

**Council on Social Work Education
Commission on Accreditation**

**Site Visit Report
MSW Program**

Program Visited Name: Arizona State University
 Program Visited State: Arizona
 Program Level(s) visited: MSW and BSW
 Date of Site Visit: February 10-11, 2016

Site Visitor(s) Names: Emiko A. Tajima (MSW Chairperson)
 Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
 University of Washington
 School of Social Work
 4101 15th Avenue, NE
 Seattle, WA 98105

(BSW site visitor)
 Freddie L. Avant, Ph.D., M.S.W.
 Director & Associate Dean
 Stephen F. Austin State University
 School of Social Work
 P.O. Box 6104, SFA Station
 NACOGDOCHES, TX 75965-6967

We want to thank the faculty, students and administration of Arizona State University and the School of Social Work for welcoming us and sharing their insights about the MSW program. Their attentiveness to our needs during the visit enabled us to focus on our site visit work.

The site visit schedule is shown below (shaded):

Wednesday, February 10, 2016

TIME	ACTIVITY	PARTICIPANTS	LOCATION
8:15am	Walk over to the School of Social Work	Michelle Carney will meet team in the Westin Lobby	Westin
8:30-9:00am	College Overview	Review Team, Dean, Jonathan Koppell & Director	750
9:15-10:15am	Meeting - BSW Curriculum	Dr. Avant, BSW Coordinator Cecilia Ayon & Director	819
9:15-10:15am	Meeting - MSW Curriculum	Dr. Tajima, MSW Coordinator Barbara Klimek & Associate Director for Curriculum and Instruction Robin Bonifas	880N

10:15-10:30am	Break	Review Team	819
10:30am	Car service to Tempe	Review Team, Dean & Director	
11:00-12:00pm	Meeting - ASU Leadership	Review Team, President, Michael Crow, Executive Vice President and University Provost, Mark Searle, Interim Dean for Graduate Education and University Accreditation Officer, Andrew Webber, Dean & Director	President's Conf. Room
12:15pm	Car service to Downtown	Review Team, Dean & Director	
12:45- 1:45pm	Working Lunch	Review Team, SSW Community Advisory Board (6 members & 2 staff)	480A
2:00-2:30pm	Meeting - Student Instructional/ Tech Support	Review Team, Associate Dean, Cindy Lietz & Jon Pratt, Director of Education Innovation	819
2:30 - 3:15pm	Meeting - Student Support	Review Team, Manager, Student and Academic Services, Laura Orr & Director	819
3:30-4:15pm	Meeting – SSW Budget and Review of the day	Review Team & Director	819
4:30-5:30	Review Team Discussion	Review Team Only	819

Thursday, February 11, 2016

TIME	ACTIVITY	PARTICIPANTS	LOCATION
8:45am	Walk over to the School of Social Work	Michelle Carney will meet team in the Westin Lobby	Westin
9:00-10:00am	Meeting – SSW Center and Office Directors	Review Team & Center/Office Directors (Ayon, Becerra, Gonzalez-Santin, Kennedy, Klimek, Krysik, Shafer)	819
10:00-11:00am	Meeting – Faculty and Lecturers	Review Team, Faculty & Lecturers (Androff, Anthony, Bonifas, Ferguson-Colvin, Mendoza, Rounds, Valderrama, Zorita)	819
11:00-11:30pm	Meeting – Field Education	Review Team, Field Manager, Lilly Perez-Freerks & Director	819
11:30-12:00pm	Review Team Discussion	Review Team Only	

12:00-1:00pm	Lunch	Review Team & Students (AISWSA, SWSO, InQUEERy, Phi Alpha)	819
1:00-1:30pm	Exit Meeting	Review Team & Participants from previous meetings (Ayon, Bonifas, Carney, Hodge, Klimek, Oh, Orr, Perez-Freerks)	819
1:30pm	Car service to Tempe	Review Team	
2:00-3:00pm	Exit Meeting - ASU Leadership	Review Team, Executive Vice President and University Provost, Mark Searle & Director	Fulton 4211
3:15pm	Car service to Sky Harbor Airport	Review Team Only	

1. Write a brief summary of the conversation on general questions regarding: program mission and goals (AS 1.0), diversity (AS 3.1), and assessment (AS 4.0).

a. Program mission and goals (AS 1.0)

The mission and goals were discussed with a range of administrators at the School of Social Work (SSW) and University as well as with members of the faculty, students, and with community advisory board members. The consistent theme that resonated from these conversations related to social justice, respect for human diversity, and empowering students, clients, families, organizations and communities. The faculty discussed the critical importance of preparing social work practitioners that are competent to engage in generalist practice. Furthermore, we were struck with how central the SSW is to the mission of the University, as described by the President and others. For example, the President described how the University embraces the notion of being “applied” and social work is a leader as an applied discipline, committed to the public good and to community outcomes. With its mission so closely aligned with the University mission, the President described the SSW as being a “core School in a core College.” In fact, he stated that social work is so critical “if we did not have one, we would build one”.

Similarly, the Dean of the College of Public Service and Community Engagement, which houses the School of Social Work further underscored the value of the MSW program. The Dean described the MSW Social Work Program as being a leader for all the Schools within the College, especially given social work field learning pedagogy. Specifically, he stated the social work program’s focus on enriching the environments for others supports the program and college mission. The school advisory committee discussed the importance of creating social solutions, community engagement and changing lives. Additionally, they discussed the role of the academic programs in preparing competent social workers and the positive impact they are making in the community.

b. Diversity (AS 3.1)

Diversity was discussed with administrators at each level, as well as with faculty and students. Administrators and faculty spoke to diversity on a range of social identities. The President spoke about creating an environment that respects and values differences. Specifically, he mentioned the importance of “inclusion not exclusion”. The Dean of the College pointed out that the faculty of the social work program is the most diverse program on a campus that is remarkable for its diversity. The President shared that 46% of students are students of color. The President and Provost described the University’s commitment to diversity among students and faculty, noting that 30% of new tenure-track hires are faculty of color. The institution is also making progress on gender equity in the faculty composition.

Faculty in the MSW program also discussed the significant number of students of color in their program. Additionally, they commented on their curriculum design with the integration of diversity content in their program. The field director described the diverse nature of their field placements and the ability to work with diverse populations. The faculty also described their commitment to work and expand opportunities to work with diverse groups through research and service. Similarly, students in the MSW program are able to be involved with many of the school research centers that focused on working with diverse populations. There are also student groups that represent the diverse nature of the students in the program. The students themselves mentioned the diversity of the student body and the importance of a focus on diversity related to ethnicity but also other types of diversity.

c. Assessment (AS4.0)

Assessment was discussed with faculty, administrators and students. The President of the University indicated that assessment was not only necessary but important to improving the university. His perspective was supported by other administrators. The MSW Program described its assessment plan for assessing competencies and foundation and advanced practice behaviors in the preparation of professional social workers. Additionally, the faculty described its assessment plan and the process of using data from a combination of field performance evaluations, classroom assignment grades and graduating student surveys to assess mastery of competencies and to inform changes in the curriculum. The faculty provided specific examples of curriculum and program changes that have occurred and changes that are scheduled for the future. Some of the changes identified included course revisions and the development of new courses. We also met with a group of fifteen (15) students on campus and several on a conference call from the social work program’s Tucson location. The students were very articulate and discussed their concerns about the ability to provide input in the assessment process and bring

about change in the program. Some of their concerns related to content in the curriculum and the field placement process. The students also discussed strengths of the program and the potential opportunities for improvement.

2. List each accreditation standard and question raised by the COA in its *Letter of Instruction* with a thorough discussion of findings for each.

Accreditation Standard M2.0.4: The program provides an operational definition for each of the competencies used in its curriculum design and its assessment [EP 2.1 through 2.1.10(d); EP M2.2].

The program provides operational definition for each of the competencies through the practice behaviors but it does not, according to EP M2.2, define practice behaviors specific to each of the two concentrations.

The site visitor is asked to have the program define the practice behaviors specific to each concentration.

The program demonstrated that advanced practice behaviors specific to each concentration are taught in the curriculum, through a combination of advanced practice courses, rigorous concentration-specific integrative seminars and through advanced field learning activities. It is apparent to the site visitors that advanced practice behaviors in the form of advanced knowledge, values and skills are defined in course syllabi and assignments and are defined in the advanced field learning contract. The program indicated that the curriculum is designed to build directly upon the foundation practice behaviors with knowledge, values and skills at an advanced level and specific to each concentration. The program identified measures used to assess practice behaviors at the advanced level.

The site visitors discussed advanced practice behaviors for each concentration with faculty, students, administrators and with Field instructors on the Community Advisory Board. All articulated that advanced practice behaviors -- distinct from foundation practice behaviors -- are the focus of students learning activities at the advanced (concentration) level. Faculty teaching in the Advanced Direct Practice (ADP) and Policy, Administration and Community (PAC) concentrations discussed advanced practice behaviors that operationalize each of the core competencies. For example, the ADP faculty discussed their emphasis on specialized knowledge, at a higher level, with greater complexity, greater focus on intervention skills and deeper self-reflection. The PAC faculty spoke of courses and assignments designed to prepare advanced students for leadership in the field, greater skill development in collaborative program evaluation and in policy analysis. Those Community Advisory Board members who serve as field supervisors also attested to differential targeted practice behaviors in the field during the advanced year, with separate learning contracts for each of the

concentrations, each defining concentration-specific practice behaviors.

The program indicated that it will compile these defined advanced practice behaviors specific to each of its concentrations in a written response to the site visit report.

Accreditation Standard 3.3.4: The program describes its faculty workload policy and discusses how the policy supports the achievement of institutional priorities and the program's mission and goals.

The program offered its faculty workload policy but did not discuss how the policy supports the achievement of institutional priorities and the master's program's mission and goals.

The site visitor is asked to have the program discuss how the faculty workload policy supports the achievement of institutional priorities and the master's program's mission and goals.

Site Visit Findings:

The program's administrators (MSW Coordinator, Director and Associate Director) discussed with the site visitors how its workload policy supports the achievement of the institution's priorities and the program's mission and goals. The program's administrators discussed that the workload policy recognizes the three (3) roles of faculty including teaching, research and service. The standard workload for ranked full-time faculty is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service, which is the expectation throughout the College. This workload policy underscores that research informs teaching and also acknowledges community collaborations (in service and research) as critical to the institution and MSW program's mission and goals. Further, it was explained that the workload policy allows faculty the flexibility to focus on different areas, initiatives and interests.

The faculty workload policy allows for workload release to support the MSW program's mission and goals and advance the priorities of the institution. For example, the MSW Coordinator has a full-time, 12 month faculty appointment and receives between .50 and .75FTE reduction in her teaching load to fulfill her administrative responsibilities.

Accreditation Standard M3.4.4(c): The program describes the procedures for determining the program director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program. To carry out the administrative functions of the program, a minimum of 50% assigned time is required at the master's level. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.

The program notes that the MSW program coordinator dedicates 100% of her time to the MSW program coordination but it was noted earlier in M3.3.3 that she teaches courses and takes the lead on a course offered to baccalaureate and master's students.

The site visitor is instructed to have the program clarify what percentage of the program director's time is assigned to the administrative functions of the master's program and that the program demonstrate that this time is sufficient.

The MSW Coordinator has a full-time, 12 month faculty appointment dedicated to the MSW program and receives between .50 and .75FTE reduction in her teaching load and a salary particular to her position for fulfilling her administrative responsibilities. The program demonstrated the appropriate release time to provide leadership to the program and affirmed that the assigned time is sufficient. All evidence supported that the release time is indeed sufficient.

Accreditation Standard 3.5.1: The program describes the procedures for budget development and administration it uses to achieve its mission and goals. The program submits the budget form to demonstrate sufficient and stable financial supports that permit program planning and faculty development.

The program describes the procedures for budget development and administration, submits the budget form but does not demonstrate that it is sufficient for master's program planning and faculty development. Additionally, the program's budget form states that 0% hard money is allocated for adjunct faculty.

The site visitor is asked to have the program demonstrate that the budget is sufficient to permit planning and faculty development. The site visitor is also asked to clarify the percentage of the budget that is designated to adjunct faculty.

Site Visit Findings:

The site visitors were informed that 100% of the budget for adjunct faculty is hard money. The MSW program demonstrated that the budget is sufficient to permit MSW Program planning and development. The Director indicated that the program has adequate support for professional development and hiring of adjunct faculty and other faculty as needed to meet the needs of the program. Evidence that the budget is sufficient includes that the program has been able to hire 5 additional adjunct and 4 additional Tenure Track faculty in the last year. Furthermore, the program has additional resources for program enrichment, beyond covering the core areas and as the program has been asked to take on new initiatives, additional resources have been made available.

Accreditation Standard 3.5.2: The program describes how it uses resources to continuously improve the program and address challenges in the program's context.

The program describes how the School of Social Work uses resources to continuously improve the School and address challenges, but it does not describe how the program

uses resources to continuously improve and address challenges in the program's context.

The site visitor is asked to have the program describe how the program uses resources to continuously improve and address challenges in the program's context.

Site Visitor Findings:

Administrators discussed how they use resources to continuously improve the program and address challenges in the program context and provided evidence that the MSW Program has the necessary resources to meet its needs. For example, resources have been devoted to space for activities, to a range of supports for students and faculty, travel for professional development, and resources to support training and field supervision (liaisons and off-site field instructors) and technology. We were given a tour of the facility which revealed adequate space and other resources to support meeting the needs of the program. Instructional design and other technological supports are readily available to the program to meet the changing demands in the program's context. In addition to touring the space resources, the site visitors met with staff that provided technological supports. Moreover, part of the context for the program is the Southwest cultural context with a large Native American population – consequently, resources have gone to enhancements such as offering a new elective and additional module content on the Indian Child Welfare Act to ensure greater understanding of that policy. This was discussed with both administrators and with students.

Accreditation Standard 3.5.3: The program demonstrates sufficient support staff, other personnel, and technological resources to support itself.

The program demonstrates sufficient support staff, other personnel, and technological resources to support the School of Social Work; however, it does not demonstrate the sufficiency for the master's program.

The site visitor is asked to have the program demonstrate that the master's program has sufficient support staff, other personnel, and technological resources to support itself.

Site Visitor Findings:

The site visitors met with support staff and other personnel, including staff that provided technological support. The information revealed and supported discussions with faculty and administrators that sufficient support was available to the MSW Program. For example, IT supports are available to MSW students and faculty at the MSW Program, School, College, and University levels. Training and outreach is conducted with faculty at orientations for new faculty and at faculty meetings. The MSW faculty report excellent customer service with instructional technology. In addition to this range of support staff and technological resources devoted to the MSW program, administrators reported that as need has grown, advisors, other staff,

and tech supports have been added.

Accreditation Standard 4.0.1: The program presents its plan to assess the attainment of its competencies. The plan specifies procedures, multiple measures, and benchmarks to assess the attainment of each of the program's competencies

The program provides a plan to assess the attainment for its foundation level competencies and practice behaviors, however there is not a plan provided to assess the attainment of its competencies at the practice behavior level for each of its concentrations.

The site visitor is asked to have the program provide its plan to assess the attainment of its competencies at the level of the advanced practice behavior for each of the program's concentrations.

The program described its assessment plan for measuring the attainment of competencies at the advanced practice behavior level. The assessment plan includes multiple measures from multiple sources, including field instructor ratings, graduating student self-assessment surveys, and concentration instructor ratings of integrative seminar performance or portfolio synthesis. All of these measures are concentration specific, as the classroom-based ratings are from concentration courses, and field instructor evaluations and student surveys contain measures of advanced practice behaviors specific to either ADP or PAC. For example, "use multidimensional bio-psycho-social-spiritual assessment frameworks," "assess client readiness for change" for ADP students, and "Design or modify a program," "conduct community or agency evaluation" for PAC. The program indicated that it would submit additional materials to further clarify its assessment plan as part of its response to the site visit report.

Accreditation Standard 4.0.2: The program provides summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of its competencies, identifying the percentage of students achieving each benchmark.

The program provides summary data and outcomes for the foundation level competencies, however summary data and outcomes are not provided for competencies at the advanced practice behavior level for each program concentration.

The site visitor is asked to obtain summary data and outcomes for the competency assessment of the program's advanced practice behaviors for each of the program's concentration.

The program provided summary assessment data in the original self-study. Summary data were derived from measures of advanced practice behaviors specific to each concentration as assessed by field instructors, classroom instructors and graduating student surveys.

Accreditation Standard 4.0.3: The program describes the procedures it employs to evaluate the outcomes and their implications for program renewal. It discusses specific changes it has made in the program based on specific assessment outcomes.

Given the clarification requested in AS 4.0.2, revisions to AS 4.0.3 may be warranted.

The MSW program administrators discussed a range of evaluation and assessment activities undertaken to evaluate outcomes and collect input for program revision. The program engages in ongoing evaluation and, although its summary data indicate that the program meets all benchmarks, administrators nonetheless consider curricular revisions in areas where ratings are lower. Specific changes to the program based on competency assessment outcomes include a new course on professionalism and ethics and revised assignments on ethics. Additional skills-based course content has been added to the curriculum based on assessment input and feedback from students. The concentration capstone courses have also been revised to help students better demonstrate their practice skills.

Accreditation Standard 4.0.4: The program uses Form AS 4(B) and/or Form AS 4(M) to report its most recent assessment outcomes to constituents and the public on its website and routinely up-dates (minimally every 2 years) these postings.

Given the clarification requested in AS 4.0.2, revisions to AS 4.0.4 may be warranted.

The program submitted form AS4(M) in its original self-study.

Accreditation Standard 4.0.5: The program appends copies of all assessment instruments used to assess the program competencies.

Given the clarification requested in AS 4.0.1, revisions to AS 4.0.5 may be warranted.

Copies of assessment instruments were appended in the original self-study