November 29, 2017

Ruth V. Watkins
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
205 Park Bldg.
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review
        College of Social Work

Dear Vice President Watkins:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council's review of the College of Social Work. Included in this review packet are the report prepared by the Graduate Council, the College Profile, and the Memorandum of Understanding resulting from the review wrap-up meeting.

After your approval, please forward this packet to President David Pershing for his review. It will then be sent to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next Senate meeting.

Sincerely,

David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Martell Teasley, Dean, College of Social Work
        Mary Jane Taylor, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, College of Social Work

The Graduate School
201 Presidents Circle, Room 302
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9016
(801)581-7642
FAX (801)581-6749
http://www.gradschool.utah.edu

College of Social Work

The College of Social Work was noted to have strong leadership and a supportive culture, as well as demonstrated commitment to diversity. The centers and the Social Research Institute associated with the College were viewed as tremendous assets that could be further integrated with faculty scholarship and student training in order to elevate the national profile of the College. Other recommendations focused on ways to improve training programs. With strategic planning now focused on articulating an action-oriented plan, the College is poised to build further on its strengths.

The Graduate School - The University of Utah

**GRADUATE COUNCIL REPORT TO THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

September 5, 2017

      The Graduate Council has completed its review of the **College of Social Work.** The External Review Committee included:

> Grover C. Gilmore, PhD
> Professor of Psychology and Social Work
> Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Dean in Applied Social Sciences
> Case Western University
>
> Lynn Videka, PhD
> Collegiate Professor and Dean
> School of Social Work
> University of Michigan
>
> Luis Zayas, PhD
> Dean and Robert Lee Sutherland Chair in Mental Health and Social Policy
> School of Social Work
> University of Texas at Austin

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

> Marissa L. Diener, PhD
> Associate Professor
> Department of Family and Consumer Studies
>
> Julie M. Metos, PhD
> Assistant Professor
> Department of Nutrition and Integrative Physiology
>
> Kent A, Ono, PhD
> Professor and Chair
> Department of Communication

This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study submitted by the College of Social Work, the reports of the external and internal review committees, the OBIA profile, and responses to the external and internal reports from the Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Social Work.

COLLEGE PROFILE

Program Overview

The mission of the College of Social Work (hereinafter the "CSW") is to shape "social institution policies, services, and interventions to prevent and alleviate human suffering; enhance individual, family, community, and global well-being; and promote social and economic justice." This mission is achieved through "preparation of students for social work practice; contributing to the development of social work knowledge through research and practice intervention; active service to the community." The CSW is a one-department college that offers three degree programs: a BSW, an MSW and a PhD, and a joint MSW degree with Public Health MS, JD, and Public Administration MS. The CSW offers three certificate programs: a Certificate in Social Justice Advocacy, an Interdisciplinary Graduate Certificate in Women's Health, and the Substance Use Disorder Treatment Training Certificate (SUDTTC). The CSW also offers a continuing education program--The Professional and Community Education (PACE) Program—that encompasses the SUDTTC Program, Social Service Worker (SSW) Licensure coursework and a Case Management Certificate Program. There are also three centers/institutes housed with the CSW: the Center for Research on Migration and Refugee Integration, the Utah Criminal Justice Center, and the Social Research Institute. The CSW has very recently hired a new Dean (Dr. Martell Teasley) after the 2015 retirement of Dr. Jannah Mather. Dr. Hank Liese served as the interim Dean during this time. The CSA faculty ranks are comprised of 21 tenure-line faculty, 23 full- or part-time career-line faculty and adjunct/contract faculty who are paid per course (6) or are uncompensated (4).

The CSW has significant undergraduate and master's teaching missions in addition to being the only social work PhD program in the state. The size of the MSW program, its community-based and field practice foci, and economic importance to the CSW demands a large portion of CSW attention and resources. While the self-study lists seven areas of second-year concentrations in the MSW program, both external and internal reviews note that the CSW essentially offers generalist preparation across all three curricular levels, and could be more focused on offering specialization areas as a way to build national reputation and establish a clear identity. The centers and institute housed within the CSW are significant resources, although the internal reviewers report that faculty see these as more focused on serving the needs of the University and the outside community rather than the CSW itself. The size, scope and involvement of CSW programs, services and the centers and Institute housed therein led reviewers to identify "dispersion" as a challenge faced by the CSW and they noted the potential for greater integration. Despite this, the CSW consistently and effectively delivers high quality education, programming, and services to students and to community stakeholders.

The current strategic plan for the CSW identifies four goals, informed by the University of Utah's mission statement and the American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare Grand Challenges: 1) Educate and empower CSW students to effect social change and transform lives; 2) Create and apply new knowledge in partnership with CSW stakeholders; 3) Promote and sustain health and supportive environments for students, faculty, staff and communities; 4) Enhance relationships with CSW stakeholders to ensure long-term viability of the CSW and regularly evaluate and continuously enhance and retain capacity to be relevant and respond to emerging trends. Each of these goals has multiple associated objectives.

External reviewers note that the strategic planning process of the CSW has spanned a number of years, and is still moving toward developing a clear, action- and future-oriented focus due to difficulties in "coming to closure" and defining specific actions to meet stated goals. CSW faculty are hoping that the new Dean will help move forward and ground this process.

The self-study documentation and external and internal reviews note that most of the recommendations of the 2010 CSW review regarding numbers of tenure-line faculty development, sustainability of BSW program funding, integration of BSW, MSW and PhD faculty, addressing student perceptions of program rigor and grade inflation, and optimizing structures to support faculty governance have been met in full or in part. Two previous recommendations are still largely unachieved (competitive funding packages for PhD students, and school-wide assessment of PhD student outcomes).

Faculty

At the time of the self-study, the faculty consisted of 21 tenured and tenure-track faculty, 23 career-line faculty and 10 adjunct/contract faculty who are typically social work practitioners. Of the tenure-line faculty, 7 are full professors, 7 associate professors, and 6 are assistant professors (one faculty is currently counted as both an instructor and as a tenure-line faculty because she will be promoted once she completes her dissertation). Twelve tenure-line faculty identify as female, 9 as male; 16 identify as white, 1 as Native American, 1 as international African, 1 as international Asian, 1 as Hispanic, and 1 as Asian-Latina. Among career-line faculty, 9 identify as female and 12 as male and 1 did not indicate a gender; 20 identified as white, 1 as Asian American, 1 as Native American, and 1 as Hispanic. Six adjunct faculty identified as female and 4 as male; 6 identified as white, 1 as Malaysian, and 3 as Asian. In summary, 60% of tenure-track and 65% of career-line and adjunct faculty are female and 23% of tenure-track, career-line and adjunct faculty identified as members of underrepresented racial and ethnic groups. The self-study states that 4 of the assistant professors, 1 of the associate professors and none of the full professors are minorities, and benchmarks the program's racial and ethnic diversity (18%) against the national average in schools of social work (31%) as reported by the 2015 Council on Social Work Education Statistical Report. Since the last review, faculty representing diversity have left the CSW and there has been a concerted effort to replace them and to increase diversity through new faculty hires. Specific plans and steps to support these efforts include the University's Office for Equity and Diversity training for faculty hiring committee members, advertising in venues that reach diverse audiences, personal outreach efforts, use of University diversity funding, and a joint appointment with the Division of Ethnic Studies. Notably, the new Dean (hired since the self-study) is also a member of an underrepresented group.

Average student evaluation ratings for CSW course and faculty assessments have remained stable at 5.2/6 since the last review. Individual course and instructor SETI ratings and student comments included in the appendices of the self-study support a positive assessment of CSW faculty teaching. The external reviewers noted that career-line faculty appear to have the heaviest teaching load because they not only teach didactic courses but also serve as faculty field advisors for students engaged in internships. A peer-teaching review process will also be included as part of the RPT review for faculty beginning 2017.

There has been a substantial increase in faculty productivity in research and scholarly output since the last review, due in part to a successful incentive program instituted in 2013 in which funds are deposited into faculty development accounts for peer-reviewed journal submissions and acceptances and grant submissions. The CSW ranks #18 among 131 benchmark institutions in total citations, #19 in books published, and #34 in journal articles published. Grant submissions and awards have also increased significantly,

supported by a federal grant writing workshop implemented by the Associate Dean for Research, course buy-out to allow faculty time to focus on grant writing, and increased infrastructure to support pre- and post-award activities. In 2016 CSW faculty were awarded 22 new grants, compared with 7 in 2010. The CSW hired its first postdoctoral student in 2016, supported through grant funding. External reviewers note that a dual focus on bringing faculty programs of research into greater alignment with the missions and activities of the centers and institute while also translating the work conducted therein into products for scholarly dissemination could increase both funding potential and scholarly output.

Despite the significant increase in research and scholarship productivity noted since the last review, newer faculty –particularly at the Assistant Professor level—still feel the need for more guidance and support to maintain a level of productivity consistent with tenure and R1 standards. Reviewers noted that a more effective mentoring program was needed for assistant professors, with a specific suggestion being that one or several senior faculty (e.g., a "development committee") offer career guidance and support. This could be augmented by workload adjustments that provide time and space for junior faculty to engage in projects that strengthen their portfolio for promotion and tenure.

Students

According to the self-study, in spring 2016, 260 students were enrolled in the BSW program The college profile provided by the Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis indicates that in 2015-2016, 318 MSW and 35 PhD students were enrolled. While there have been some fluctuations, overall enrollment is fairly consistent with the size of these programs at the last review. Diversity among undergraduate and graduate students, however, has increased since the last review. In 2016, 35% of BSW students and 24% of graduate students identified as racial or ethnic minorities compared with 24% and 18% in 2010, respectively. This increase in student diversity was supported by the 2009 appointment of a Diversity Coordinator in the CSW and associated admissions, outreach and diversity initiatives.

Financial aid is an ongoing concern for students in every program, but is particularly problematic in the doctoral program, which relies on competitive financial aid packages to attract highly qualified students. For BSW and MSW students, the average amount of debt at graduation is increasing, and these increases are not offset by starting salaries for social workers. This is despite recent increases in scholarships and donor funds. Title IV-E funding comprises 62% of the funding available to BSW and MSW students engaged in training to work with children, while students with other foci have a smaller funding pool. It is difficult to attract highly qualified doctoral students when the packages offered by other programs far outstrip what the CSW currently offers. Other programs are able to offer more money for longer time periods with no work requirements, while the CSW requires that all incoming doctoral students work as RAs in order to qualify for aid. As a result, desirable students admitted to the CSW are accepting other offers with better aid packages. External reviewers also highlighted how the capacity to attract and retain promising doctoral students would have a positive impact on the research and scholarly output of faculty, and is ultimately necessary for the CSW to operate at the same level as other programs of social work in R1 universities. There is a highly synergistic relationship between PhD student quality and faculty productivity; being able to attract and retain the best and brightest PhD students would also invigorate faculty research and productivity.

Morale is positive among BSW students, who are generally happy with their educational and clinical experiences. Among graduate students, morale and student perceptions are more mixed. MSW students expressed satisfaction while also citing numerous tracks and modes of program delivery, limited choice in practicum placements, and integration between practicum coordinators and practicum sites as concerns.

Time to degree completion, a concern noted in the 2010 Graduate Council review, actually increased among PhD students: According to the self-study, in AY 2010-2011 average time to doctoral degree completion was 11.39 semesters, and in 2015-2016 it was 13.75 semesters. Slower progression and limited on-campus interaction for students in the technology-enhanced PhD program, curricular changes, and lack of previous research experience in a program that expects autonomy were cited as particular concerns for PhD students, as were gaps in statistical and quantitative coursework to support dissertation research and lack of individualized faculty mentorship.

Curriculum

The BSW and MSW programs are accredited by the Council on Social Work Education, indicating rigorous standards. The BSW program follows a standard generalist model of undergraduate social work education and is offered in both on-campus and online (asynchronous) formats. The BSW curriculum includes 51 credits of coursework and a 450-hour field practicum, and is one of only 4 BSW programs in the state. The online BSW program, introduced in 2014, is one of only 16 such programs in the US. Notable aspects of the BSW program include student satisfaction, small class sizes, and faculty mentoring and student support services. While the 450-hour practicum is currently configured as a capstone occurring after completion of coursework, the external review team suggested that CSW faculty consider adjusting the curriculum to integrate clinical experiences while students are in coursework. This would allow for direct application of concepts while they are being learned.

The MSW program requires 60 credit hours, including fieldwork that is incorporated throughout the coursework. Core courses are completed the first year, and during the second-year students focus on at least one area of concentration (aging, child welfare, forensic social work, global social work, health, mental health, substance use and abuse). Students must also take a practice class in one area of specialization other than their primary concentration. The MSW program is offered through 6 different delivery methods: 1) a traditional 2-year full-time on-campus program; 2) a 3-year part-time evening program; 3) a 3-year part-time distance education program in St. George; 4) an MSW for Utah's Department of Human Services Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) employees; 5) an MSW DCFS distance education program; and 6) a 45-credit-hour program for students with a BSW from an accredited program. The MSW is one of 3 accredited programs in Utah. The internal review notes that "there are a number of other MSW programs in the state" competing for students, resulting in small cohorts for some of the delivery modalities and a diffusion of resources and attention across cohorts, sites and delivery methods. Faculty expressed concern about uneven quality of equipment and proctoring across distance education sites.

The PhD program requires 50 credit hours across 10 core courses, electives and dissertation credits. The program is delivered on campus. The Technology-Enhanced Doctoral Program (TED) is currently on hold. Student-identified needs for more quantitatively-oriented coursework and research support were noted above.

Previous reviews raised the issue of lack of coherence or connection across these different curricula and programs, stemming from the fact that tenure-line faculty tend to teach only in the graduate program, while career-line faculty were concentrated in the undergraduate program. The CSW has made progress toward more integration of faculty from both tracks across programs with more tenured and tenure-track faculty teaching BSW students, and joint elective offerings for BSW and MSW students. There is more room for greater integration at the level of organizational structure and faculty governance.

Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment

Expected leaning outcomes for the BSW, MSW and PhD programs are posted at http://learningoutcomes.utah.edu/department-program/63. The same webpage, however, displays dead links (without content) for the CSW certificate programs. It is unclear whether these exist but are not posted, or whether they are yet to be developed.

The self-study presents a thorough accounting of methods for assessing and evaluating the BSW program. The Social Work Education Assessment Project (SWEAP) is a comprehensive, standardized and widely-used tool that allows for comparisons with 300 other BSW programs nationally. Other methods of assessment include a field placement performance tool, course-based assessments, program satisfaction, employer/supervisor evaluation, and state licensure examination outcomes. An instructor strengths inventory is also being developed. Changes that have been made during this review period as a result of these evaluation methods include changing the number of sections in courses, hiring an MSW prepared student advisor, less expensive textbook options, the addition of new courses, and modification of course content.

The MSW program evaluation process seems less well-developed, which was also noted as an issue in the last review. Despite this, the CSW has undertaken specific assessment and evaluation steps and appears to be moving toward more systematic review methods. An MSW curricular review occurred in AY 2014-2015 (Appendix M of self-study). Field instructors are surveyed regarding student competencies and readiness for practice. MSW faculty are also developing the Multi-Dimensional Curriculum Instrument (MCDI). The MCDI measures competencies throughout the program via case-based scenarios and questions similar to national licensure examination, with separate assessments for generalists and specialists. This instrument, based on the 9 core competencies of the 2008 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS), was slated to be piloted spring and summer terms 2017. While this instrument is innovative, internal reviewers urged MSW faculty to consider a cost-benefit assessment regarding timely assessment and effort to develop this tool vs. gathering information through extant data, and the need to collect data regarding post-graduation outcomes via alumni and employers.

The PhD program is evaluated by program faculty based on GPA, papers presented and published, and informal review of student progression. Both external and internal reviewers noted a lack of more comprehensive and systematic methods for tracking PhD student program and post-graduation outcomes, especially given the fact that average time to completion increased during the review period.

Results of program assessment and outcome evaluations for BSW and MSW programs are largely positive and indicate effectiveness. BSW students are enthusiastic about their program and feel well-supported. The MSW program suggests some challenges in linking theory and practice in introductory courses as well as classroom and course management issues, with better student ratings for advanced courses, field instructors' positive assessments of MSW readiness and competency, and a degree completion rate of 92%. The PhD program has made curricular changes to enhance research preparation and mentoring and increase scholarships (although, as noted above, financial aid packages remain noncompetitive.)

Facilities and Resources

The CSW is located within two buildings on campus, the original CSW building and the newer Goodwill Humanitarian Building. For now, classroom, office, meeting and lab space is adequate but the buildings are full and would be challenged to accommodate further growth in either student body or faculty research programs. It is likely that additional space will be needed in the next 3-5 years.

Reviewers noted two CSW resources as being exceptional: the Bridge Training Center and the institute and centers. The Bridge Training Center is a space that allows for students to unobtrusively observe live therapy sessions; reviewers note that lately this space is being used more for research purposes (e.g., interviews) than for the originally intended purpose. The Social Research Institute, the Utah Criminal Justice Center, and the more recently established Center for Research on Migration and Refugee Interaction are noted as "tremendous assets" with the potential to be more fully connected with faculty and PhD student research. These centers are engaged in timely and relevant social welfare work, supported by a diverse mix of funding sources, with both national and interdisciplinary collaboration and established connections with key community advisors and stakeholders. At present CSW and center leadership report a disconnect between the center's programs and CSW's research agenda. These resources could be better leveraged by connecting faculty and student research more closely into their activities, and utilizing CSW resources to help support and promote wider dissemination of the centers' products.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The CSW has benefitted from strong leadership, and has been successful in attracting a new Dean with a national reputation who is well respected and well regarded. CSW leadership has developed and implemented programs and practices to support and enhance faculty development and faculty governance, enhance transparency in selecting program leaders, and increase private donations.

2. There is a culture of collegiality, respect and support among faculty, staff and students, and notable progress has been made toward unifying faculty and students across degree and certificate programs.

3. Aspirations to rise in national profile and ranking are being translated into initiatives that have substantially increased faculty productivity in scholarly output and grant applications; this increased productivity is key to attracting and retaining high quality PhD students.

4. The CSW programs and the centers and institute housed therein have strong community connections and provide unparalleled opportunities for faculty and students to engage stakeholders in research and other activities that enhance the social welfare and well-being of the local community, including many underserved groups.

5. The CSW is making strides in increasing the diversity of its students and faculty, and is on trend to continue in this direction. While some percentage of faculty diversity was lost due to retirements and career changes, the CSW has made concerted, specific efforts to recruit and hire diverse faculty and these efforts appear to be paying off. While most diversity is now represented at the Assistant Professor level, continuing along this trajectory means that in due course there will be greater diversity among Associate and Professor ranks. Student diversity in the BSW and MSW programs has increased. The hiring of a Diversity Coordinator and elevation of the role to a full-time position demonstrates commitment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Articulate and implement a compelling vision and action-oriented strategic plan that establishes and markets a clear identity based on unique strengths of their programs, faculty, students and community, and that better leverages extant resources like the centers, institute, and the service provided to DWS and DCFS. Strategic planning should identify key foci for teaching and scholarship, and these should guide hiring and growth.

2. Strive for and incentivize better integration and collaboration between CSW faculty and the institute and centers based in the College. Community connections and resources supported by the centers' structures can be used to promote translational community-based research opportunities while faculty and student skills in scholarship could be tapped to more broadly disseminate center products. Opportunities supported by better integration could also attract PhD students and new faculty.

3. Revitalize the PhD program to address challenges related to recruiting and retaining high-quality PhD students. Systematic methods of tracking time-to-degree and student outcomes are needed to evaluate and guide program changes. Recruiting top applicants will require concerted effort, including the need to recruit nationally through faculty networking and improved, targeted marketing strategies. At present, the financial aid packages available to potential students are not competitive at a national level.

4. Continue to address financial aid for all students, which is an ongoing issue despite increased donor funding for scholarships since the last review. CSW students are taking on considerable debt to complete their programs, and this is not offset by potential earnings for new grads. There is still concern about the financial sustainability of both BSW and MSW programs, which are still reliant to a significant degree on federal funds.

5. Review the range of MSW options to identify efficiencies and consider contracting or modifying delivery accordingly (e.g., run certain options every other year rather than annually; the TED PhD model is already taking this approach). While offering a range of options for earning an MSW enhances flexibility and allows more working students to pursue an MSW, it also appears to be stretching faculty and infrastructure resources. This is particularly problematic when several of the options are delivered with small cohorts. Narrowing or staggering options could also allow the CSW to invest time in updating and upgrading its distance education approach and resources.

6. Improve mentoring and research support for assistant professors. Consider creating formal mechanisms to deliver mentoring, such as assigning a "development committee" and offering workload adjustments to allow time to increase productivity and strengthen tenure portfolios. Underwriting more research time and providing more research infrastructure support would help assistant professors develop their research programs and lead to greater productivity, including grant submissions. One area to explore with administration, according to reviewers, is the current amount of indirect costs returned to the CSW from successful grant applications (15%), which is not in line with national numbers for social work programs in research-intensive institutions.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council:

Kristin G. Cloyes (Chair)
Associate Professor, College of Nursing

Arul Mishra
Professor, Department of Marketing

Sara Hart (Undergraduate Council Representative)
Associate Professor (Clinical), College of Nursing

College Name
College of Social Work

Department Name
All

Program Name
All

Faculty Headcount

		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
With Doctoral Degrees Including MFA and Other Terminal Degrees	Full Time Tenured Faculty	10	10	12	12	11	10	14
	Full Time Tenure Track	7	7	7	8	9	7	6
	Full Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	21	22	22	23	17	21	23
	Part Time Tenure/Tenure Track	2	1	1	1	1	3	2
	Part Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	7	8	7	12	13	12	12
	Total	47	48	49	56	51	53	57
With Masters Degrees	Full Time Tenured Faculty	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Full Time Tenure Track	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Full Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	2	2	2	3	3	2	2
	Part Time Tenure/Tenure Track	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Part Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total	2	2	2	3	3	2	2
With Bachelor Degrees	Full Time Tenured Faculty	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Full Time Tenure Track	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Full Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Part Time Tenure/Tenure Track	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Part Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Headcount Faculty	Full Time Tenured Faculty	10	10	12	12	11	10	14
	Full Time Tenure Track	7	7	7	8	9	7	6
	Full Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	23	24	24	26	20	23	25
	Part Time Tenure/Tenure Track	2	1	1	1	1	3	2
	Part Time Career Line/Adjunct Faculty	7	8	7	12	13	12	12
	Total	49	50	51	59	54	55	59

Cost Study

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Direct Instructional Expenditures	5,040,526	4,917,605	5,148,639	5,920,135	6,193,938	6,236,643	6,909,741
Cost Per Student FTE	8,002	7,248	7,397	8,071	9,242	9,316	9,869

FTE from Cost Study

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Full-Time Salaried	31	31	36	37	35	34	16
Part-Time or Auxiliary Faculty	4	5	4	6	5	5	37
Teaching Assistants	2	1	3	1	2	2	1

Funding

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Total Grants	2,966,612	2,673,952	3,171,453	4,077,921	4,435,513	4,123,940	4,375,776
State Appropriated Funds	3,485,681	3,484,428	3,635,158	3,860,151	4,135,823	4,644,859	4,883,930
Teaching Grants	1,985,173	1,435,998	1,653,852	2,398,352	2,092,433	1,679,488	2,067,792
Special Legislative Appropriation*							
Differential Tuition*							

Student Credit Hours and FTE

		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
SCH	Lower Division	867	993	837	696	552	591	588
	Upper Division	3,133	3,714	4,595	4,752	4,398	4,575	4,604
	Basic Graduate	9,515	9,831	9,594	10,485	9,660	9,634	10,213
	Advanced Graduate	417	601	706	554	444	312	329
FTE	Lower Division	29	33	28	23	18	20	20
	Upper Division	104	124	153	158	147	152	153
	Basic Graduate	476	492	480	524	483	482	511
	Advanced Graduate	21	30	35	28	22	16	16
FTE/FTE	LD FTE per Total Faculty FTE	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
	UD FTE per Total Faculty FTE	3	3	4	4	4	4	3
	BG FTE per Total Faculty FTE	14	13	12	12	12	12	10
	AG FTE per Total Faculty FTE	1	1	1	1	1	0	0

Enrolled Majors

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Undergraduate Pre-Majors	96	112	103	100	77	80	97
Undergraduate Majors	116	122	141	144	128	132	138
Enrolled in Masters Program	327	339	329	334	308	305	318
Enrolled in Doctoral Program	35	45	49	43	37	30	35
Enrolled in First Professional Program							

Degrees Awarded

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Undergraduate Certificate			6	9			
Graduate Certificate							
Bachelors	56	67	65	91	81	81	63
Masters	147	173	184	224	186	179	176
Doctorate	6	4	6	10	6	8	5
First-Professional							

Memorandum of Understanding
College of Social Work
Graduate Council Review 2016-17

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on November 2, 2017, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the College of Social Work (CSW). Ruth V. Watkins, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Martell Teasley, Dean of the College of Social Work; Mary Jane Taylor, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the College of Social Work; David B. Kieda, Dean of the Graduate School; and Katharine S. Ullman, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the review summary report presented to the Graduate Council on September 5, 2017. The working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1: Articulate and implement a compelling vision and action-oriented strategic plan that establishes and markets a clear identity based on unique strengths of their programs, faculty, students and community, and that better leverages extant resources like the centers, institute, and the service provided to DWS and DCFS. Strategic planning should identify key foci for teaching and scholarship, and these should guide hiring and growth.

Strategic planning is well underway, integrating both college-level and area-specific plans. Dean Teasley indicated that progress on these pieces will be revisited in Spring semester and the overall process is on track to culminate in a finalized plan by July 2018. As is stated in this recommendation, one big picture element of this planning process is determining a core identity that capitalizes on CSW strengths and differentiates the College at a national level. Accompanying this are efforts to align strengths within CSW and the centers it houses to support a robust research effort (see Recommendation 2). The strategic plan will delve into educational goals as well (see Recommendations 3-5). Dean Kieda mentioned that a useful exercise to accompany strategic planning can be to assess where funding for the College comes from now and where it would ideally come from. A comprehensive marketing plan will also go hand-in-hand with raising the profile of the College and is a priority for Dean Teasley. He discussed the creation of electronic newsletters focused on research and innovation that are being distributed at a local and national level, among other efforts in this area. SVP Watkins pointed out that his position as President of the National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work itself makes a very positive contribution to the College's profile.

Recommendation 2. Strive for and incentivize better integration and collaboration between CSW faculty and the institute and centers based in the College. Community connections and resources supported by the centers' structures can be used to promote translational community-based research opportunities while faculty and student skills in scholarship could be tapped to more broadly disseminate center products. Opportunities supported by better integration could also attract PhD students and new faculty.

To capitalize on the potential for research that these resources provide, Dean Teasley has been actively seeking to integrate faculty into the activity of the institute and centers. This has been through creating formal affiliation of faculty with these entities, as well as through simple but meaningful mechanisms such as lunch-time gatherings to promote collaboration. In a complementary fashion, he plans to implement research (publication) standards and merit pay as an incentive for research faculty with positions within institute/centers. Dean Teasley also mentioned his intention that open positions in the institute/centers would be nationally advertised as a way to bring in new perspective and augment diversity. In written comments, a recently instituted policy was described that requires PhD students working within institute/centers to work on projects intended for publication in peer-reviewed scientific journals. Incorporating the vision for integration and collaboration into the strategic plan is likely to further galvanize faculty and staff to creatively disrupt silos and identify additional practices that leverage strength in community outreach to support academic research. The College may also find opportunities for broader collaboration; for instance, there may be ways to partner with the College of Education where there is ongoing interest in determining what interventions and activities in the community help put youth on a successful path to college.

Recommendation 3. Revitalize the PhD program to address challenges related to recruiting and retaining high-quality PhD students. Systematic methods of tracking time-to-degree and student outcomes are needed to evaluate and guide program changes. Recruiting top applicants will require concerted effort, including the need to recruit nationally through faculty networking and improved, targeted marketing strategies. At present, the financial aid packages available to potential students are not competitive at a national level.

The College has made improvements to outcomes tracking that they will continue to build on and use to inform the evolution of their graduate programs. They have also recently improved infrastructure by renovating a doctoral education room. This modernization includes improved technology for content delivery to both on-site and distance participants, enabling a new, synchronous distance education component, which in turn allows broader recruitment of top candidates. Improving financial aid packages remains very important to address, with external reviewers emphasizing the importance of both a competitive level of funding and at least a 4-year commitment. Since the cohort size is not big enough to make a trade-off of fewer positions for better packages, the group discussed other routes of increasing student support with the goal of attracting and retaining a high-quality cohort. One strategy to increase funds that can be deployed to bolster the PhD program is to develop an online MSW program, which has the added benefit of expanding the reach of the College. Dean Teasley has begun to explore this option with Cory Stokes in the University's

UOnline office and expressed his appreciation for this in-house resource. The group also discussed issues with differential tuition, which often presents a financial barrier for doctoral students. Waiving differential tuition in the form of a scholarship, at least in some instances, would likely have a beneficial effect for a relatively small financial loss. The College has the autonomy to make this type of adjustment, but would need to be sure to do so with the advice of financial administration to determine the best process.

Recommendation 4. Continue to address financial aid for all students, which is an ongoing issue despite increased donor funding for scholarships since the last review. CSW students are taking on considerable debt to complete their programs, and this is not offset by potential earnings for new grads. There is still concern about the financial sustainability of both BSW and MSW programs, which are still reliant to a significant degree on federal funds.

First, the College is commended for its success in raising funds for scholarships, partnering with ARUP for scholarships, and securing Title-IVE funding to support students. Dean Teasley noted that Lisa Himonas, Assistant Dean for Development, is providing very strong leadership in this area. Yet, increased effort is planned in development, with the recognition that untapped potential remains for raising funds to support training in this area, which aligns so tightly with the ideals and needs of Utah citizens. To this end, Dean Teasley is planning to tour the state to meet alumni, as well as others who can be brought into a network of potential donors. Laying this groundwork is critical, both for immediate priorities, such as scholarships, and longer-term priorities, such as increasing College space. In specific cases, barriers exist to using resources on hand; in particular, the College has an endowment for Native Americans but has found it difficult to recruit in this area. If outreach efforts were to reach this population, this would be a tremendous success on multiple fronts. Future updates to the Graduate School will be an opportunity to report on the growth of the donor network and development more generally, as well as reporting on how resources are put to use.

Recommendation 5. Review the range of MSW options to identify efficiencies and consider contracting or modifying delivery accordingly (e.g., run certain options every other year rather than annually; the TED PhD model is already taking this approach). While offering a range of options for earning an MSW enhances flexibility and allows more working students to pursue an MSW, it also appears to be stretching faculty and infrastructure resources. This is particularly problematic when several of the options are delivered with small cohorts. Narrowing or staggering options could also allow the CSW to invest time in updating and upgrading its distance education approach and resources.

Adaptability and flexibility in delivery and degree options is important, but it is recognized that honing down the number of these options will also be key to the College's success. These issues are very much under scrutiny, with several changes underway or under consideration in the context of a more complete review of curriculum. The College has successfully integrated faculty with undergraduate and graduate teaching responsibilities, which will help them plan this efficiently. The group discussed the range of concentrations

offered in the second year of the MSW program and innovative solutions being considered to consolidate offerings to a number optimized for the size of the student – and faculty – pool. An additional concern is the uneven distribution of students among topics, with the Mental Health concentration being disproportionately popular. Here, Associate Dean Taylor indicated that one option being discussed is to remove the Mental Health concentration, and weave the topic of Community Mental Health through the curriculum in all concentrations. At the other end, the concentration in Aging is not well-subscribed yet is highly germane to future trends at the local and national level. Here, "marketing" the benefits of this expertise to students may be a strategy to take. There is also college-wide discussion of ways to more consistently provide students with a "macro" perspective that is needed in balance with a focus on clinical licensure in order for graduates to contribute to much-needed solutions at a broad, system-wide level. Finally, identifying signature niches of the College through the strategic planning process will help in prioritizing educational, as well as research, goals.

Recommendation 6. Improve mentoring and research support for assistant professors. Consider creating formal mechanisms to deliver mentoring, such as assigning a "development committee" and offering workload adjustments to allow time to increase productivity and strengthen tenure portfolios. Underwriting more research time and providing more research infrastructure support would help assistant professors develop their research programs and lead to greater productivity, including grant submissions. One area to explore with administration, according to reviewers, is the current amount of indirect costs returned to the CSW from successful grant applications (15%), which is not in line with national numbers for social work programs in research-intensive institutions.

Incoming faculty get course releases and development funds. Associate Dean Taylor facilitates a mentorship program in which new faculty choose a mentor; however, to make this more effective, she noted that explicit duties for mentors may need to be articulated. The Associate Dean for Research in the College of Social Work, Dr. Eric Garland, has invigorated grant-writing efforts by running a grant-writing class for faculty and doctoral students. The group discussed other resources on campus that could supplement these mentoring activities -- specifically, the Grant Writing Academy workshops sponsored by the Office of the Vice President for Research and the Associate Vice President for Research Integrity, the Vice President's Clinical & Translational (VPCAT) Research Scholars Program (although based on the Health campus, faculty across campus with a focus on securing funding from the National Institutes of Health have participated), and a Faculty Fellows program available for faculty pursuing major foundation awards. It may also be useful to look at other mentoring models on campus. For instance, in the College of Humanities a cadre of new faculty meet as a group with one senior faculty for directed mentorship. These ideas are intended as avenues that might complement, not replace, current efforts, as the College develops a comprehensive mentoring system, tailored to the needs of their faculty. Importantly, the Dean's written response also reports that RPT guidelines are being revised, particularly with respect to standards for teaching and research. These are anticipated to be implemented in Fall 2018. The level of returned indirect

costs is not an issue possible to resolve in the context of a one-hour wrap-up meeting, but a more thorough analysis of national, peer institution numbers in Social Work would provide a starting point for continued conversation with the SVP on this topic.

SVP Watkins concluded by thanking Dean Teasley and Associate Dean Taylor for the time and effort they and their faculty have put into the 7-year Program Review, and she further stressed her appreciation for the work that has already been done in response to feedback received during this process. Clearly, many great things are happening and all were excited about the trajectory from here.

This memorandum of understanding is to be followed by regular letters of progress, upon request of the Graduate School, from the Dean of the College of Social Work. Letters will be submitted until all of the actions described in the preceding paragraphs have been completed. In addition, a three-year follow-up meeting may be scheduled during AY 2019-20 to discuss progress made in addressing the review recommendations.

Ruth V. Watkins
Martell Teasley   _____
Mary Jane Taylor   David B. Kieda
David B. Kieda   Dean, The Graduate School
Katharine S. Ullman   November 29, 2017