency benchmark.

An aggregate score of the two measures shows that 61% of students assessed exceed the set benchmark for competency #9.

2. Conclusions drawn from the information summarized above

Students are assessed on their mastery of the competencies that comprise the accreditation standards of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE.) These competencies are dimensions of social work practice that all social workers are expected to master during their professional training. A measurement benchmark is set for each competency and an assessment score at or above the set benchmark is considered to represent mastery of that particular competency. The aggregate score of the two measures utilized to assess student achievement of the programs nine competencies falls between 61% and 93%, indicating that the majority of students are meeting or exceeding the standards for learning outcomes.

Scores from six competencies reflect that at least 81% of students are achieving the desired outcome—falling between 81% and 93%, while the remaining three scores are just below an acceptable outcome varying between 61% and 77% of students meeting the set benchmark. It should be noted that CSWE considers students to be successful when able to correctly answer 50% of questions. Our program has set a more ambitious goal of 80%. While we have easily met CSWE required goals we fell shy of our program goal for 3 of the 9 competencies.

The desired outcome was achieved on four of the measurable practice behaviors that integrate each of the nine competencies as measured by the Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI). We believe it is necessary to mention that while no fewer than 62% of students meet the expected outcome for each of the 9 competencies (meeting CSWE goals), our effort is for students to exceed the benchmark set by CSWE. To this end we believe we have been successful. The majority of students assessed exceeded that set outcome—falling between 62% - 96%.

3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above

Curricular changes will be discussed during our spring Accreditation & Assessment retreat. The department recently submitted its 2024 Reaffirmation of Accreditation Self-Study to the Council on Social Work Education's Commission on Accreditation

4. Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the curricular changes resulting

Dr. LaVerne Demientieff, Dr. Retchenda George-Bettisworth, Christina Ireton, LCSW, Christian Stettler, MSW, and Carol Renfro, M.Ed.

Fiscal Report for CLA Social Work Department				
	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	Definitions for the compiling staff
Total Student Credit Hours (SCH)	1266	1659	1645	Provided in SCH tab in the student success data provided by PAIR.
Service SCH	171	171	184	Sum rows labeled as "In unit, outside department, Service" and "Outside unit, Service" in the SCH tab of the data provided by PAIR.
Department FTEs	3.63	4.65	5.61	FTE = Full-time equivalent employee. Use the worksheet below to calculate for each employee type, and then use the total from row 31 here.
Total SCH per Department FTE	349	357	293	
Service SCH per Department FTE	47	37	33	
Majors in Programs	149	145	133	Sum for all programs from the Majors Total tab in the data provided by PAIR.
Department FTEs	3.63	4.65	5.61	From row 31 below or row 5 above
Majors per Department FTE	41	31	24	
Total Unrestricted Expenditures	\$			Total Expenditures made from budgets with an F1 or F7 fund type designation, from provided cycle report data filtered by Data Liasion
Total Restricted Expenditures	\$			Total Expenditures made from budgets with revenue of the F2 or S2 fund type designation, from provided cycle report data filtered by Data Liasion
Total Unit/Central Support Allocated to Program(s)	\$			Expenses incurred for direct support of instruction within orgs identified as central or academic support, if applicable
Tuition Revenue	\$			Receipts to college from tuition generated by the department/program (F1). NOTE: under the current 80/20 percent tuition distribution model generating units receive 80%. PLEASE USE PAIR REPORTED SCH TO REPLACE ZEROES IN CELL CALCULATIONS.
State Appropriation Revenue	\$			Appropriations for current funds operation of the university from the general fund of the State of Alaska through the annual budget cycle. This category also includes TVEP and State Mental Health Trust funds, if allocated to the department. (F1)
Restricted/Sponsored Project Revenue	\$			Revenue from external sponsors; includes grants, contracts, sponsored projects & restricted (grant) accounts funded by UA Foundation funds (F2/S2)
Fees	\$			Course Fees (9159)
Other UA Receipts/Revenue	\$			e.g. Performance and Sales Receipts, Space Rental Revenue, Indirect Cost Recovery (F1/F7); NOTE: COURSE FEES (9159) REPORTED ABOVE
Workload allocation: Teaching Units	50	50.5	73	Department faculty's workload units assigned to teaching
Workload allocation: Service Units	32	32	40	Department faculty's workload units assigned to service
Workload allocation: Research Units	8	7.5	7	Department faculty's workload units assigned to research

Full-time Equivalent Worksheet**	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	
Faculty FTEs	2.40	2.55	3.30	Base assumption: 12-month full-time = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE. Split appointments are multiplied by the % of effort assigned to this department. Part-time are multiplied by the % of effort assigned. F9 faculty on sabbatical count as 67% of one 9-month 0.75 FTE (or 0.50 FTE).
Adjunct FTEs	0.23	0.60	0.45	Base assumption: 40 units/credits = 1.0 FTE. Total # of credits taught by adjuncts in a year divided by 40 = the FTE of adjuncts in that year.
Staff FTEs	1.00	1.50	1.86	Base assumption: 12-month full-time = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE. Split appointments are multiplied by the % of effort assigned to this department. Part-time are multiplied by the % of effort.
Graduate TA/RA FTEs	0.00	0.00	0.00	Base assumption: 40 hours/week for 12 months = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE.
Total Departmental FTEs	3.63	4.65	5.61	Sum of all employee FTEs

**Note: FTE definitions and calculations for the purpose of Academic Program Review are different than for other institutional reporting processes (e.g. OMB or IPEDS re

Definitions for the programs and reviewing committees

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Receipts to college from tuition generated by the department/program, based on the campus's active tuition distribution model, which determines how much the unit receives of their generated tuition, and how much the campus keeps (in addition to the out-of-state surcharges) to support central offices/functions. The current distribution model is 80/20, where the unit/college receives 80% of their generated in-state tuition.

Appropriations for current funds operation of the university from the general fund of the State of Alaska through the annual budget cycle.

Revenue from external sponsors; includes grants, contracts, sponsored projects & restricted (grant) accounts funded by UA Foundation funds

porting)

