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Executive Summary

As a program in the Graduate School at The University of Texas at Austin, the School of Social Work offers two graduate degree programs: the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) and the Master of Science in Social Work (MSSW). The MSSW program began offering classes in fall, 1950, and has awarded over 5,100 MSSW degrees in its sixty plus year history. The first class of students was admitted into the PhD program in social work in 1973, and over 210 PhD degrees have been awarded. Data from the Graduate Student Information System indicated there were 347 full-time students in the MSSW program and 39 full-time students in the Doctoral program in 2012.

Mission
The mission of the School of Social Work is: Through excellence in professional education, research, and service, The University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work provides national leadership to promote social and economic justice, alleviate critical social problems, and enhance human well-being.

Our mission is consistent with the mission of the Graduate School: Dedicated to excellence in original research, teaching, creative expression, and intellectual leadership. Using our extensive resources and talents, we cultivate individuals who work together to bring knowledge, innovation, and best practices to meet the great and small challenges of our time, and consistent with the core purpose of The University: To transform lives for the benefit of society.

Ranking
PhD programs in social work are not provided a national ranking, but the doctoral program at UT benefits from the national ranking of seventh for the MSSW program. US News & World Report ranks CSWE accredited social work master’s programs every four years.

Frameworks for Excellence
We ensure the quality of the PhD program in social work by following the Quality Guidelines for PhD Programs in Social Work provided by the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education in Social Work (GADE). These quality guidelines are not prescriptive but provide the doctoral program with a set of educational practices that guide and enhance our program. Our PhD program currently meets or exceeds the GADE guidelines, including the ones that are considered to be aspirational.

The MSSW program is accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), which uses the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) to accredit baccalaureate and master’s level social work programs. EPAS supports academic excellence by establishing thresholds for professional competence. It permits programs to use traditional and emerging models of curriculum design by balancing requirements that promote comparability across programs with a level of flexibility that encourages programs to differentiate. Our most recent accreditation review was in the fall of 2011.

Competition for Top-Quality Students
The PhD program competes with the top ten nationally ranked programs in social work education for students. The PhD program has the advantage of being housed within the Graduate School of UT, a world-class research one university.

The MSSW program competes with the other ten top-ranked programs for the best students from around the country. Students consistently mention the school’s ranking in their application essays.
The other ten top-ranked schools with whom we compete for students at both the master’s and PhD levels include University of Michigan, Washington University, University of Chicago, University of Washington, Columbia University, University of North Carolina, University of California at Berkeley, Case Western University, and Boston College.

**Program Goals**
The PhD program prepares its graduates to provide intellectual leadership for the social work profession as researchers, educators, and directors of public and private organizations. It has the following primary goals:

- Graduates will become scholars utilizing advanced knowledge and skills to become researchers and academicians at top-ranked Schools of Social Work. (Recent appointments include Washington University, University of Pittsburgh, and University of Southern California.)
- Graduates will develop leadership capacities for critical inquiry, knowledge development, and the dissemination and implementation of knowledge within the social work profession.
- Graduates will develop a specialized area of knowledge related to theories and research methods for specific problem areas and populations so they are prepared to transform knowledge in an area of social work practice.

The MSSW program is designed to educate and graduate social work students who are advanced professional practitioners and are committed to the promotion of social and economic justice, the alleviation of critical social problems, and the enhancement of human well-being. It has the following primary goals:

- Graduates will practice professional social work utilizing advanced knowledge and skills in clinical social work or community and administrative leadership.
- Graduates will develop and apply a commitment to critical inquiry and knowledge acquisition and development.
- Graduates will be able to discuss their understanding of the dynamics of populations at risk and implement social justice strategies to redress inequities and oppression within individual, family, group, community, and organizational contexts.

**Faculty**
The full-time faculty of the School of Social Work is exceptionally well qualified to achieve the MSSW and PhD programs’ goals. Responsibilities of full-time faculty include the design and modification of the curriculum through the School’s curriculum committees, teaching of practice and other social work courses, coordination of agency-based internships, maintenance of program integrity, and evaluation of program outcomes. The full-time faculty is comprised of 29 tenured and tenure-track faculty, 12 non-tenure track clinical faculty, and 4 non-tenure-track Research faculty. In addition, 48 part-time lecturers teach one or two courses per semester in their area of professional expertise. The clinical faculty provides a critical link between the School and the professional community with a special focus on assisting students with integration of theory and practice and enhancing agency-based field instruction. The research faculty secure research funding and manage some of the School’s Research Institutes. They provide mentoring and support for graduate students through their research grants and, in some cases, provide guidance and encouragement to doctoral students when they reach the dissertation stage of the program.

The School’s faculty are widely recognized and highly respected locally, nationally, and internationally for their significant contributions to social work education and the knowledge base of the profession. Social Work faculty have been inducted in the University’s Academy of Distinguished Teachers, selected...
for university-wide teaching awards, and authored popular social work textbooks. Many faculty also hold national leadership positions in professional associations, task forces, and committees. Annually, members of the faculty generate around $18 million in spending authority in grants and contracts from various federal, state, and foundation sources to fund a diverse array of research in areas such as addictions, child welfare, family violence and sexual assault, human trafficking, end-of-life care, restorative justice, mental health services, school-based services, health disparities, poverty in America, immigration reform, suicide prevention, juvenile justice, childhood cancer survivors, and aging.

Curriculum
The PhD program requires a minimum of 47 hours of post-master’s degree coursework and is designed to follow the Quality Guidelines for PhD programs in Social Work closely. The curriculum focuses heavily on the development of research competencies related to both social work practice and policy and prepares students to generate and disseminate knowledge that will guide social work practice. In order to increase research competencies, the program provides students with substantial opportunities to be involved in research and publication through personal one-on-one mentorship from faculty, research practicums, involvement in our nine research institutes, and completion of dissertation research. In addition to the strong focus on the development of research competencies, students are also prepared to disseminate knowledge through teaching as they complete teaching assistantships, course work in pedagogy, and personal classroom teaching experiences.

The full-time curriculum of the MSSW program consists of 60 credit hours (45 classroom credit hours and 15 internship credit hours). Developed in accordance with the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) curriculum standards and policies, it is based upon a liberal arts perspective and has two major components—a 27-credit-hour professional foundation curriculum offered during the first year and a subsequent 27-credit-hour specialized, advanced curriculum focused in two concentration areas: Clinical Social Work and Community and Administrative Leadership. Six credit hours of electives complete the 60-hour curriculum. In both foundation and concentration curriculum, experiential learning is provided through internships at selected organizations --governmental, nonprofit, or for-profit agencies in which qualified and competent educational supervision is provided.

Admissions, Selectivity Index, Yield Index, and Financial Support
Data from the Graduate Student Information System for 2012 (the last year that includes all data elements) shows 54 applicants to the PhD program. Thirteen applicants were admitted (selectivity index = 24%). Six of the admitted students enrolled (yield index = 46.1%). In 2012, 96.7% of full-time enrolled PhD students had institutional financial support, averaging $16,514 per supported student, which does not cover the full cost of a student’s living expenses in Austin.

Data from the Graduate Student Information system for 2012 indicates that 458 persons applied to the MSSW program. A total of 325 applicants were admitted (selectivity index = 71.0%). A total of 189 students enrolled (yield index = 58.2%). In 2012, 41.8% of full-time enrolled MSSW students had institutional financial support, averaging $6,158 per supported student.

Competitive Advantages
Both the MSSW and the PhD programs share several competitive advantages:
• As academic programs within the Graduate School at the University of Texas at Austin, a research intensive university that provides some of the best research and learning opportunities available in the world.
• Our location in Austin, Texas, a city known for its innovation, creativity, and personal appeal. As the seat of state government, Austin offers unique opportunities for research and professional practice. Proximity to the Texas border supports transnational research.
• An interdisciplinary faculty drawn from a range of academic areas, including social work, business, law, medicine, public administration and policy analysis, psychology, theology, political science, public affairs, public health, epidemiology, and statistics.
• The Center for Social Work Research with its nine research institutes, ranging from addictions and domestic violence to health behavior and children’s mental health.
• The DiNitto Center for Career Services, which is available to assist students and alumni in initial and ongoing pursuit of their professional social work career goals.

Other advantages for our PhD students include:
• The opportunities to teach undergraduate courses as the instructor of record,
• A purposefully collaborative environment allowing students to benefit from multiple mentors and have the opportunity to be co-authors on scholarly publications, and
• Our geographic location that facilitates research on diverse ethnic populations, including refugee and immigration issues.

Additional advantages for our MSSW students are:
• The joint degree programs with law, public health, public affairs, and divinity, and
• The dedicated clinical faculty who teach practice courses and field seminar while serving as the liaison for that cohort of students over two semesters, enhancing students’ identification with the profession.

Competitive Disadvantages
Both the MSSW and the PhD programs share several competitive disadvantages:
• Even with comparatively lower tuition and recent gains in available scholarship dollars, admitted students are lost to other top-ranked schools who offer stronger scholarship packages.
• Another area that may create a disadvantage is the increasing number of programs offering online courses and degree programs.
• Inadequate space in the current building, requiring many research projects to be located off-campus.

Current Enhancement Efforts
Both the MSSW and the PhD programs are working to improve their web presence as a recruitment and retention strategy. In addition, both programs are adding new curricular offerings that enhance research skills for PhD students and new fields of practice for MSSW students, such as medical and military social work.

The PhD program in the School of Social Work is currently working to offer four-year financial packages to recruit top-level students. The PhD program is leveraging the Graduate School’s milestones and benchmarks to facilitate program completion and entry into the academic job market.

The MSSW program is actively pursuing additional funding for student scholarships and stipends, such as the Bilingual Scholars program, the HRSA grant, and the GRACE program.

The School of Social Work has an active fundraising and development effort focused predominantly on scholarships and fellowships.
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Purpose of the Self-Study Report

The self-study report reflects data and information requirements established by The University of Texas at Austin Graduate School (Graduate School), the Dean of the School of Social Work, and the State of Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). The external review serves to meet the reporting requirements of THECB and to provide an analysis and evaluation of the academic program for the internal purposes of the Graduate School and the School of Social Work.

Organization of the Self-Study Report

This self-study report of the graduate programs in social work is divided into three major sections. The first section includes information common to both the MSSW degree program and the PhD degree program:

- Program Facilities and Equipment (item F for Doctoral Programs, W for Master’s Programs)
- Program Finance and Resources (item G for Doctoral Programs, X for Master’s Programs)
- Program Administration (item H for Doctoral Programs, item Y for Master’s Programs)
- Faculty Qualifications (item I for Doctoral Programs, item Z for Master’s Programs)

The second section contains the narrative description and data specific to the PhD program and the third section contains the narrative and data specific to the MSSW program. In all sections, we have used the headings from the Instructions for Preparing the Self-Study Report from the Graduate School.

Since the MSSW degree program is focused on professional social work practice and the PhD program is focused on preparation for careers as academicians and researchers, we have organized the material for each program following the separate guidelines and accreditation standards for each program.

Since MSSW programs are required to be accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the self-study will incorporate the framework for CSWE accreditation. PhD programs in social work are not accredited by the Council on Social Work Education, but there are recommended quality guidelines promulgated by the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education in Social Work (GADE). Since our PhD program is a member of GADE, the self-study report for the doctoral program will use GADE’s Quality Guidelines as the framework for the report. For reference, the GADE guidelines and the CSWE standards are included as appendices to this report.
Graduate Program Review

The following section contains a general introduction and Graduate School requirements common to both the PhD and MSSW programs.
Introduction

The School of Social Work was established as a graduate program in 1949 and began offering classes in the fall of 1950. The MSSW program was accredited by the Council on Social Work Education in 1952 and has continued in accredited status since that time. The Undergraduate Program was initiated in 1958 as a concentration in the College of Arts and Sciences and was designed to provide basic knowledge about the field of social welfare and the profession of social work. The BSW program was accredited in 1975 and the former Graduate School of Social Work became the School of Social Work. The BSW program has maintained its accredited status since 1975. In 1974, the first class of students was admitted into the PhD program in social work. The program serves as an important component of the School of Social Work by preparing its students to become the intellectual leaders of the profession.

As an integral part of The University of Texas at Austin, the School of Social Work has formulated its mission and goals to be consistent with those of the University, the Graduate School, and the profession of social work.

The stated Core Purpose of The University of Texas is “to transform lives for the benefit of society.” Embracing this core purpose, the mission of The University of Texas Graduate School is to “…cultivate individuals who work together to bring knowledge, innovation, and best practices to meet the great and small challenges of our time.”

Since its founding, the School of Social Work’s emphasis on empirically based social work research, quality professional education, and concern for significant social problems has remained constant. This constancy is reflected in the focus of the School’s mission on the creation and transmission of knowledge to enhance effectiveness in social work practice. The School’s mission statement is:

Through excellence in professional education, research, and service, The University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work provides national leadership to promote social and economic justice, alleviate critical social problems, and enhance human well-being.

This mission is consistent with the University’s core purpose and the mission of the UT Graduate School as can be seen in the focus on excellence in professional education; the advancement of social work research and the understanding of social issues; the enhancement of human well-being; and the promotion of social and economic justice at all levels of society.

The faculty, staff, and students of the School represent a valuable resource to agencies, voluntary associations, and other groups in the community. They serve as volunteers, consultants, trainers, board and committee members, researchers, grant writers, and in many other capacities, drawing on the values, competencies, and commitments of the
School to promote just, effective, and efficient responses to human needs. The School seeks to capitalize on this fact as it designs its educational programs and pursues its mission.

While the School of Social Work has long been a valuable resource to the Austin/Travis County area and the state of Texas, it envisions itself in partnership with a much broader community. Over the last decade the School has emerged as a national leader in social work education and research with a number of faculty serving important leadership roles in national professional organizations such as the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), and the Society for Social Work and Research (SSWR).

**Program Facilities and Equipment**

The School of Social Work is located between the Recreational Sports Center and the UT Swim Center in a building that was used as a lab school for the College of Education. The University Jr. High was housed in the building until the 1970s. It became the home of the School of Social Work in 1994. It has self-contained classrooms, a large auditorium, meeting and seminar rooms, lounges for faculty, staff, and students, a Learning Resource Center, an IT classroom, and a recording/taping studio. However, as the School has grown over the last two decades, space has been a persistent concern and finding office space for all faculty members has been a challenge. The School maintains off-campus space at the Heartland Center, where much of its research operation is housed.

All classrooms are fitted with integrated Instructional Technology (IT) consoles that greatly enhance the School’s capacity for incorporating multi-media technology into classroom instruction. All faculty and most staff members have private offices and individual computers and there is an incremental upgrading of computer equipment in order to remain up to date with current technology. The doctoral student study area includes computers and printer access. Adjunct lecturers share a large office with two computers. All computers are network-wired with access to email and the internet. In addition, the school has a wireless network that provides students, faculty, and staff with internet access through the university’s secure internet server from anywhere in the building. The School continues to develop its technology infrastructure and resources. The videotaping/recording studio serves as a valuable tool for student learning and is augmented by a wide array of teaching aids located in the Learning Resource Center.

**Program Finance and Resources**

The operating budget for the School of Social Work for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 academic years is presented below. The School’s operating budget has remained stable for the last few years. For the current academic year, 2013-2014, the school’s operating budget is just over 7.5 million dollars. The majority of the budget, about 80%, is for
faculty and staff salaries. This budget reflects the academic staff and administration and does not include staff for the Center of Social Work Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Expenses</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; Administrators</td>
<td>$4,442,028</td>
<td>$4,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>$699,884</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary or Adjunct Faculty and Field Staff</td>
<td>$648,215</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>$860,877</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$110,189</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid</td>
<td>$249,122</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,210,315</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,550,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** 2012-2013 figures are final based on NACUBO summaries and represent 100% hard money. The figures do not include research funding or faculty endowments. Supplies & Services include technology resources. Student Financial Aid includes scholarships and students’ wages. Other includes the Professional Development Program (Continuing Education Workshops).

Also located in the School of Social Work is the Center for Social Work Research (CSWR). The CSWR was established in 1974 and for nearly 40 years has worked to build knowledge about the human condition, social issues, and service delivery systems in order to enhance learning and practice, advance theory, and promote social welfare and social justice. The CSWR provides the umbrella for the School’s research activities, including several institutes that provide expertise in research methodology and/or training related to specific social work topics or specializations. Institutes, which are organized as projects or groups of projects headed by one or more social work faculty, provide a range of services to the research and practice communities. There are currently nine Institutes housed within the CSWR:

1. Addictions Research Institute (ARI)
2. Child and Family Research Institute (CFRI)
3. Health Behavior Research and Training Institute (HBRT)
4. Institute on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (IDVSA)
5. Institute for Grief, Loss, and Family Survival
6. Institute of Organizational Excellence
7. Institute for Restorative Justice and Restorative Dialogue (IRJRD)
8. Institute for Community Development: U.S. and Abroad
9. Texas Institute for Excellence in Mental Health

The budget below represents the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Operating Budget for Core Infrastructure and Research Administrative Support for the Center for Social Work Research (CSWR). This budget reflects the core administrative staff, along with supplies and travel resources, for the CSWR. For 2013-2014, nearly 80% of this budget is soft money, either from fees charged to active projects (e.g. Foundation funding) or indirect costs returned to the CSWR. The only hard money in the CSWR budget is for the salary and fringe benefits for the Associate Director and a portion of the salary and benefits for the Associate Dean for Research and Director of the CSWR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center for Social Work Research (CSWR)</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$408,913</td>
<td>$437,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>$98,792</td>
<td>$105,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$19,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$533,205</strong></td>
<td><strong>$569,742</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this modest budget, the Center for Social Work Research (CSWR) administers 70 training and research projects with an annual spending authority of $18 million ($8.5 million average expenditures per year) in grant awards from various federal, state, and foundation sources. Currently, CSWR’s research support is 80% federal funds, 15% state funds, and 5% foundation support. Federal funders include the National Institutes of Health (NIAAA, NIDA, NCI); the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC); the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA); the U.S. Department of Justice; and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services agencies including the Children’s Bureau and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). State agency support comes from the Texas Department of State Health Services, the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, and the Texas Health and Human Services Commission. Foundation sponsors are both national and local, including...
American Cancer Society, the RGK Foundation, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and Soros Foundation / Open Society Foundations.

While the primary CSWR staff is located in the social work building, recent growth in the Center has required the School to acquire additional office space off campus. This space, located near downtown Austin, is a short drive from the School of Social Work and is home to a number of major research projects.

Student Support

The graduate programs at the School of Social Work are continually searching for ways to provide financial support for students. Through scholarships, Teaching Assistant, Assistant Instructor, and Graduate Research Assistant positions, the school seeks to support as many students as possible. The tables below show the institutional support for doctoral students and the Graduate School and School of Social Work support for students in the MSSW program. The institutional support for MSSW students is reflected in charts G and H under Coordinating Board Requirements in the MSSW section of the report.

Doctoral Student Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-2013 PhD Teaching Assistant (TA) and Assistant Instructor (AI) Appointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 PhD students in Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 PhD students in Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 PhD students in Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TA and AI Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-2013 PhD Graduate Research Assistant (GRA) Appointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 PhD students in Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 PhD students in Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PhD students in Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GRA Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-2013 PhD Scholarships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Dollars Awarded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Scholarships include $100,000 from Graduate School allocation.
### 2012-2013 Total PhD Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Institutional Support</td>
<td>$510,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Full-Time PhD Students Receiving Support</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MSSW Student Support

#### 2012-2013 MSSW Teaching Assistant (TA) Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32 MSSW students in Fall 2012</td>
<td>$99,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 MSSW students in Spring 2013</td>
<td>$88,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 MSSW students in Summer 2013</td>
<td>$41,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TA Funding</td>
<td>$230,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unduplicated MSSW TAs</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2012-2013 MSSW Graduate Research Assistant (GRA) Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 MSSW students in Fall 2012</td>
<td>$61,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 MSSW students in Spring 2013</td>
<td>$50,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 MSSW students in Summer 2013</td>
<td>$45,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GRA Funding</td>
<td>$156,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unduplicated MSSW GRAs</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2012-2013 MSSW Scholarships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Dollars Awarded</td>
<td>$343,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated Full-Time MSSW Students Receiving Scholarships</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Scholarships range from $1000 to full tuition and fees.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2012-2013 Total MSSW Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate School and School of Social Work Support</td>
<td>$730,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Full-Time MSSW Students Receiving Support</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Administration

The administration of the Graduate School is the responsibility of the vice provost and dean of graduate studies. Each academic area that offers a graduate degree has a Graduate Studies Committee (GSC), a group consisting of all the assistant, associate, and full professors who are active in that graduate degree program. The Graduate Studies Committee recommends students for admission to the program, sets program-specific requirements for the graduate degrees in that area, and recommends students for admission to candidacy for degrees. Graduate education is the responsibility of the members of Graduate Studies Committees. One member serves as the graduate adviser to register and advise all graduate students, to maintain records, and to represent the Graduate School in matters pertaining to graduate work in that area.

Implementation of GSC policies is delegated to the Assistant Deans for the graduate programs. Figure 1 shows the organizational structure for the School of Social Work. Key administrators for the school are listed below.

Administration of the School of Social Work

**Dean.** Dr. Luis H. Zayas was appointed Dean of the School of Social Work in January 2012 and holds the Robert Lee Sutherland Chair in Mental Health and Social Policy. Before joining UT Austin, Zayas was the inaugural Shanti K. Khinduka Distinguished Professor of Social Work and Professor of Psychiatry at Washington University in St. Louis. During his nearly ten years at Washington University, Zayas held the post of Associate Dean for Faculty from 2005-2007 and founded the Center for Latino Family Research in 2007.

**Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.** Dr. A. James Schwab joined the faculty in the School of Social Work in 1981. In addition to holding the Clara Pope Willoughby Centennial Professor in Child Welfare, Dr. Schwab has filled many important administrative positions in the school including Director of the Center for Social Work Research from 1990 to 1994, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs from 1990 to 1995, and Assistant Dean for Doctoral Education from 2004 to 2013. He is again serving as the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, being appointed to that position in 2012.

**Assistant Dean for Doctoral Education.** Dr. Cynthia Franklin joined the faculty in 1989 after completing her PhD at The University of Texas at Arlington. She is the Stiernberg/Spencer Family Professor in Mental Health and the new Assistant Dean for Doctoral Education as of June 2013. She previously served as the Coordinator of the Clinical Concentration in the MSSW program from 1992–2013.
Assistant Dean for Master’s Programs. Jane Kretzschmar, MSW, joined the clinical faculty in the School of Social Work in 1989 and holds the rank of Clinical Professor. She has been Assistant Dean for Master’s Programs since 2004 and was Director of Field Education from 1994-2004.

Assistant Dean for Field Education. Tanya Voss, MSSW, joined the clinical faculty in 1999 and holds the rank of Clinical Associate Professor. She has been the Assistant Dean for Field Education since 2006.

Associate Dean for Research. Noel Busch-Armendariz, PhD, joined the faculty in 2001. She holds the rank of Professor and was appointed the Associate Dean for Research and Director of the Center for Social Work Research in 2013.

GSC Chair. Dr. Sanna Thompson joined the social work faculty in 2005 after holding the position of Research Associate Professor from 2003–2005. She holds the rank of Associate Professor and was elected to the position of GSC Chair by the faculty in 2013.

Graduate Adviser. Dr. A. James Schwab, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, serves as the school’s Graduate Adviser. Jane Kretzschmar, MSW, Assistant Dean for Master’s Programs, serves as the Assistant Graduate Adviser.
Figure 1: The School of Social Work Organizational Chart
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Administrative Support Staff for the Social Work Graduate Programs

The following staff members work closely with the school’s administration to support its mission through student recruitment and admissions, advising, student services, and alumni relations.

Director of Student and Community Affairs. Ramon R. Gomez, MSSW, joined the staff in 2006 and oversees student recruitment and community relations.

Director of Admissions. Andrea Montgomery, MSSW, joined the staff in 2004 and manages the admissions process for the MSSW and PhD programs.

Graduate Program Coordinator. Marian Ascensio, MSSW, joined the staff in 2006 and assists the Graduate Adviser and the Assistant Dean for Master’s Programs with student advising and MSSW program support.

Graduate Program Coordinator. Sherry Melecki, M. Ed., joined the staff in 2008 and assists the Graduate Adviser and the Assistant Dean for Doctoral Education with student advising and PhD program support.

Director of the DiNitto Center for Career Services and Alumni Relations. Jennifer Luna-Ildunate, MSSW, joined the staff in 1995 and directs career support services for current students and alumni relations.

Faculty Qualifications

The full-time faculty of the School of Social Work is exceptionally well qualified to achieve the MSSW and PhD programs’ goals. Responsibilities of full-time faculty include the design and modification of the curriculum through the School’s curriculum committees, teaching of practice and other social work courses, coordination of field education, maintenance of program integrity, and evaluation of program outcomes.

The full-time faculty is comprised of 29 tenured and tenure-track faculty, 12 non-tenure-track faculty who hold the designation of clinical faculty, and 4 non-tenure-track research faculty, and 48 part-time lecturers, each teaching one or two courses per semester in their areas of professional expertise. Although non-tenure-track positions represent about one-third of the full-time faculty, they play a central role in the life of the school. Both the clinical and research faculty have processes and procedures for promotion within this faculty category.

The clinical faculty provides instruction, monitoring, and evaluation of the field practicum experience for students in the MSSW programs, offers professional advising for students in the Field Education Program, and works to enhance the quality of School/agency/student interaction. The clinical faculty provides a critical link between the School and the
professional community with a special focus on assisting students with integration of theory and practice and enhancing agency-based field instruction.

The research faculty is central to the School’s research enterprise. They secure research funding and manage some of the School’s Research Institutes. They provide mentoring and support for graduate students through their research grants and, in some cases, provide guidance and encouragement to doctoral students when they reach the dissertation stage of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty (N=29)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Awarding Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Choi</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of California at Berkley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Davis</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. DiNitto</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Fong</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Franklin</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of Texas at Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Lauderdale</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Padilla</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Pomeroy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Rubin</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. J. Schwab</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Shorkey</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Streeter</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Velasquez</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>UT Health Science Center in Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Zayas</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Armour</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Busch-Armendariz</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cubbin</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ferguson</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Gilbert</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Awarding Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Grant</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Holleran Steiker</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Jang</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Jones</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>State University of New York at Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Rountree</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Thompson</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Von Sternberg</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>UT Health Science Center in Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Castro</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. De Luca</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Granillo</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clinical Faculty (N=12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Awarding Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Kretzschmar</td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Mulvaney</td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>MSSW</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Packheiser</td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Anderson</td>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>MSSW</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Armenta</td>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Linseisen</td>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>MSSW</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Voss</td>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Hough</td>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>MSSW</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sloan</td>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>MSSW</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R. Smith  
Clinical Assistant Professor  
MSSW  
The University of Texas at Austin

D. Sparks  
Clinical Assistant Professor  
MSSW  
Southwest Texas State University

S. Swords  
Clinical Assistant Professor  
MSW  
Simmons College

### Research Faculty (N=4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Awarding Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Spence</td>
<td>Research Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Field</td>
<td>Research Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>UT Southwestern Medical School - Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Lopez</td>
<td>Research Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Novy</td>
<td>Research Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Qualifications.** All tenured and tenure-track faculty have doctorates. Likewise, all members of the research faculty hold a doctorate. All members of the clinical faculty have a master’s degree and many years of practice experience in the community.

**Faculty Stability.** The faculty has remained stable for many years. The average length of service with the university for all full-time faculty members is 13.5 years. Of the 29 tenure-track faculty, 22 (75.9%) have ten or more years of service with the university and 8 (27.6%) have over 20 years of service. Of the 16 non-tenure-track faculty (clinical and research), 8 (50%) have been with the university for 10 or more years and 2 (12.5%) have 20 or more years of service.

**Faculty Leadership.** The School’s faculty is widely recognized and highly respected locally, nationally, and internationally for its significant contributions to social work education and the knowledge base of the profession. Faculty members maintain a strong commitment to effective teaching and service, and a high standard for scholarly productivity. Since the establishment of the University’s Academy of Distinguished Teachers in 1995, six members of the social work faculty have been inducted into membership: Dr. Rosalie Ambrosino (1995), Dr. Diana DiNitto (1997), Dr. Ruth McRoy (1999), Dr. David Springer (2005), Dr. Marilyn Armour (2010), and Dr. Lori Holleran Steiker (2012). Many other members of the faculty have been selected for university-wide distinctions such as the William David Blunk Memorial Professorship, Dads’ Association Centennial Teaching Fellowship, Joe and Bettie Branson Ward Endowed Excellence
Award, Texas Exes Award for Outstanding Teachers, Outstanding Graduate Teaching Awards, and The Texas 10.

Faculty members from the School of Social Work are well known as pedagogical leaders in social work education. They have authored some of the most popular textbooks used in social work education in the United States and around the world. For example, Dr. Allen Rubin has numerous textbooks and study guides on research methods and statistics. His text *Research Methods for Social Work*, first published in 1989, remains the most popular social work research text in the US and has been translated into several languages. In addition, he has written *Essential Research Methods for Social Work* (2007), *Practitioner’s Guide to Using Research for Evidence-Based Practice* (2008), and *Statistics for Evidence-Based Practice and Evaluation* (2010). Dr. Diana DiNitto has authored *Social Welfare: Politics and Public Policy* (1983) and *Chemical Dependency: A Systems Approach* (1995). Both of these texts have been revised numerous times and both remain very popular social work textbooks. Dr. Marilyn Armour’s book *Restorative Justice Dialogue: An Essential Guide for Research and Practice* was published in 2010 and is widely used as a guidebook to teach social work students about the critical skill of facilitation in restorative justice and community dialogue. Dr. Calvin Streeter’s text *Rural Social Work: Building and Sustaining Community Capacity* is now in its second edition and remains one of the most widely used rural social work texts in the US.

The faculty is widely recognized for its cutting-edge research and significant contributions to the knowledge base of the profession. Annually, members of the faculty secure around $18 million in grants and contracts from various federal, state, and foundation sources to fund a diverse array of research in such areas as addictions research, child welfare, family violence and sexual assault, human trafficking, end-of-life care, restorative justice, mental health services, school-based services, health disparities, poverty in America, immigration reform, suicide prevention, juvenile justice, childhood cancer survivors, and aging.

Many faculty hold national leadership positions in professional associations, task forces, and committees. In 2012, Dean Zayas was inducted as a Fellow in the American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare, where he joined several other members of the faculty including Dean Emeritus Barbara White, Diana DiNitto, Allen Rubin, King Davis, and Ruth McRoy (retired). Dr. Allen Rubin and Dr. Rowena Fong have both served as president of the Society for Social Work and Research. Dr. Rubin has also served on the national board for the Action Network for Social Work Education and Research (ANSWER). Dr. Namkee Choi is on the National Advisory Committee for both The Institute on Geriatric Social Work and the Hartford Geriatric Social Work Program. Dr. Barbara Jones is the president of the Association of Pediatric Oncology Social Workers (APOSW) and a steering committee member of the Network of Social Workers in Palliative and End-of-Life Care. Dean Emeritus Barbara White is the only person who has served as the president of both the National Association of Social Workers and the Council on Social Work Education. Others have served on boards and committees for many local and statewide agencies and organizations.
Members of the faculty have also served as editors and on editorial boards for many important professional journals, encyclopedias, and reference books. For example, Dr. Beth Pomeroy is the current editor-in-chief of Social Work, the official journal of the National Association of Social Workers. Dr. Noel Busch-Armendariz is editor-in-chief of AFFILIA: The Journal of Women and Social Work. Dr. Michael Lauderdale is co-editor of Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education. Dr. Cynthia Franklin was editor-in-chief of Children and Schools, consulting editor for the Social Work Desk Reference 1st and 2nd editions, and is currently editor-in-chief for The Encyclopedia of Social Work, 20th edition. Dr. Dorie Gilbert has served as co-editor of the Journal of HIV/AIDS and Social Service. Several of our tenured and research faculty serve as peer reviewers for federal grant proposals. We have representatives on National Institutes of Health Standing Study Sections and Special Emphasis Panels through the Center for Scientific Review. In addition, faculty review proposals for other federal agencies such as the Department of Justice, the Office of Adolescent Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.
Doctoral Program Review

The following section contains Graduate School requirements and Coordinating Board requirements utilizing the common headings provided for all PhD programs.
I. Graduate School Requirements

A. Narrative Description.

The PhD program in the School of Social Work at the University of Texas at Austin (UT) prepares its graduates to provide intellectual leadership for the social work profession as researchers, educators, and directors of public and private organizations. This intersects with the Graduate School’s mission of “serving as a community of diverse scholars … dedicated to excellence in original research, teaching, creative expression, and intellectual leadership.” In addition, both the Graduate School and the PhD program in the School of Social Work strive to “cultivate individuals who work together to bring knowledge, innovation, and best practices to meet the great and small challenges of our time.”

Since its inception in 1973, the School of Social Work Doctoral Program has graduated over 200 professionals. These professionals work in the top universities in the United States and other distinguished places of leadership. Graduates are esteemed researchers and scholars who are known for their expertise in improving social justice, resolving critical social problems of our time, and enhancing the well-being of people across diverse socioeconomic groups. Most notably, social work scholars that graduate from UT enhance the well-being of individuals and families in diverse fields of practice such as health, mental health, substance abuse, child welfare, domestic violence, disabilities, poverty, and school-based services through their research and leadership. Most graduates find jobs and post-doctoral appointments in major universities and research centers and in high posts within the military. For example, recent graduates have obtained positions at University of Southern California, Washington University, University of Pittsburgh, and the Pentagon.

The PhD program in social work at UT requires a minimum of 47 hours of post-graduate study and is designed to follow the *Quality Guidelines for PhD Programs in Social Work* closely. These guidelines, developed in 1992 by the Group for Advancement for Doctoral Education (GADE) in Social Work, guide the development, review, and improvement of PhD programs in social work. Consistent with the GADE guidelines, the doctoral program in social work at UT aims to produce “PhD-trained social work scholars that will improve the art and science of social work by generating, disseminating, and conserving the knowledge that informs and transforms professional practice.” Social work’s mission and purpose, “To enhance human well-being and help meet the needs of all people, with particular attention to the needs and empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty” (NASW Code of Ethics), determines the domains of social work inquiry. Please see Appendix A for a full text of the *Quality Guidelines for PhD Programs in Social Work*.

Specifically, the PhD program in social work at the University of Texas at Austin focuses heavily on the development of research competencies related to both social work practice
and policy, and prepares students to generate and disseminate knowledge that will guide social work practice. In order to increase research competencies, the program provides students with substantial opportunities to be involved in research and publication through personal one-on-one mentorship from faculty, research practicums, involvement in our nine research institutes, and completion of dissertation research. In addition to the strong focus on the development of research competencies, students are also prepared to disseminate knowledge through teaching as they complete teaching assistantships, course work in pedagogy, and personal classroom teaching experiences. Furthermore, students develop a specialized area of knowledge so they can contribute to meaningful scholarship in an area of social work practice and assume positions as new contributors and stewards of knowledge for the social work profession.

The PhD program goals are explicitly reflected in the curriculum, comprehensive exams, and dissertation research. The curriculum follows instructional areas that are emphasized by the GADE Quality Guidelines, including knowledge about social work as a profession and discipline, and preparation to be a quality researcher and teacher.

The PhD program in social work at The University of Texas at Austin has the following primary goals:

a. Graduates will become scholars utilizing advanced knowledge and skills to become researchers and academicians who will be the professional and intellectual leaders of the social work profession.

b. Graduates will develop leadership capacities for critical inquiry, knowledge development, and the dissemination and implementation of knowledge within the social work profession.

c. Graduates will develop a specialized area of knowledge related to theories and research methods for specific problem areas and populations so they are prepared to transform knowledge in an area of social work practice.

Study in the PhD program in social work at The University of Texas at Austin is broader than any single department or program. Supporting work in the social and behavioral sciences may be taken in a single academic department or it may focus on a particular issue cutting across several academic departments. Students may also petition the Graduate School for permission to develop an interdisciplinary program under an interdepartmental committee. The research and academic competencies gained in the PhD program in social work therefore are supported by a large transdisciplinary knowledge base encompassing diverse epistemologies, theories, and methods.

Students graduating from the PhD program in social work at the University of Texas at Austin are expected to:
1. Understand the major issues in social work education and research, and the current challenges facing our society and the social work profession.
2. Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of social work theory and be able to apply the theoretical knowledge base in research and teaching.
3. Understand the conceptual and theoretical underpinnings of the research and statistical methods that are being applied in research studies.
4. Demonstrate expertise in the application of both quantitative and qualitative research methods and data analysis techniques.
5. Be able to solve statistical problems using data sets relevant to social work topics, and interpret the findings supported by the statistical analysis, including the limitations of the analysis that may result from issues of sample size, violation of underlying assumptions, and validation analysis.
6. Prepare and submit plans for the responsible and ethical conduct of research.
7. Show capacity to be productive scholars by submitting manuscripts for publication and participation in learned societies and professional conferences.
8. Be able to develop and submit research proposals independently, and in collaboration with others.
9. Develop a research career plan or trajectory including formulating a research agenda that will serve as a framework for career advancement after graduation.
10. Demonstrate a capacity to be an effective social work educator through formulation of a teaching philosophy and successful participation in instructional activities.
11. Show an in-depth knowledge and understanding of a specialized area related to social work and be able to use this expertise to transform knowledge in an area of social work practice.

The program of work for the PhD, excluding dissertation, requires a minimum of 47 credit hours of post-master’s study. Core courses focus on research and data analysis with additional courses in theories, pedagogy, electives to build theory, specialized knowledge, advanced methods in research, colloquia on the social work profession, and additional research and teaching practicums. Consistent with the mission of the PhD program to produce scholars and teachers, coursework is designed to provide opportunities to acquire both research and teaching competencies through study and practicum experiences. The required program of work is outlined in Table 1.

**Table 1: Core Course Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three seminars in research methods</td>
<td>9 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research II: Quantitative Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research III: Qualitative Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two seminars in computer data analysis</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data Analysis and Computers I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data Analysis and Computers II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comprehensive Examination

Prior to admission to candidacy, each student must pass a comprehensive examination that demonstrates mastery of the theory and research for the broad subject area in which the student proposes to conduct his or her dissertation research. The comprehensive exam has both a written and an oral component.

The comprehensive examination is designed to measure each student’s ability to conceptualize, critically analyze, and present knowledge in an organized and coherent manner. The examination requires students to demonstrate competence in the integration, synthesis, and application of social work theory and research methods drawn from course materials and independent readings.

Once a student has selected a proposed field of research for the dissertation (e.g. child welfare, mental health, substance abuse, domestic violence, poverty, etc.) and has begun taking electives as foundation for research in that specialization area (typically in the third semester), the student submits a written proposal to the Assistant Dean for Doctoral Education which identifies the broad, proposed subject area of the dissertation research and a proposed supervisor. The student, in consultation with the chair, will determine the additional committee members. The supervisor (who must be either a full Professor or an Associate Professor) and one committee member must be members of the program’s Graduate Studies Committee (GSC). The third committee member may be a member of the GSC or a social science faculty member (including tenured and tenure-track faculty, research faculty, and research scientists employed by The University of Texas at Austin) who brings content experience. All committee members must have obtained a PhD, an MD, or a JD. Students are advised to discuss the selection of the two members with their chair prior to any discussion with potential members. The committee chair must approve the selection of research faculty, research scientists, or tenure track faculty from other departments prior to contact by the student. The comprehensive examination structure and/or outline will be approved by the student’s comprehensive examination chair during the semester in which the student is enrolled in the comprehensive examination course.

The student prepares a proposed reading list that encompasses materials on the theory, research, and research methodology that addresses the major themes in their proposed area of research. When the student has prepared a proposed reading list, an initial meeting
of the supervising committee is convened by the committee supervisor to review, modify, and approve the scope of the reading list, and to set the timetable for completing the paper.

Following committee approval, the student prepares a substantial integrative paper (75-100 pages) that synthesizes and critically analyzes the literature pertinent to the specialization area, summarizes the literature reviewed, identifies gaps in the research, and proposes research strategies that respond to these gaps. The integrative paper is expected to be a resource for the literature review in the dissertation, but should not be equated with the literature review.

Students submit their paper to committee members and when each committee member reports to the chair that the written paper satisfies expectations, the oral defense is scheduled.

When the committee has approved the written paper and oral defense, the committee will recommend to the PhD committee whether the student should be advanced to candidacy. When the PhD committee has approved this recommendation, the student will complete the requirements for application to candidacy for the School of Social Work and the Graduate School.

Dissertation

Students may complete a traditional or three-article dissertation. Students work closely with their dissertation supervisor to prepare a statement of up to 500 words providing the title and a brief description of the proposed dissertation prior to applying for candidacy. Once in candidacy, students in consultation with their dissertation supervisor are expected to schedule a meeting with their dissertation committee to present their dissertation proposal defense. The chapters of the dissertation proposal should contain the preliminary work necessary to conduct the dissertation research. A satisfactory final oral examination is also required for the approval of a dissertation.

The final oral examination will cover the dissertation, the general field of the dissertation, and other parts of the program that the committee determines. The decision of the dissertation committee must be unanimous. The final oral examination may result in one of the following decisions as established by the Graduate School:

**Pass.** This decision indicates that the committee unanimously agrees that the student defended his or her dissertation satisfactorily. When a student has only very minor revisions to make after defending the dissertation, the committee may sign the report and leave oversight of revisions to the supervisor.

**Reconsideration.** This decision indicates that extensive revision is necessary, but that the committee is willing to examine the revised dissertation without requiring another oral examination. When a committee asks for reconsideration, a letter from
the supervisor explaining the situation should be sent to the Graduate School. The dissertation supervisor retains the final paperwork and approvals until the student satisfactorily completes the revision. If a committee member still has doubts after the revisions, he or she may request another oral examination. The candidate has three months to complete requirements laid down by the committee after a report for reconsideration has been filed.

**Not Pass.** This decision indicates that the committee is not satisfied with the dissertation, but anticipates that it could be made satisfactory with significant revision. When such a decision is made, the committee returns the report unsigned, committee members submit their individual Report on Doctoral Dissertation indicating their dissatisfaction with the dissertation, and another oral examination is scheduled.

**Fail.** This decision and the accompanying individual committee members' reports on the dissertation indicate that the committee has decided that the dissertation is unsatisfactory and the candidate may not revise and resubmit. The dissent of a single member of the committee is usually considered enough to result in failure.

**B. Ranking of PhD Program.**

PhD programs in social work are not provided a national ranking but the doctoral program at UT benefits from the national ranking of the MSSW program of the School of Social Work which has been consistently ranked as one of the top ten schools of social work in the US. *US News & World Report* ranks CSWE accredited social work master’s programs every four years in the category of Health Schools.¹

According to *US News & World Report*,

All the health rankings are based solely on the results of peer assessment surveys sent to deans, other administrators, and/or faculty at accredited degree programs or schools in each discipline. All schools surveyed in a discipline were sent the same number of surveys.

Respondents rated the academic quality of programs on a scale of 1 (marginal) to 5 (outstanding). They were instructed to select "don't know" if they did not have enough knowledge to rate a program. Only fully accredited programs in good standing during the survey period are ranked. Those schools with the highest average scores appear in the rankings.²

---


The PhD program competes with the top ten nationally ranked programs in social work education for students. The PhD program has the advantage of being housed within the Graduate School of UT, a world-class Research I university. In addition, we help ensure the quality of the PhD program in social work by following the Quality Guidelines for PhD Programs in Social Work provided by GADE. These quality guidelines are not prescriptive but provide the doctoral program with a set of educational practices that guide and enhance our program. The UT School of Social Work’s PhD program currently meets or exceeds the guidelines, including the ones that are considered to be aspirational. See Table 2 for a comparison of the GADE Quality Guidelines for PhD Programs in social work in relationship to the program at UT. Appendix A also provides the full text for the GADE Quality Guidelines for PhD Programs in Social Work.

Table 2: GADE Quality Guidelines in Comparison with School of Social Work PhD Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT Doctoral Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of Social Work Profession and Discipline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This content is covered in professional colloquiums and organized course on pedagogy, and is infused in other courses in the core curriculum in research methods, data analysis, and comprehensive exam courses that require students to locate their specialized knowledge in the landscape of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research/Scholarship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content in this area is extensively covered in 21 credit hours of research methods, data analysis, advanced statistics, and research practicum as well as strong mentorship by GSC and research faculty and completion of dissertation research. Theories course also prepares students to conceptualize and design research guided by theory along with other electives that build specialized theory and knowledge for scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devoted content is covered in required pedagogy course, teaching practicum, and opportunities to act as a teaching assistant and teach independent courses in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Resources/ Administration/ Structure

The School of Social Work PhD program provides dedicated staff through providing an Assistant Dean of Doctoral Education, a Graduate Coordinator, and by providing tuition assistance and financial support to students. The admission process is guided by a dedicated group of doctoral faculty members that serve on the PhD committee, and involves wide participation on the part of GSC and research faculty who are encouraged to participate in the review process for admissions and student mentoring. The Assistant Dean of Doctoral Education also serves as an academic adviser and, with the assistance of the graduate coordinator and the PhD committee, reviews curricula, student advancement, and milestones including timeliness of graduation.

### Aspirational Outcomes for Students

Doctoral students at the School of Social Work at UT achieve aspirational outcomes including presentation at conferences, published articles, and participation in writing grant proposals.

### C. Competition.

Table 3 identifies the top five PhD programs in social work that UT most frequently competes against for students. Four of these programs, the University of Michigan, the University of Washington, University of California at Berkeley, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, are public universities. One program, Washington University, is a private school. All of these schools of social work are nationally ranked within the top 10 social work programs; three of the programs with whom we compete most directly, University of Michigan, University of Washington, and Washington University, are ranked within the top five schools of social work.
Table 3: Top 5 Social Work Doctoral Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Financial Support</th>
<th>Range of Years Until Completion</th>
<th>Time Expected to Graduation</th>
<th>Average Number of Student Applications (approximate)</th>
<th>Average Number of Students Enrolled (approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| University of Michigan – Ann Arbor          | Stipend amount: $1700/month (Fall/Winter – academic year)  
Tuition coverage  
Health insurance  
Travel and research expenses ($400/year) through debit account  
Funding provided through a combination of fellowship awards, graduate student research assistant positions, and graduate student instructorships | 6-7                            | 5-6                         | 100+                                                 | 8                                                 |
| Washington University                       | Stipend amount: $18,500/year for 4 years.  
Tuition coverage  
Provides stipends for conferences/travel | 4 to 5                         | 4                           | 100+                                                 | 10                                                |
| University of California – Berkeley        | Stipend amount: $19,000 - $24,000 per year (4-5 years)  
Tuition coverage  
Health insurance  
Provides stipends for presenters to travel (up to $300)  
Doctoral students may also be funded by financial support packages offered by faculty. | 4 to 5                         | 3                           | 50-60 (last year)                                   | 5 (2013 incoming)                                  |
| University of Washington                   | Stipend amount: $1,700/month (Fall/Winter – academic year)  
Tuition coverage  
Health insurance  
Students required to fill research assistantship and teaching assistantship positions. | 5–6                            | 4-5                         | 65                                                  | 6                                                 |
| University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill | Stipend amount: $18,000 (annual increases) for 4 years  
Tuition coverage  
Health Insurance  
Travel and conference registration funding  
Additionally, most doctoral students participate in faculty research projects over the summer months, which account for an additional income of approximately $6,500 - $13,000 per year.  
The School has also provided tuition funding for several students to attend one of the weeklong summer Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) advanced methods courses offered at UNC-CH and at the University of Michigan. | 4                              | 4                           | 50-60                                                | Accept ~10%. Accepted 4 in 2013. Accepted 6 in 2012. The number is based on the amount of funding they have for tuition and stipend. |
| The University of Texas at Austin          | Stipend amount: $1,057 - $1,378 per month for TA, RA, and AI positions for 4 years with possibility of 5th year  
Tuition coverage – approximately 75% each semester  
Health insurance – as long as working as TA, RA, or AI  
Stipends for presenters to travel (up to $300)  
Additional scholarships and fellowships ranging from $2500 to $18,000 per year | 8                              | 4                           | 45                                                  | 7                                                 |

* Information was obtained through the university website and subsequent phone interviews with the graduate coordinators or other designated staff.
D. Competitive Advantage.

The doctoral program in social work at UT provides several competitive advantages that compare favorably to our peer institutions and main competitors. One advantage is the fact that we are housed at UT, a Research I university that provides some of the best research and learning opportunities available in the world. The University is also located in Austin, Texas, which is a city known for its innovation, creativity, and personal appeal—an advantage for attracting young scholars. The Center for Social Work Research is also a part of the School of Social Work and houses nine research institutes that provide student research assistantships and opportunities to build research competencies while participating in cutting-edge research and evaluation projects. The nine research institutes and their missions are listed below.

**Addiction Research Institute (ARI)** focuses on substance abuse among underserved populations (particularly African Americans and Mexican Americans). The program adopts a uniquely social work perspective, emphasizing factors at the individual, family, organizational, societal, and cultural level that influence substance abuse and substance-abuse treatment.

**Child and Family Research Institute (CFRI)** is a partnership of researchers committed to producing quality research to guide policy and social work practice for children and families.

**Health Behavior Research and Training Institute (HBRT)** specializes in the development and implementation of interventions addressing behavior change using the Transtheoretical Model (TTM) and Motivational Interviewing (MI). Intervention research has targeted HIV and safer sexual practices, prenatal health, alcohol, cocaine, smoking, STI testing, and fetal alcohol spectrum disorder. The HBRT has a history of providing training on the TTM, MI, and evidence-based intervention and prevention approaches, with recent emphasis on teaching health care providers to use brief motivational interventions in medical settings.

**Institute for Community Development: U.S. & Abroad** seeks to strengthen the resilient capacity of international and local communities through culturally tailored, sustainable community development projects designed and implemented by cross-disciplinary, inter-university, and community-driven collaborations.

**Institute on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (IDVSA)** creates opportunities for faculty and students to conduct research and share expertise through collaboration with community agencies and local, state, and national organizations. In addition, IDVSA offers trainings and disseminates information on domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking to policy makers, students, and service providers in fields of social work, law, nursing, and related disciplines.
Institute for Grief, Loss, and Family Survival is a multi-disciplinary collaboration among research and community professionals to investigate and address the needs of children, adults, and families who have experienced grief and loss. The overarching goals of this initiative are to enhance and support individual and family survival.

Institute of Organizational Excellence (IOE) has 30 years of experience in providing survey research services to over a hundred state and local government agencies and institutions of higher education as well as private and nonprofit organizations. The overlying goal of the IOE is to promote excellence within organizations by encouraging research and continuing education. The largest continuous project is the Survey of Employee Engagement (formerly the Survey of Organizational Excellence), an employee assessment instrument widely used throughout Texas governmental agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and in many different types of organizations across the country.

Institute for Restorative Justice and Restorative Dialogue (IRJRD) seeks to build a national mindset that embraces restorative justice principles. Its mission is to advance meaningful accountability, victim healing, and community safety through the use of restorative solutions to repair the harm related to conflict, crime, and victimization.

The Texas Institute for Excellence in Mental Health is a multi-disciplinary collaboration focused on improving the social, emotional, and behavioral health of Texans. The scope of the Institute’s effort includes evidence-based practice implementation, workforce training and technical assistance, research and evaluation, policy and program development, and information dissemination.

Beyond research opportunities within the institutes, many other faculty members have independent research projects on which students work. Additionally, the PhD curriculum assigns students two practicum classes, one in research and another in writing, that require students to prepare and publish scholarly work. This provides a “dress rehearsal” of critical skills needed for success in a research or academic career. This practical focus on the development of scholarly abilities and products further helps students improve the competencies they will need to be productive leaders and scholars in the social work profession.

Being part of a Research I university affords doctoral students many opportunities to work with faculty researchers on some of the most innovative research projects within the field of social work. Many students carry out research within the multimillion-dollar Center for Social Work Research. For example, nine doctoral students worked in the research institutes over the past year carrying out funded research projects. Students were mentored by world-renowned innovators who have developed widely used interventions such as
Motivational Interviewing for substance abuse treatment, new mental health recovery approaches such as Via Hope, and cutting-edge community research projects such as a clinic for victims of human trafficking. Students also reaped the benefit of working on federal and state funded research grants from funders such as the NIH, NIMH, CDC, and various state agencies and foundations. Additionally, doctoral students continue to benefit from being able learn how to write their own research grants while working alongside successful faculty who can mentor them through the grant writing process that leads to research funding.

The PhD program in social work has a distinct advantage of offering some of the best opportunities available to carry out research on Hispanic populations. The large Mexican and Mexican-American communities in Texas and Mexico give immediate access to these populations, providing a living laboratory for important research on health disparities, immigration, education, and child welfare. Austin is a city of diverse populations with a variety of needs and experiences. As a result, there are many opportunities to perform needed research in a wide array of areas and to be involved in the resolution of critical social problems. As an example, there is a large Asian immigrant population in Texas. The school has strong ties to Korea and China through our faculty and doctoral graduates, thus providing additional opportunities to research Asian immigrant populations. Since Austin is the capital of Texas and the seat of state government, UT also offers other opportunities to study and influence programs that will impact vulnerable populations across the state, including programs in health, juvenile justice, and child welfare.

The School of Social Work at UT also establishes research study groups that encourage partnerships leading to cutting-edge scholarship. One recent group united faculty and doctoral students interested in the Latino population in efforts to create new funded research. The school also has plans to create more of these research study groups and generally encourages collaboration between faculty and doctoral students. In addition, students working on their comprehensive exam papers and their dissertations are encouraged and supported in creating and participating in writing groups.

An additional advantage of the learning environment at UT is that it offers flexibility and a relational model that allows students to have more than one mentor. Many of these mentorships extend past the students’ matriculation into ongoing collaborations throughout their careers. Both GSC and research faculty may work with students, which gives students opportunities to receive one-on-one mentorship in research and teaching from a variety of faculty involved in research that is aimed at solving critical social problems. This broad exposure to faculty and diverse research projects facilitates a small learning community within a large, diverse public university. It also provides students with greater personal choice in the selection of their specialized areas and dissertation chair. This model is in contrast to some of our peer programs that designate a select group of faculty that can work with PhD students, pre-select specializations, and may assign students to one specific faculty mentor.
The social work PhD program emphasizes the career development and success of our students by providing dedicated resources to the PhD program including an Assistant Dean and a Graduate Coordinator. The School of Social Work also has a dedicated Office of Student Services, which includes a career center that helps students with their writing skills, resumes, job talks, and teaching philosophies. UT also provides many institutional resources that support the success of PhD students including:

1. Free statistical consulting that is available on the UT campus.
2. A regional foundation library to support the research and writing practicum.
3. Consultation and help with external research applications, preparation of proposals, and budgets through the Center for Social Work Research.
4. A Center for Teaching and Learning that provides workshops to prepare students to be effective instructors.
5. A dedicated social work faculty member that supervises and coaches doctoral students on the successful implementation of curricula in our undergraduate program when they teach a class.

In particular, career services and teaching preparation are strengths of UT’s PhD program when compared to other social work doctoral programs. Career services are provided to the students throughout their matriculation in the PhD program. To support students as they enter the job market, we offer workshops, specific mentoring, help with interviews, and portfolio preparation. The PhD program also excels in teaching preparation, providing every student an opportunity for an Assistant Instructor (AI) position where they can teach undergraduate classes on their own. The AI position allows students to gain needed classroom experience before they take their first academic appointments. This opportunity provides UT School of Social Work students with an advantage over those students from some peer institutions who are not given opportunities to teach a course independent of a Teaching Assistant (TA) position.

E. Competitive Disadvantage.

Information gathered from prospective students that select doctoral programs at other academic institutions over UT suggests that the main disadvantage for UT’s PhD program is the financial packages that we offer students in relationship to our major competitors. We have consistently lost top students to the schools highlighted in Table 3, for example, because we could not match the financial incentives provided. In particular, the UT School of Social Work has only been able to guarantee students financial incentives including scholarships, TA appointments, health benefits, and tuition assistance for the first year. Although we have frequently been able to provide funding for 3–4 years, the fact that we could not guarantee these funds at admission has kept us from attracting some of our top recruits. In contrast, our competitors provide a variety of financial supports to students and tuition assistance for 4-5 years or longer while they are completing their coursework and dissertation. Some of our competitors were also able to offer students additional funding on research projects beyond the financial packages already provided.
them. The University of North Carolina School of Social Work, for example, promises some students additional summer money in the amount of $6500–$13,000 for participation in summer research projects. The University of Washington has offered NIMH-funded prevention research traineeships with special in-depth research opportunities.

Some prospective students that chose other institutions over UT reported that they, upon admission, were assigned to one faculty mentor that would be available from the beginning to nurture that student’s career. This guarantee of a mentor has been an additional incentive for some students to accept offers from other academic institutions.

Some of our strongest competitors provide interdisciplinary education and specific dual degree programs. While UT provides opportunities for students to take electives outside the School of Social Work (e.g. 12 credit hours), some of our competitors offer more structured interdisciplinary education and/or programs of study. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, for example, offers a dual PhD degree in Public Health and Social Work. The University of Michigan requires students to receive a dual PhD degree between social work and another academic discipline (e.g. psychology, sociology and education). Dual degrees provide PhD students with an opportunity to gain greater expertise in a field of practice, which enhances their marketability for top-ten university research and faculty positions.

One distinct disadvantage is that UT does not yet have a medical school compared to the majority of programs that UT competes against for doctoral students. The presence of a medical school is significant to social work doctoral programs for many reasons. Social work educates the majority of mental health professionals in the United States and the interventions that these professionals use are supported by transdisciplinary knowledge that is primarily developed through interdisciplinary research. The presence of a medical school encourages interdisciplinary research on health and mental health interventions and is known to greatly enhance the receipt of federal funding to support this research. The medical school environment provides more opportunities for social work researchers to make significant contributions to the development of important interventions by working on interprofessional teams to conduct research. The absence of a medical school makes this interprofessional work more difficult.

The current facilities that house the School of Social Work have several limitations compared to our major competitors. The building is older and not as well equipped with space and cutting-edge technologies. Major research initiatives such as those in substance use/addictions and mental health are housed in rented space off campus. This makes it more difficult for doctoral students to interact with the faculty and staff involved in research projects. It also creates a separation between faculty members at the two sites, making it more difficult for them to collaborate.
Some additional disadvantages for students involve the way that classes outside the School of Social Work are offered and accessed. Students often have difficulty enrolling in the out-of-department classes they want, including critical classes in statistics and theory, because the classes are not easily accessible to those outside the department or may be taught infrequently by the most renowned professors. This lack of access to classes across disciplines has potential to limit the learning options for students and force them into other classes that are not as useful to their study. In particular, it appears to be difficult to access classes in advanced statistical methods that are most critical to the students’ learning. An unexpected consequence, however, is that our students are forced to develop networking skills and tenacity as they work to establish personal contact with the highly sought-after professors outside the School of Social Work. Lastly, a growing concern is the high cost of living in Austin, particularly for housing near the university. This has kept some students from accepting offers to attend UT and made matriculation more difficult for current students.

**F. Current Enhancement Efforts.**

The doctoral program in the School of Social Work at UT has recently worked to guarantee and extend our financial assistantship package in order to better recruit and retain top-tier students. Starting with the class of 2014, we have worked with the Graduate School at UT to offer students a guaranteed four-year financial package to help us recruit students. In addition, Dean Luis Zayas and the development office have initiated active fundraising efforts for endowed scholarships for doctoral students. The school also has plans to apply for doctoral training grants to support the development of doctoral student research. We have also worked to improve our recruiting efforts through re-designing our website and providing more support and structure to campus visits for prospective students. In the curricular area, we have added advanced electives in data analysis, including courses in advanced qualitative research and secondary data analysis with an emphasis in Structural Equation Modeling.

We have further enhanced our research practicum options and have recently hired several new faculty members, some of whom possess more interdisciplinary training. In addition, with guidance from the Graduate School, we have established milestones or benchmarks to establish expected times of achievement for areas such as completion of formal coursework, advancement to candidacy, and successfully defending the dissertation. These will be introduced during orientation for the incoming cohort and will be reviewed individually with each student on an annual basis. UT is in the process of establishing a medical school. Social work faculty have been appointed to committees contributing to the selection of a medical school dean, curricular development, and educational models including joint social work PhD/MD programs.
G. Selectivity Index and Yield Index.

Table 4 describes the Selectivity and Yield Indexes for the PhD program. For the past five years the percentage of total applicants who were admitted ranged from 24–52.7%. The percentage of admitted students that enrolled ranged from 38.8–66.6%.

Table 4: Selectivity and Yield Indexes for PhD program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number Applied</th>
<th>Number Admitted</th>
<th>Number Enrolled</th>
<th>Selectivity % of Applicants Admitted</th>
<th>Yield % of Admitted Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.53%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Coordinating Board Requirements

A. 18 Characteristics.

The 18 Characteristics Report was developed by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to create a snapshot of graduate programs at public universities and health-related institutions. The 18 characteristics report is intended to provide information to the institutions for self-improvement and to serve as a guide to members of the general public who are interested in graduate education.

1. Number of Degrees Conferred Annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each of the three most recent years:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of degrees awarded per academic year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Graduation Rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each of the three most recent years:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The percent of first-year doctoral students who graduated within ten years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% for 2000 cohort</td>
<td>50% for 2001 cohort</td>
<td>71.4% for 2002 cohort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Average Time to Degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each of the three most recent years:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of the graduates' time to degree.</td>
<td>8.6 years</td>
<td>8.3 years</td>
<td>7.0 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average time to degree is higher due to a part-time program implemented in 2002. This program has now been discontinued.

4. Employment Profile (i.e. employment or further education/training):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each of the three most recent years, the number and percent of graduates by year:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>11; 84.6%</td>
<td>10; 100%</td>
<td>9; 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Seeking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2; 15.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Admission Criteria.

**Doctoral Program Admission Criteria Summary**

Master’s degree, preferably in social work; Minimum GRE score of 300 (new scoring) or 1000 (past scoring); Capacity for advanced academic work & potential for scholarship; Development of competence to design & carry out rigorous research studies relevant to social work; Excellent references; International students whose native language is not English must submit TOEFL scores (minimum sum of 100, preferably with minimum score of 25 in each section). Students must submit an online application as well as a personal narrative statement, one copy of a publication or other written document which is representative of academic or professional work, a current resume or CV, and three letters of reference (though five are preferred).
Admissions Requirements
Students entering the PhD program must meet the requirements set forth by the Graduate School of The University of Texas to enter the program. The minimum requirements set by the Graduate School are as follows:

**Requirements for Graduate Admission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>A bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution in the United States or a comparable degree from a foreign academic institution. The Graduate and International Admissions Center (GIAC) will determine eligibility for admission in consultation with prospective graduate programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 GPA Upper-Division</td>
<td>A grade point average of at least 3.0 (on a 4.0 scale) or comparable grade point average in upper-division work (junior- and senior-level courses) and in any graduate work already completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Test Scores (GRE, GMAT, TOEFL, IELTS)</td>
<td>The Educational Testing Service (ETS) code for The University of Texas at Austin is 6882. Test scores sent to this code are made available to all graduate departments. <strong>TOEFL scores over two years old will not be accepted. Other test scores more than five years old will not be accepted. Only test scores mailed directly from the testing agency are considered official.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter Preparation</td>
<td>Records should reflect that the applicant has received adequate subject preparation for the proposed graduate major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Requirements</td>
<td>This includes such items as statement of purpose, writing samples, portfolios, etc. Check with the graduate program to which you are applying for their specific requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Recommendation</td>
<td>Letters of recommendation are required for almost all applications to graduate school. Most graduate programs use our online recommendation system. Check with the graduate program to which you are applying to determine how to submit your letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification of Financial Responsibility Form for International Applicants</td>
<td>While this form is not required for consideration of your application for admission, it is necessary for preparation of the immigration document (Form I-20 or Form DS-2019) for The University of Texas at Austin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Doctoral Committee of the School of Social Work also looks for evidence of the following when reviewing applications:

- Applicants are expected to show capacity for advanced academic work and potential for scholarship. The development of competence to design and carry out rigorous research studies relevant to social work is a critical expectation of the PhD program.
- Applicants must have a master’s degree from an accredited school of social work. Exceptions are sometimes made to this requirement for applicants from countries without accreditation or for applicants with degrees from related fields with exceptionally strong academic credentials and/or experience working in social-work settings.
- Applicants are expected to demonstrate excellent writing skills, particularly those that show evidence of analytic skills and research capabilities and interests, as part of the admissions application.

**Language Requirements**

The School of Social Work welcomes applications from international students to the PhD program. In addition to meeting the general requirements for admission to the Graduate School and the School of Social Work, applicants whose first language is not English must demonstrate English proficiency by submitting a score for both the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and the Test of Spoken English (TSE), or the TOEFL-ibt. While the Graduate School may waive the TOEFL tests for those who hold bachelor’s degrees from a US institution or from an institution in another English-speaking country, the School of Social Work requires the above-named tests. This more rigorous language requirement is necessary because of the demanding nature of the literature covered in the program and the expected high level of writing and verbal performance required of our students. The School also accepts the International English Language Testing System in place of the TOEFL.

Upon acceptance to the School of Social Work and arrival at The University of Texas at Austin, all students for whom English is a second language will be assessed for English language proficiency. Based on this assessment, students may be required to take English as a Second Language (ESL) courses before enrolling in social work courses. Additional coursework may delay a student’s completion of the PhD program. The student is responsible for the cost of ESL courses, which are not included in estimated tuition and fees.

**Admissions Process**

The Assistant Dean for Doctoral Education is responsible for the development and oversight of the PhD program, including admissions, programs of work, degree program modifications, and graduation. Administrative oversight for the PhD program is vested in the Doctoral Committee; the Assistant Dean, this committee, and other GSC faculty review each applicant. Applicants are further ranked and offered admission based on the criteria for admission.
6. Percentage of Full-Time Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTS/number of students enrolled (headcount) for the last three fall semesters.</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For those receiving financial support, the average monetary institutional support provided per full-time graduate student for the prior year from assistantships, scholarships, stipends, grants, and fellowships (does not include tuition or benefits).</td>
<td>$16,514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the prior year, the number of FTS with at least $1000 of annual support / the number of FTS.</td>
<td>29/30 = 96.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student not receiving institutional financial support is fully funded by the military.

9. Number of Core Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of core faculty in the prior year (defined as members of the GSC). This number represents the faculty involved in the PhD program.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Student to Core Faculty Ratio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each of the three most recent years:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of full-time student equivalent (FTSE) / average of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) of core faculty.</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Core Faculty Publications.

For each of the three most recent years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers or publications, books or book chapters, juried creative or performance accomplishments, and notices of discoveries, files, or patents issued per core faculty member.</td>
<td>76 (total)</td>
<td>142 (total)</td>
<td>Available after faculty activity reports are submitted later in Fall 2013 semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per core faculty member</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Core Faculty External Grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Core Faculty Members</th>
<th>Faculty Members Reporting External Funds</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>Average Expenditures Per Faculty Member Reporting External Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$4,081,428</td>
<td>$204,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$3,546,324</td>
<td>$168,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$3,003,189</td>
<td>$125,133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data represents external grants for GSC faculty only. The total expenditures for all faculty and researchers were $7,552,908 in 2010, $8,374,225 in 2011, and $9,613,639 in 2012.

13. Faculty Teaching Load.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Core Faculty Members</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty Members</th>
<th>Total Credit Hours Taught</th>
<th>Average Credit Hours Taught Per Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5,750.5</td>
<td>191.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4,888.0</td>
<td>181.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5,119.5</td>
<td>176.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. **Faculty Diversity: Core Faculty by Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and Gender.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender/Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black and Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic in Any Combination</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **Student Diversity: Enrollment Headcount by Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and Gender in Program During Prior Year.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender/Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black and Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic in Any Combination</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. **Date of Last External Review.**

We have not had an external review.

17. **External Program Accreditation.**

Not applicable.

18. **Student Publications and Presentations.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each of the three most recent years:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of discipline-related papers and publications, juried creative or performance accomplishments, book chapters, books, and external presentations per year by student FTE.</td>
<td>99 = 2.75 per student</td>
<td>112 = 3.5 per student</td>
<td>109 = 3.1 per student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Student Enrollment.

For each of the three most recent years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student enrollment is defined as the number of students enrolled full time in the doctoral program in the fall semester in the academic year in which the graduate program review is being conducted.

For Fall 2013, 32 full-time students enrolled.

C. Graduate License Rates.

Not applicable to social work PhD students.

D. Alignment of Program with Stated Program and Institutional Goals and Purposes.

The mission of the Graduate School at UT is to be an active community of diverse scholars in over 100 academic programs dedicated to excellence in original research, teaching, creative expression, and intellectual leadership. Using our extensive resources and talents, we cultivate individuals who work together to bring knowledge, innovation, and best practices to meet the great and small challenges of our time. The School of Social Work is among these PhD programs and shares the mission of the Graduate Program at UT to prepare its graduates for successful academic careers as social work educators whose excellence as teachers and scholars will provide intellectual leadership to the profession. Our PhD graduates in social work provide innovation and best practices to solve critical social problems and to enhance the well being of people throughout the world.

E. Program Curriculum and Duration in Comparison to Peer Programs.

Table 5 compares UT’s PhD curriculum with the top five schools of social work with whom UT competes for students. The average number of credit hours minus dissertation required by these schools for their PhD degrees varies from 45-51 hours with an average of 47 credit hours in comparison to the 47 credit hours required by UT. It should be noted, however, that there are variations in how doctoral programs are offered in social work that do not lend themselves very well to direct comparison. The University of California at Berkeley, for example, does not require a specific number of courses in the same way that other programs typically do and the University of Michigan offers several dual degree programs that have many different degree requirements.

Comparison of each program’s curriculum indicates that there are also similarities between UT and other doctoral programs in social work. For example, all programs offer a
variety of courses in research, theory, and pedagogy, as well as courses that prepare students in a specialized knowledge area and content related to the social work profession. This coursework is consistent to what is suggested in the Quality Guidelines for PhD Programs in Social Work provided by GADE. Refer to Appendix A for a review of the Quality Guidelines.

Time expected to graduation varies between the PhD programs in social work from 3-6 years in comparison to UT’s expectation of 4 years. The average number of years to completion also varies from 4-7 years while UT’s average number of years to completion for the past three years is 8.0 years. One reason for a slightly longer matriculation for UT’s PhD program is the fact that UT previously had a part-time summer PhD program intended for faculty throughout the United States who were already teaching in undergraduate social work programs. The cohorts in that program extended the average time to completion numbers. As several of these part-time students graduated in recent years, our average time to completion is expected to improve (refer back to item 3 in the 18 Characteristics data).
### Table 5: Curriculum Comparisons for the PhD Program in Social Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Credit Hours (Coursework)</th>
<th>Number of Other Classes</th>
<th>Number of Theory Courses</th>
<th>Number of Research Methods and Statistics Courses</th>
<th>Number of Pedagogy Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan – Ann Arbor</td>
<td>51 hours</td>
<td>3 courses</td>
<td>1 course:</td>
<td>10 courses:</td>
<td>3 courses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Role and Use of Theory in Applied Social Research</td>
<td>Introduction to Social Measurement and Research</td>
<td>Practicum in Teaching I, II, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Advanced Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foundations of Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Applications for Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Computer Applications for Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multivariate Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized Methods Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practicum in Research I, II, III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>7 social work courses are required. Social science courses vary.</td>
<td>Varies with dual degree program.</td>
<td>Varies with dual degree program.</td>
<td>Varies with dual degree program.</td>
<td>Varies with dual degree program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 hours</td>
<td>3 courses</td>
<td>1 course:</td>
<td>6 courses:</td>
<td>1 course:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose from interdisciplinary list of social science theory.</td>
<td>Doctoral Research Methods and Techniques in Social Welfare</td>
<td>Teaching in Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Library Resources and Faculty Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An approved elective course in research methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Probability and Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical Analysis of Continuous-Outcome Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical Analysis of Categorical Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California – Berkeley</td>
<td>There is no total coursework requirement. Students must enroll full-time (12 units) until they pass the qualifying exam.</td>
<td>1 course:</td>
<td>2 courses:</td>
<td>9 courses:</td>
<td>2 courses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global and International Issues in Social Welfare Policy</td>
<td>Teaching Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of two 3+ credit graduate social science theory courses.</td>
<td>Additional teaching opportunities available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington – Seattle</td>
<td>45 hours</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>2 courses:</td>
<td>9 courses:</td>
<td>1 course:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptualizing Social Problems to Inform Interventions</td>
<td>Research Methods in Social Interventions</td>
<td>Teaching Seminar/Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Social Intervention Models</td>
<td>Additional teaching opportunities available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptualizing Social Problems to Inform Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 courses outside of SSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill</td>
<td>45 hours</td>
<td>2 courses</td>
<td>3 courses:</td>
<td>9 courses:</td>
<td>1 course:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptualizing Social Problems to Inform Interventions</td>
<td>Research Methods in Social Interventions</td>
<td>Teaching Seminar/Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Social Intervention Models</td>
<td>Additional teaching opportunities available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptualizing Social Problems to Inform Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 courses outside of SSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>47 hours</td>
<td>3 courses</td>
<td>1 course:</td>
<td>7 courses:</td>
<td>1 course:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theories of Social Work</td>
<td>Research I</td>
<td>Pedagogy in Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electives to build specialization that can be taken outside department (minimum of 12 credit hours)</td>
<td>Research II-Quantitative Methods</td>
<td>Assistant Instructor and teaching positions available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research III-Qualitative Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research III-Qualitative Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data Analysis and Computers I, II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One research practicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One elective in advanced research or statistical methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information was obtained through the university website and subsequent phone interviews with the graduate coordinators and other designated staff.
MSSW Program Review

The following section contains Graduate School requirements and Coordinating Board requirements utilizing the common headings provided for all master’s programs.
I. Graduate School Requirements

A. Narrative Description.

The Master of Science in Social Work (MSSW) program at the University of Texas at Austin prepares students for advanced social work practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Developed in accordance with the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) curriculum standards and policies, the social work program is committed to providing leadership and excellence in social work education. In both foundation and concentration curriculum, experiential learning is provided through internships at selected organizations, governmental, nonprofit, or for-profit agencies in which qualified and competent educational supervision is provided. Course content and field experiences are organized and integrated using a systems/developmental framework and a bio-psycho-social perspective.

The full-time curriculum of the MSSW program consists of 60 credit hours (45 classroom credit hours and 15 internship credit hours). It is based upon a liberal arts perspective and has two major components—a 27-credit-hour professional foundation curriculum offered during the first year and a subsequent 27-credit-hour specialized, advanced curriculum focused in two concentration areas: Clinical Social Work and Community and Administrative Leadership (CAL). Six credit hours of electives complete the 60-hour curriculum. The MSSW is considered the terminal practice degree.

Students entering the MSSW program may complete the program requirements on either a full-time (2 year), extended full-time (2.5 year), or part-time basis (3 or 3.5 year). In addition, the program offers a Post-BSW (Advanced Standing) option for students who have a BSW degree from an accredited BSW program in social work. Post BSW (PBSW) students may also complete the program on an extended full-time basis. Most 60-hour students choose to complete the program in two years.

The MSSW program is designed to educate and graduate social work students who are advanced professional practitioners and are committed to the promotion of social and economic justice, the alleviation of critical social problems, and the enhancement of human well-being. The MSSW program has the following primary goals:

1. Graduates will practice professional social work utilizing advanced knowledge and skills in clinical social work or community and administrative leadership.

2. Graduates will develop and apply a commitment to critical inquiry and knowledge acquisition and development.

3. Graduates will be able to discuss their understanding of the dynamics of populations at risk and implement social justice strategies to redress inequities and
oppression within individual, family, group, community, and organizational contexts.

The MSSW program goals are explicitly reflected in the foundation curriculum and in each of the concentrations. The goals of the extended full-time and part-time program options and its courses are identical to those of the full-time program. The full-time, extended full-time, part-time, and Post-BSW (Advanced Standing) program options provide equal quality of education. Individual sections of a particular course use standardized course descriptions and objectives to achieve comparable course outcomes. Course outlines, texts, supplemental readings, assignments, and bibliographies are the same or equivalent.

As with all social work programs accredited by the Council on Social Work Education, students successfully completing the MSSW must show competence in the following ten areas:

- Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.
- Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.
- Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.
- Engage diversity and difference in practice.
- Advance human rights and social and economic justice.
- Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.
- Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.
- Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.
- Respond to contexts that shape practice.
- Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

The first-year foundation curriculum is designed so that courses taken at the same time are complementary (horizontal integration) and are prerequisite to subsequent foundation courses and concentration courses (vertical integration). With rare exceptions, students must finish all foundation courses before taking second year concentration courses.

**Foundation Curriculum**

In addition to providing a generalist perspective for social work practice, the foundation curriculum serves to develop the student’s knowledge of and identification with the social work profession—that is, knowing about and appreciating social work’s historical development and evolution, the range of professional interventions characteristic of contemporary practice, ethical issues and concerns now confronting practitioners, and the organizational contexts of practice. The foundation curriculum provides socialization to the profession that is further developed during study in a particular concentration area.
Throughout the program, regardless of the student’s choice of concentration, emphasis is placed on social work’s commitment to culturally diverse populations and women, to issues of social and economic justice, and to the advancement of the knowledge base of the profession. Social work values and ethics are supported throughout the classroom and field internship courses. All students in the MSSW program must demonstrate mastery of foundation knowledge, values, processes, and skills essential to a generalist social work perspective by either completing the foundation year of the MSSW curriculum or by earning a baccalaureate degree in social work from a program accredited by the Council on Social Work Education. Students admitted to the MSSW program must also have earned a bachelor’s degree to demonstrate that they have acquired the appropriate liberal arts perspective upon which to build their professional education.

The 27 credit hours of foundation coursework are completed through the following nine courses:

- Theories and Critical Perspectives of Human Behavior and the Social Environment (HBSE) – 381R
- Foundations of Social Justice: Values, Diversity, Power and Oppression – 381S
- Dynamics of Organizations & Communities – 381T
- Social Work Practice I – 383R
- Field Instruction I – 384R
- Social Work Research Methods – 385R
- Social Policy Analysis & Social Problems – 382R
- Social Work Practice II – 383T
- Field Instruction II – 384S

Post-BSW students are waived from HBSE, Social Justice, Organizations and Communities, Research, Policy, and Practice I if they received a B or better for each in their BSW program. If a PBSW student received lower than a B, the student will be required to take that course in place of an elective. All PBSW students take Practice II as a bridge course and each is evaluated upon admission to determine if they are waived from foundation field (Field I and II).

**Concentration Curriculum**

Advanced curriculum content builds upon the MSSW foundation curriculum, the liberal arts perspective, and the eco-systems/developmental framework. Preparation for advanced practice goes beyond that of the foundation year in significant ways. Although built upon a foundation curriculum, advanced content extends the depth, breadth, and specificity of that curriculum. The concentration curriculum prepares our graduates for advanced social work practice. In addition to more specialized knowledge and skill related to the area of concentration, practice at this level requires a higher degree of creativity and judgment and a more sophisticated use of self in situations characterized by ambiguity, rigidity or rapid change, complexity, conflict, ethical dilemmas, client or system vulnerability, and often limited time and resources. Advanced practitioners are self-critical and can
qualitatively and quantitatively evaluate the efficacy of their actions. They hold themselves responsible for their own growth and development and that of their profession. They practice collaboratively and with a higher degree of autonomy than those possessing the BSW or having completed only the foundation year.

In the Advanced Curriculum, students in each concentration complete required courses, concentration-specific selectives, nine credit hours of concentration field internship, and the Capstone course. All sections of the Capstone course teach through case-based learning.

The 27 credit hours of concentration coursework are completed through the following eight courses (Field III and IV are divided into two courses to allow students to finish in the summer if this extended field option is selected):

**Clinical Social Work (CSW)**

- Clinical Assessment & Differential Diagnosis – 393R1
- Theories and Methods of Family Intervention – 393R3
- Theories and Methods of Group Intervention – 393R26
- Advanced CSW Selective
- Advanced CSW Selective
- Advanced Integrative Capstone in Social Work Knowledge and Practice – 385T
- Advanced Field Instruction: CSW (6 credit hours) – 694R
- Advanced Field Instruction: CSW (3 credit hours) – 394S

**Community and Administrative Leadership (CAL)**

- Social Work Leadership in Human Service Organizations – 393T16
- Advanced CAL Selective
- Advanced CAL Selective
- Advanced CAL Selective
- Advanced CAL Selective
- Advanced Integrative Capstone in Social Work Knowledge and Practice – 385T
- Advanced Field Instruction: CAL (6 credit hours) – 694R
- Advanced Field Instruction: CAL (3 credit hours) – 394S

**Advanced Concentration Course Selective/Elective Options.** Based on School and faculty resources, advanced selective courses are offered to students to individualize their learning within their area of concentration. This allows students course-option flexibility in order to focus their own social work career path with their specific areas of interest. The respective concentration sub-committees approve all selective courses. The distinction being made between a “selective” course and an “elective” course within each
concentration is one of advanced level of coverage. Advanced selectives are only available to social work students who have completed foundation coursework. Elective courses, however, may be cross-listed and include BSW students, MSSW students from either concentration, or, based on class space availability, either undergraduate or graduate students from outside the School of Social Work.

Clinical Social Work
Students completing the Clinical Social Work Concentration at The University of Texas at Austin will possess advanced competence in clinical technologies to become leaders in the provision of human services specific to practice with individuals, families, groups, and communities within a community-based practice context. Students are taught clinical practice technologies that are evidenced-based, strengths-based, and culturally competent. Students are provided explanations from transtheoretically based and ecologically focused theories that explain how to purposefully change human behavior. Using a variety of effective treatment models, the best practice skills for intervening with individuals, families, and groups within a community-based practice network are emphasized. Practice interventions taught are competency-based and focus on enhancing client functioning in the areas of strengths and coping, collaboration, problem solving, and self-efficacy, as well as promoting social and economic justice within all systems in the environment. Practice effectiveness and evaluation skills are integrated throughout the coursework. Students further enhance their advanced practice competencies by choosing clinical practice selectives and electives on specialized practice topics.

The Clinical Social Work Concentration emphasizes integrative ecological systems and transtheoretical and innovative perspectives in the teaching of theory and practice. The purpose of choosing these frameworks is to help students conceptualize clients across a range of perspectives from individual to systemic. This teaching of diverse therapeutic perspectives provides opportunities for learning the best practices that exist across intervention models. Using the integrative and broad lenses provided by ecological systems and transtheoretical frameworks, students are taught to use multiple perspectives to guide their practice as they assess, select, and evaluate intervention methods across diverse client systems.

Theoretical Frameworks

Ecological Systems Theory. The ecological systems perspective is a popular and widely used framework in social work. The ecological framework targets for change all client and community systems and their interactions that are contributing to the development and maintenance of client problems (e.g., individual, peer group, family, school, work, or community agencies). The ecological systems framework helps clinicians to view clients through various social systems and to integrate techniques across diverse clinical practice perspectives. Empirically supported best practices are used to purposefully design effective interventions and systems of care within a community-based setting. The
ecological systems perspectives further emphasize the need for community development and maintenance strategies within the community systems network to ensure that clients continue to progress and change.

The Transtheoretical Model. The transtheoretical model recognizes that diverse clinical practice models offer important content and processes for client change. There are currently several therapeutic theories and models that show efficacy for various client populations. No single theory or set of interventions can best serve all client needs and problems. Some integration is necessary for learning the best practices for helping clients. Instead of relying on one theory or set of interventions, the transtheoretical model encourages practitioners to develop ways of practicing that can draw from the best practices across the clinical spectrum. The transtheoretical model respects the richness and applicability of various models, emphasizes that a model must be measured and validated, and recognizes the importance of understanding the processes involved in human change.

The following list provides a basic framework to define the knowledge and skills we expect students to have when they complete their program of work in the Clinical Social Work Concentration. Students graduating from the Clinical Social Work Concentration will be able to:

- Strategically apply empirically based theories and knowledge to effectively assess the developmental level of the client (based on biological, sociological, cultural, psychological, and spiritual development across the life span), the influence of the client’s social systems (individual, family, group, organizational, and community), and the ways in which those systems promote or deter clients in maintaining or achieving health and well-being.

- Deliberate about human complexity by using multiple perspectives to analyze client’s strengths and problems within the larger community and policy contexts.

- Prioritize selective target systems for intervention: individual (intrapersonal), family and community-based networks (interpersonal), and broader societal systems (individual-societal conflicts). Interventions will be based on the knowledge and skills that inform the dynamics of human change from different theoretical perspectives.

- Use multiple theoretical perspectives that are informed by best practices and empirically based studies to identify, critique, and apply strengths-based interventions to the problems and unique characteristics of diverse populations.
• Develop and promote self-awareness including the professional use of self to engage and work with diverse client populations and community systems in addressing ethical dilemmas.

• Identify and utilize culturally relevant perspectives to define, design, implement, and evaluate interventions for effective practice with persons from diverse backgrounds and community contexts.

• Advocate for practice delivery and policies that promote social and economic justice and equity at multiple levels.

• Utilize quantitative and qualitative research findings to understand scientific, analytic, and ethical approaches to building practice knowledge; provide high quality services; initiate change; improve practice, policy, and service delivery; and evaluate the social worker’s own practice.

• Demonstrate leadership skills in public speaking, marketing, community networking, resource development, interprofessional and interagency collaboration, mediation, and conflict management to promote strengths-based solutions to client system problems.

• Seek and advance continuing education, the efficacy of innovations in practice delivery, and the effective use of clinical supervision to evaluate treatment integrity and adherence to best practices.

Community and Administrative Leadership (CAL)
The Community Administrative and Leadership (CAL) Concentration fosters excellence, innovation, and change at the macro-systems level

• in the communities we serve,
• in the administration of organizations that deliver social services, and
• in the policies that affect social and economic wellbeing.

The purpose of the Community and Administrative Leadership (CAL) Concentration is to prepare students for leadership roles in the areas of program design and implementation, program management and evaluation, community organization and development, and policy analysis and advocacy. In the CAL Concentration, students gain specialized in-depth knowledge and practice skills for advanced practice with a range of client populations and with groups, organizations, and communities.
Theoretical Framework

Ecological Systems Theory. The concentration’s curriculum is grounded in an ecological systems perspective. Communities and organizations do not exist in isolation. What happens in and to them depends on economic, political, sociological, legal, and technological factors in the external environment, as well as forces in their internal environment, such as organizational mission, culture, operations, human resources, technology, and financial resources. Human service organizations are comprised of subsystems, with the tasks of management being the proper organization and direction of individual subsystems at the supervisory and mid-management levels and the design and effective integration of all subsystems at the executive level. Communities are also comprised of institutions or subsystems that perform critical functions for the members of the community. The task for community and policy practitioners is to assess the functioning of those subsystems for all members of the community and design interventions that build on the strengths of the community and create real opportunities for all its members.

The ecological systems framework helps macro practitioners understand how various social systems impact individual clients and how community institutions can support or inhibit dynamic change. While systems theory serves as the major organizing framework for the curriculum, other approaches to understanding organizations, administrative practices, and communities are also incorporated, including the asset-based approach, the empowerment perspective, and political-economy theory.

The CAL Concentration teaches cross-cutting knowledge and skills that prepare students for macro practice as master’s level social workers in community, administrative, and policy practice settings. For example, MSSW CAL graduates may work in community planning, development, and organizing; social service management and program coordination; or policy development, analysis, and research. Six domains provide a basic framework to define the knowledge and skills in the Community and Administrative Leadership Concentration.

Advocacy: Develop and defend well-reasoned positions on critical issues in the community, champion systematic interventions that prevent problems, expand opportunities, and enhance quality of life for individuals and communities, and organize and mobilize community resources to advance the cause of social and economic justice. Specific practice skills include gathering and analyzing information on community problems, forming interagency committees and coalitions, organizing client groups, educating relevant segments of the community, engaging in policy development, lobbying elected leaders and public officials, providing expert testimony, and actively participating in the political process.
Program Development: Apply a variety of planning processes, change strategies, and models for community capacity building, critically assess the program’s internal and external environment through effective assessment tools, and utilize common assessment methodologies to understand the demographics, resources, needs, and strengths of the community. Specific practice skills include developing and prioritizing goals and objectives, creating and implementing program structures, developing program budgets and monitoring financial operations to ensure efficient and effective services, mobilizing community resources to support new programs, identifying common ground to facilitate involvement of important constituents in planning for the future, and facilitating dialogue and consensus.

Evaluation: Design and conduct community and organizational assessments, program evaluations, and productivity analyses using appropriate scientific methods, and create strategies for community and organizational change based on empirical results. Specific practice skills include the development of logic models, analysis and interpretation of quantitative and qualitative data that reflect program outputs, outcomes and impacts, and writing and presenting research findings related to communities, administration, and policies.

Informatics: Innovatively and creatively assess the organizational, interpersonal, ethical, and cultural factors that facilitate and impede the flow and exchange of information (i.e., formal/informal structure, hierarchy, organizational roles, democratic ideals, and similar factors) within organizations. Specific practice skills include the analysis of the differential impacts of technology on diverse user groups and the technological assessment of the organizations that engage in community, administrative, and policy practice.

Leadership and Communication: Critically and creatively examine effective models of leadership and communication and decision making to (a) inspire, influence, and create change; (b) align individuals, groups, and communities to action; and (c) bridge differences and foster inclusivity. Specific practice skills include the ability to create and articulate a vision that inspires others to action; to encourage and receive constructive feedback; and to engage in active listening and constructive dialogue to help solve problems.

Governance: Work with agency staff, Board of Directors, other governing bodies, and key stakeholders to design, implement, and monitor effective policies, procedures, and practices that enhance the effectiveness of the operations, management, and service delivery (and quality) of organizations. Specific practice skills include agenda building, budgeting, organizing and developing staff and constituents, establishing structure, developing policy, problem solving, project management, and providing quality outcomes for key stakeholders.
Additionally, students of both concentrations are challenged to acquire advanced knowledge and skills consistent with our mission and goals in the following areas:

**Social Justice:** Students will evaluate, differentiate, and apply professional roles, functions, and strategies to competently address needs of vulnerable populations to enhance human well-being, reduce social problems, and promote social and economic justice.

**Ethics and Values:** Students will critically examine personal values, attitudes, and expectations to enhance professional self-awareness and will demonstrate competency in managing value differences and ethical dilemmas in practice in accordance with the NASW Code of Ethics.

**Professional Use of Self:** Students will integrate and apply the differential use of self in professional relationships to enhance practice effectiveness with clients, colleagues, and staff and/or representatives of other organizations or communities.

**Professional Development:** Students will maximize the use of supervision and consultation to refine critical thinking skills, seek learning opportunities outside the agency, and utilize collegial feedback in order to increase professional competence through skill building, accountability, and professional development.

**Cultural Competence:** Students will analyze the needs, values, and strengths of diverse client systems and effectively support their power to act on their own behalf and/or collaborate with others to address personal, community, and social problems.

Field Education is a multifaceted professional activity that requires students to develop a knowledge, skill, and value base that can support a complex configuration of activities across diverse settings. The field practicum serves as a primary link between knowledge presented in the classroom and actual social work practice. It also provides students with an opportunity to build a repertoire of competencies, to field test those competencies in actual practice settings, and to enhance their sense of identification with the profession. Both foundation and concentration field instruction are addressed below.

**Foundation Field**
Foundation-year students enter field in September and continue through the spring term. The placement process includes completion of a placement packet after admission and review of application materials by the Office for Field Education and clinical faculty. The student is provided with an appropriate placement depending upon his or her educational goals, needs, and interests, as well as agency availability and resources. The Assistant Dean for Field Education and clinical faculty match students based on their ranked preferences and application materials.
In the field placement, student educational assignments revolve around service-giving responsibilities. The agency-based field instructor and faculty liaison develop assignments for each semester designed to fulfill the field course objectives. The student, under the supervision of the field instructor and the faculty liaison, develops the educational contract, which reflects the practicum goals and the assignments identified to assist the student in reaching those goals. All students receive supervision from a designated agency-based staff member—the field instructor—who holds a master’s level social work degree from a CSWE-accredited program. The faculty liaison is the designated faculty member responsible for assisting field instructors with their educational role and for monitoring and evaluating the student’s performance in field.

A generalist social work practice perspective is the underlying foundation of the foundation field sequence. This perspective is seen as encompassing an evidence-based, strengths-based, and culturally competent model that incorporates the ecological and transtheoretical models wherein students learn the importance of the interaction between the person and the environment in order to understand and better enhance the problem-solving capacities of clients, especially those who are members of at-risk populations. Students learn to identify and prioritize a wide range of client systems needs and to link clients with appropriate resources. Within the generalist perspective, the student is also encouraged to promote social and economic justice by considering the broader implications of client problems, assessing risk, working to contribute to the improvement of human service systems and policies, and identifying needed resources for clients so that they may reach their potential. The problem-solving approach to intervention at the individual, family, group, organizational, and community levels and the identification of strengths is also emphasized. Students learn to apply the problem-solving approach, including the principles of data collection, problem, asset, and resource identification, assessment, planning, implementation, and evaluation to systems of various sizes. Students also learn the importance of research in the acquisition of evidence-informed and practice-based knowledge.

Concurrent with their first field placement, students are enrolled in foundation practice courses SW383R and SW383T. Practice material is integrated with the field experience during both semesters through a weekly one-hour field seminar. Typically, the practice classes and the seminars are taught by the faculty liaison to enhance and focus the educational experience of the beginning student.

The Assistant Dean for Field Education reviews the application materials for students admitted to the master’s program who have an undergraduate degree in social work (Post-BSW students) prior to admission to determine if they have the depth and breadth of experience to be exempt from foundation field. Post-BSW students who are required to take both first and final field do not take SW383R in the fall but do take SW383T in the spring. These same students enroll in the field seminar class for both the fall and spring semesters.
The Office for Field Education assigns students to the integrative seminars in groups of 18 to 23, depending upon the number of students entering field. Usually students in each seminar represent a number of agencies and client populations, with an emphasis on a cluster of agencies dealing with a particular practice area or population such as child welfare, gerontology, health, or mental health. This model allows students to become familiar with a variety of agencies and client populations, while also being exposed to more in-depth content in one specific area. Students enjoy this exposure to various agencies and populations and learn from one another.

Students in the foundation year are required to complete educationally focused assignments in intervention at the individual, family, small group, organizational, and community levels. All students must have an opportunity to work with at-risk populations.

Throughout both semesters of the foundation field sequence, there is an emphasis on integration of theory and knowledge with practice. Self-evaluation on the part of the student and responsibility for evaluation of social work practice are stressed. To better assess learning and integration, foundation-year field students keep daily journals detailing their understanding of the integration of practice and theory, ethical issues, and their growing identity as professionals. This log is read by the faculty liaison and is one tool used in evaluating the classroom and field experience for individual students. Students submit three process recordings each semester of foundation field for written and oral feedback from their field instructor and faculty liaison. Each semester students also complete self-evaluations, which are submitted to both their faculty liaison and field instructor.

**Concentration-Year Field (Block)**

Concentration-year students enter field in January and finish in May or August depending on whether they are enrolled in block or extended-block field. The regular central Texas placement process occurs in the fall semester and includes attendance at a mandatory meeting where a list of approved agencies differentiated as Clinical or Community and Administrative Leadership (CAL) Concentration is provided. Students also have the following opportunities: meet with agency representatives at the Agency Field Fair; receive assistance with the preparation of a professional resume and educational objectives; interview with the Assistant Dean for Field Education or clinical faculty to prioritize agency choices; have on-site interviews with the top three available choices; and engage in a mutual selection by both the agency and the student. Students requesting international placement must complete an application, be approved by the international committee, and attend a semester-long preparatory seminar.

Final field placements must be in the student’s chosen concentration area. The student confers with clinical faculty to determine an area of interest and/or population within their concentration area for the intensive final field experience. Students must formulate educational goals consistent with competencies and practice behaviors for final field as they explore their own needs and the availability of learning experiences in the agency.
An up-to-date resume and educational objectives are sent to student-selected agencies prior to the pre-placement interview of the student. Once again, all students must have an opportunity to work with at-risk populations.

Students in their concentration field placements enroll in the Advanced Integrative Capstone in Social Work Knowledge and Practice course in the spring semester where field experience is an integrated part of the course case-study structure. As in foundation field, clinical faculty members perform as liaisons with final field interns. Agency/student visits typically occur twice each semester for review of practicum progress and integration of theory and concepts. Students placed out-of-state or in international settings have one visit per semester with their assigned liaison.

Dual Degree Programs
The School of Social Work offers four dual degree programs. These opportunities are in collaboration with the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, The University of Texas Health Science Center School of Public Health, The School of Law, and The LBJ School of Public Affairs and include:

**MSSW/Master of Divinity.** The University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work and the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary have established a dual degree program of study that provides master’s-level students the opportunity to complete requirements for two degrees concurrently: the Master of Divinity (MDiv) and Master of Science in Social Work (MSSW). The program is designed to be completed in four years of full-time study. Students will receive degrees from both institutions. Students must be accepted into both programs independently and meet each institution’s admission criteria.

**MSSW/Master of Public Health.** The School of Social Work and the UT Health Science Center School of Public Health have established a dual degree program that will target students who wish to combine social work and public health education using an interdisciplinary perspective. This type of educational program is critically important in health-related communities that currently are hiring social workers to carry out social services. The value of combining the MPH and MSSW degree programs is that students will gain expertise from two esteemed educational programs that will allow them to work toward solving crucial public health and social problems. The MSSW/MPH program is designed to be completed in three years.

**MSSW/Doctor of Jurisprudence.** The School of Social Work and the School of Law have established a dual degree program that offers students an opportunity to integrate each profession’s conceptual frameworks, knowledge bases, and practice skills through a program of study that enhances their work as effective practitioners in today’s complex legal and social service environments. This dual degree program expands and further enhances existing opportunities for collaboration.
between the School of Law and the School of Social Work. The MSSW/JD dual degree program is designed so that students can earn an MSSW and JD degree in four years rather than the five years required to complete the two degrees independently.

**MSSW/Master of Public Affairs.** The School of Social Work and The Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs have established a dual degree designed to prepare qualified students for a career in social welfare policy development and human service management. The core knowledge of social work and public affairs are a compelling combination for students who want to pursue a professional career in human service management, social welfare policy development and analysis, program planning and implementation, and program evaluation. Students completing the dual MSSW/MPAff program will be uniquely prepared to design and manage effective and client-responsive human service delivery systems and pursue careers in social policy analysis. The MSSW/MPAff program is designed to be completed in three years.

**Portfolio Programs.** Portfolio programs are opportunities for students to obtain credentials in a cross-disciplinary academic area of inquiry involving research conducted in several disciplines. Portfolio programs are offered through the University’s Graduate School and include those in Disability Studies, Dispute Resolution, Gerontology, Nonprofit Studies, and Women and Gender Studies. Students work with the MSSW Academic Adviser to arrange portfolio classes.

### B. Statement of Program Status

*US News & World Report* ranks CSWE accredited social work master’s programs every four years in the category of Health Schools.³

According to *US News & World Report*, “All the health rankings are based solely on the results of peer assessment surveys sent to deans, other administrators, and/or faculty at accredited degree programs or schools in each discipline. All schools surveyed in a discipline were sent the same number of surveys.

Respondents rated the academic quality of programs on a scale of 1 (marginal) to 5 (outstanding). They were instructed to select ‘don’t know’ if they did not have enough knowledge to rate a program. Only fully accredited programs in good standing during the survey period are ranked. Those schools with the highest average scores appear in the rankings.”⁴

---


The most recent ranking of social work programs occurred in 2012. The University of Texas at Austin was ranked seventh. The top fifteen programs are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>University of Michigan–Ann Arbor Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>University of Chicago Chicago, IL</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>University of Washington Seattle, WA</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>Columbia University New York, NY</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill Chapel Hill, NC</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>University of California–Berkeley Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>University of Texas–Austin Austin, TX</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>Boston College Chestnut Hill, MA</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>Fordham University New York, NY</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>University of Southern California Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin–Madison Madison, WI</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, VA</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Competition**

The top ten programs are considered the main competition for top-quality students. Students consistently mention ranking in application essays.
D. Competitive Advantage

Faculty and staff in the School of Social Work strive every day to ensure that students receive the best educational experience possible at UT, to advance knowledge in the field for the benefit of society, and to nurture partnerships with community agencies that provide avenues for direct service. We are committed to a collaborative learning environment that supports excellence in research on social problems, applying new knowledge toward solving complex policy issues, and strengthening performance of nonprofit organizations in Texas. This unique blending of research, teaching, and service is a hallmark of the School.

Toward the stated goal of building a premier program in the field of social work in line with the University's aspirations, we have developed an interdisciplinary faculty drawn from a range of academic areas, including business, law, medicine, public administration and policy analysis, psychology, political science, public affairs, public health, epidemiology, and statistics. We have also established formal linkages with other schools and departments that support our goals in this area, including the LBJ School of Public Affairs, the UT School of Law, the UT Health Science Center at Houston School of Public Health, and Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary. Each of these linkages offers our students the opportunity to obtain joint degrees and participate in cutting-edge research. The School's comprehensive research agenda seeks to build knowledge in critical areas such as substance abuse and recovery, child welfare, poverty, domestic violence and sexual assault, gerontology, and mental health.

The faculty at the UT School of Social Work is a distinguished group of nationally known experts in social work research and practice. They include tenured and tenure-track faculty as well as a significant number of clinical faculty members who work directly with students in their community-based field assignments. We also have a strong adjunct faculty with a dedicated half-time adjunct faculty liaison who provides support and access to teaching workshops.

Curriculum is an area of competitive advantage. It includes a diverse offering of clinical social work courses, Maymester courses in London and Ghana, and interdisciplinary portfolio programs (Disability Studies, Dispute Resolution, Gerontology, Women and Gender Studies, and Nonprofit Studies). Additionally, our location in the state capital provides CAL-concentration students with opportunities for course projects and internships in state government.

Field Education is a strong component of our program. Clinical faculty members teach foundation practice courses and field seminar while serving as the liaison for that cohort of students over two semesters. This valuable continuity between knowledge and skill building enhances students' identification with the profession. Community partnerships represent an important component within our School, as these provide the essential clinical connection for our students and faculty.
Through partnerships involving more than 400 public and private agencies that serve Texans, social work students in field internships provide nearly 200,000 hours of service each year, enhancing the capacity of nonprofit organizations while gaining hands-on experience in the profession of social work. Collaboration with community agencies also provides opportunities to bring research to bear on practice and for practice to inform our research. Many field instructors are alumni of our program and participate in skill-building workshops twice per year. Having alumni act as field instructors allows us to build relationships with and create internship and employment opportunities in otherwise hard-to-reach agency settings. In addition to these strong local opportunities, we offer international internships to students approved by our International Committee.

The DiNitto Center for Career Services, an asset for our students and alumni, has served as a national leader in social work career services. The center is available to assist students and alumni in pursuit of their professional social work career goals. Staffed by an MSSW alumna, the office assists students considering various options available within the profession of social work. Career Services facilitates workshops, groups, and trainings designed to provide students with skills related to their job search process. Opportunities to network with social work professionals and agency recruiters are offered during the school year. Students are taught techniques that will assist in their continuing professional development. Additional services include graduate writing assistance, resume and cover letter review, portfolio development, and licensure preparation.

The Center for Social Work Research (CSWR) is a critical resource within our organization, serving as the umbrella for several institutes that support research, practice, and policy studies in strategic areas. CSWR provides the expertise, infrastructure, and the interdisciplinary environment to support rigorous research endeavors in areas including substance abuse, child welfare, poverty and welfare reform, domestic violence, mental and behavioral health, immigration, restorative justice, youth justice, and grief, loss, and family survival. All of this research emphasizes the needs of the most vulnerable among us, the poor and marginalized. Being part of a Research I university affords MSSW students many opportunities to work with faculty researchers on some of the most innovative research projects within the field of social work. For example, 22 MSSW students were appointed as graduate research assistants over the past year.

Other areas of competitive advantage include our Bilingual Scholars program providing scholarships for bilingual applicants through endowments and grants, comparatively low resident and non-resident tuition rates, and a professional academic affairs team (recruitment, admissions, advising, and career services) staffed by MSSW alumni. Students often cite the city of Austin itself as a reason to choose our school.
E. Competitive Disadvantage

Even with comparatively lower tuition and recent gains in available scholarship dollars, admitted students are lost to other top-ranked schools who offer stronger scholarship packages. Another area that may create a disadvantage is the increasing number of programs offering online degree programs. Recruitment and graduate fair visits are currently limited to schools in the state of Texas. Although Austin is a vibrant, multicultural city with much to offer, the cost of living is high. One possible area of competitive disadvantage may be requiring the GRE for admission. Only two other top 15 social work master’s programs and one other Texas social work master’s program have this admissions requirement. Further, only 19% of CSWE accredited social work master’s programs require the GRE. Our MSSW Committee has been studying this issue and it will be discussed with the School of Social Work Graduate Studies Committee to determine if we will explore the possibility of an alternative requirement with the Graduate School. Lastly, the current facilities that house the School of Social Work have several limitations compared to our major competitors. The building is older and not as well equipped with space and cutting-edge technologies.

F. Current Enhancement Efforts

Since ranking is determined by a survey of deans and directors, our plan to improve our ranking centers on increasing our national presence. Faculty members are actively involved in national boards, conferences, publications, and research endeavors. Additionally, our doctoral graduates enhance our reputation as they are hired and produce scholarship in other social work programs. Other plans to improve competitiveness include enhanced fundraising to increase student scholarships, fellowships, and employment packages. The new medical school on UT’s campus will also provide a venue for further interdepartmental educational opportunities. Finally, we are working to enhance and refine our website and web presence.

G. Selectivity Index & H. Yield Index

The following table shows both the selectivity index (percentage of total applicants who were admitted) and yield index (percentage of admitted students who enrolled) for 2009 through 2013 based on UT School of Social Work admissions data.
### Number of Degrees Conferred Annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data does not include dual degree students.

### Student Graduation Rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future goals include continuing to diversify our student population, developing the means to fund our graduate students at a competitive level, and further establishing ourselves as a premier social work program.

II. Coordinating Board Requirements

The 18 Characteristics Report was developed by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to create a snapshot of graduate programs at public universities and health-related institutions. The 18 characteristics report is intended to provide information to the institutions for self-improvement and to serve as a guide to members of the general public who are interested in graduate education.

A. Number of Degrees Conferred Annually.

B. Student Graduation Rates.
C. Student Time to Degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each of the three most recent years:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of the graduates' time to degree.</td>
<td>2.3 years</td>
<td>2.2 years</td>
<td>2.4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Graduate Placement (i.e. employment or further education/training):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each of the three most recent years, the number and percent of graduates by year:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>105; 54%</td>
<td>109; 57%</td>
<td>50; 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Seeking</td>
<td>13; 7%</td>
<td>6; 3%</td>
<td>119; 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>76; 39%</td>
<td>78; 40%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Admission Criteria.

The University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work seeks to admit candidates to its MSSW program who share our commitment to promoting social and economic justice, alleviating critical social problems, and enhancing human well-being; demonstrate a personal and professional readiness to pursue graduate education in social work; and make a significant contribution to the profession. The program welcomes applications from all persons regardless of race, sex, color, religious affiliation, age, marital status, sexual orientation, national origin or ancestry, or ability. In order to maintain a dynamic student body, the following areas are given particular consideration in admission: human services motivation, academic potential, interpersonal effectiveness, capacity for sustained effort, communication skills, and contribution to a diverse student body. Applicants are reviewed and evaluated on the basis of their applicant file, which includes records of academic work, a personal narrative statement, scores on the Graduate Record Examination General Test (GRE), resume, and letters of recommendation.

Applicants must be admitted to both The University of Texas Graduate School and the School of Social Work. The minimum requirements for admission are as follows:

- A bachelor’s degree from an accredited United States institution or proof of equivalent training at an institution outside the United States.
• A grade point average (GPA) of at least 3.00 (on a 4.00 scale) in upper-division work (junior- and senior-level courses) and in any graduate work already completed.
• A satisfactory score on the GRE.
• Adequate undergraduate preparation with a range of studies in the liberal arts and behavioral sciences.
• Successful completion of at least one introductory statistics course that covers inferential applications.

In addition to all of the materials required for admission to the MSSW program, applicants to each dual degree program must also independently apply and be accepted to that program. In addition to meeting the general requirements for admission to the Graduate School and the School of Social Work, international applicants whose first language is not English must demonstrate English proficiency by submitting a score for the Test of English as a Foreign Language–Internet Based Test (TOEFL-IBT) or the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). Those who hold bachelor’s degrees from a US institution or from an institution in another English-speaking country may receive a waiver of the TOEFL-IBT and the IELTS.

**Review Process**
The program enrolls new students in the fall, spring, and summer semesters and, with few exceptions, the application process must be completed by the October 1 deadline for spring and the January 15 deadline for summer and fall. The Office of Admissions staff screens the transcripts to determine whether the statistics requirement has been met and certifies that each admission application is electronically ready for distribution to and review by members of the Graduate Admissions Committee (comprised of the Assistant Dean for Master’s Programs, the Director of Admissions, and MSSW faculty). The Director of Admissions and assigned reviewers independently evaluate the applicants, placing them in one of four categories: admit, conditional admit, wait list, or deny. When the reviewers disagree, the application is given to a third reviewer and is then read by the Assistant Dean for Master’s Programs. All admitted applicants are then recommended to the Graduate School. Applicants are admitted on a competitive basis, considering GRE scores, GPA, letters of reference, employment and volunteer history, and the applicant’s personal narrative statement. Acceptance or denial of applications is based upon expert faculty judgment, reflecting the relative ranking of the applicant among applicants in the following areas: human services motivation, academic potential, interpersonal effectiveness, capacity for sustained effort, communication skills, and contribution to diversity. Therefore, denial of admission does not necessarily mean that the applicant could not have successfully completed the program; rather, there were stronger applicants in the pool.

**Notification**
All applicants are notified by electronic mail as soon as admissions decisions are made. No admission decisions are given by telephone. Applicants may also check the status of
their Graduate School application online. Applicants admitted to the MSSW program are required to submit a $150 (non-refundable) enrollment deposit to indicate acceptance of the offer of admission. The deposit is applied to the payment of tuition and fees when the student enrolls. Details regarding payment deadlines and processing are included in admissions materials.

**Admission with Conditions**
Most students who enter the Graduate School are admitted as regular students and have qualifications equal to or higher than the usual standards. A limited number of exceptions to these standards may be granted to applicants demonstrating the capability and qualifications for master’s level study in social work. The Graduate Studies Committee may recommend that a student be admitted with conditions. These conditionally admitted students must carry a full academic load their first semester, not withdraw from any courses or receive incompletes, and must earn a B or better in all first semester courses. A student who does not fulfill the conditions within the specified time may be barred from subsequent registration in the Graduate School.

**Admission to Post-BSW Track**
To be eligible for this admission status, applicants must possess a Bachelor of Social Work degree from a CSWE-accredited program and must request consideration at the time of application. This admission status is a two-step process. First, applicants are considered for admission to the MSSW program; then, if accepted, the Assistant Dean for Field Education reviews additional materials for admission to the Post-BSW track. Most applicants with a BSW are admitted to the 42-hour program of study with exemption for foundation field and any other foundation coursework for which they received a B or better. Students admitted to this program begin their study in the spring or summer session and are able to earn their degree in one to one and a half calendar years. Some applicants with a BSW who do not have a strong direct practice experience in field may still be admitted to the Post-BSW Track, but will be admitted to a 48-hour program of study that includes foundation field.

In addition to all of the materials required for regular admission listed, applicants with a BSW degree must also submit the following:

- Letter of Reference from Field Instructor
- Letter of Reference from Faculty Liaison, or Coordinator of Field Instruction, or BSW Program Director
- Final Field Practicum Evaluation
- Syllabi of Undergraduate Field Seminar and Field Practicum
- Case Application

Students wishing to transfer into the MSSW program must meet all admission requirements and must be transferring from a program accredited by the Council on Social Work Education. Prospective transfer students complete the same application process as other
applicants. Applicants must also provide a letter stating that they are in good standing from the Director of any social work program attended. Students may transfer graduate coursework from an accredited institution with the prior approval of the Assistant Dean for Master’s Programs, the Graduate Adviser, and the Office of Graduate Studies. The Graduate Studies Committee of the School of Social Work provides students with an opportunity to receive a waiver for certain coursework they believe they have mastered based upon courses completed (with a B or better) at another accredited program. Up to 24 credits may be waived. Waiver credits do not appear on the student’s official University record. Students requesting transfers or waivers submit a transcript to the Assistant Dean for Master’s Programs showing the completed coursework and a syllabus with course descriptions for each course to be considered.

F. Percentage of Full-Time Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTS/number of students enrolled (headcount) for the last three fall semesters.</td>
<td>349 / 385 = 90.7%</td>
<td>313 / 365 = 85.8%</td>
<td>292 / 347 = 84.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For those receiving financial support, the average monetary institutional support provided per full-time graduate student for the prior year from assistantships, scholarships, stipends, grants, and fellowships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($763,545 in financial support divided by 124 FT students receiving support)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Percentage of Full-Time Students with Institutional Financial Support.

In the prior year, the number of FTS with at least $1000 of annual support / the number of FTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122 / 292 = 41.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Number of Core Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of core faculty in the prior year. The number represents the faculty involved in the master's program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the MSSW program, the number of core faculty includes 30 Graduate Studies Committee members identified by the Graduate School plus the 11 additional full-time clinical faculty members who teach Practice and Field to the MSSW students. Clinical faculty members are considered an integral part of the MSSW core.

J. Core Faculty / Student Ratio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each of the three most recent years:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of full-time student equivalent (FTSE) / Average of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) of core faculty.</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>9.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data defines core faculty as including 30 Graduate Studies Committee members identified by the Graduate School. Eleven full-time clinical faculty members who teach Practice and Field to the MSSW students are not reflected in the ratio.

K. Faculty Publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each of the three most recent years:</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers or publications, books or book chapters, juried creative or performance accomplishments and notices of discoveries files or patents issued per core faculty member</td>
<td>76 (total)</td>
<td>142 (total)</td>
<td>Available after faculty activity reports are submitted later in Fall 2013 semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.53 (average per core faculty member)</td>
<td>4.73 (average per core faculty member)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data represents GSC faculty only. Clinical faculty members are not expected to conduct research or publish as part of their duties. Some clinical faculty members participate in research/writing in their areas of expertise, yielding one publication in 2011-2012 and two publications in 2012-2013 (not included in the data above).
L. Faculty External Grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Core Faculty Members</th>
<th>Faculty Members Reporting External Funds</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>Average Expenditures Per Faculty Member Reporting External Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$4,081,428</td>
<td>$204,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$3,546,324</td>
<td>$168,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$3,003,189</td>
<td>$125,133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data represents external grants for GSC faculty only. The total expenditures for all faculty and researchers were $7,552,908 in 2010, $8,374,225 in 2011, and $9,613,639 in 2012. Additionally, the Assistant Dean for Master’s Programs was the lead in obtaining a two million dollar endowment supporting Bilingual Scholarships.

M. Faculty Teaching Load.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Core Faculty Members</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty Members</th>
<th>Total Credit Hours Taught</th>
<th>Average Credit Hours Taught Per Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5,750.5</td>
<td>191.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4,888.0</td>
<td>181.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5,119.5</td>
<td>176.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data defines core faculty as including 30 Graduate Studies Committee members identified by the Graduate School. Eleven full-time clinical faculty members who teach Practice and Field to the MSSW students are not reflected in the data.
N. Faculty Diversity: Core faculty by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender/Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black and Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic in Any Combination</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data defines core faculty as including 30 Graduate Studies Committee members identified by the Graduate School. Full-time clinical faculty members who teach Practice and Field to the MSSW students add 11 female faculty members (one of whom is classified as Hispanic in Any Combination).

O. Student Demographics: Enrollment headcount by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender in program during the prior year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender/Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black and Not Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic in Any Combination</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This 2012 data represents full-time students only and does not include dual degree students.

P. Date of Last External Review.

The last external review of the MSSW program was conducted by the CSWE Reaccreditation Site Team in November 2011.

Q. External Program Accreditation.

The Council on Social Work Education is the accrediting body for the MSSW program. The program was first accredited in 1952 and has been continuously accredited since that time. The last reaffirmation of accreditation was awarded in February 2012, and the next accreditation review will occur in February 2020.
R. Student Publications and Awards.

With the MSSW being a terminal practice degree, the educational emphasis is on blending theory and practice. Each 60-credit-hour student performs a minimum of 1020 hours in service to the community through required internships. Students do not typically have the requirement or opportunity to publish during the two-year program and as such we have not had an avenue to collect this data. An informal survey of students this year did result in the report of five awards, papers/publications, or presentations.

S. Student Enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each of the three most recent years:</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of students enrolled full time in the master’s program in the fall semester of the academic year in which the external review is conducted.</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data represents full-time students only and does not include dual degree students. There were 358 total students (full-time, part-time, and dual degree) enrolled in the MSSW program in Fall 2013.

T. Graduate Licensure Rates.

In 1986, Texas began using the nationally administered examination of the American Association of State Social Work Boards (AASSWB) to determine eligibility for licensure of social workers. The examination was developed to measure objectively the knowledge and skills required of advanced social work practitioners. Graduates of CSWE accredited master’s programs are eligible to be licensed in Texas at the Licensed Master’s Social Worker (LMSW) level. After three years of post-master’s experience with supervision and an advanced exam, LMSW-level social workers may be recognized as Licensed Clinical Social Workers (LCSW) if they have been under clinical supervision and as Advanced Practitioners (AP) if they have been under non-clinical supervision. Few social workers actually choose to sit for the AP examination and it is in the process of being phased out for Texas licensure.
Performance of MSSW Graduates on Social Work Licensing Examination, 2011-2012 (most recent data available):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>UT MSSW Graduates</th>
<th>Percentage Passed</th>
<th>Number Examined</th>
<th>Number Passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>LMSW (Master’s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Pass Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>LMSW (Master’s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Pass Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>LMSW-AP (Adv. Generalist)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Pass Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>LMSW-AP (Adv. Generalist)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Pass Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>LCSW (Adv. Clinical)</td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Pass Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>LCSW (Adv. Clinical)</td>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Pass Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U. Alignment of Program with Stated Program and Institutional Goals and Purposes.

The Graduate School Mission Statement is: “The Graduate School of The University of Texas at Austin is an active community of diverse scholars and researchers in over 100 academic programs dedicated to original research, creative expression, teaching, and intellectual leadership. Using our extensive resources and talents, we cultivate individuals who work together to bring knowledge, innovation, and best practices to meet the great and small challenges of our time.”

The School of Social Work’s Mission Statement is: “Through excellence in professional education, research, and service, The University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work provides national leadership to promote social and economic justice, alleviate critical social problems, and enhance human well-being.”

In keeping with the Graduate School and the School of Social Work missions regarding leadership, innovation, best practices, and service, the MSSW program is designed to educate and graduate social work students who are advanced professional practitioners and are committed to the promotion of social and economic justice, alleviation of critical social problems, and the enhancement of human well-being. The MSSW program has the following primary goals:

1. Graduates will practice professional social work utilizing advanced knowledge and skills in clinical social work or community and administrative leadership.
2. Graduates will develop and apply a commitment to critical inquiry and knowledge acquisition and development.
3. Graduates will be able to discuss their understanding of the dynamics of populations at risk and implement social justice strategies to redress inequities and oppression within individual, family, group, community, and organizational contexts.

V. Program Curriculum and Duration in Comparison to Peer Programs.

The University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work’s full-time MSSW degree is completed in a two-year, 60-credit-hour program of work. An analysis of the other top 15 ranked peer programs shows that the average length of completion is two years and the average number of required credit hours is 59.9 to complete the degree.

All accredited master’s in social work programs provide content in the following areas to meet CSWE required competencies: Values and Ethics; Diversity and Social and Economic Justice; Human Behavior in the Social Environment; Policy; Research; Practice; and a minimum of 900 Field Internship hours. All programs must also provide advanced coursework. Each program develops this coursework to support their mission, goals, and student competency outcomes. A comparison of advanced coursework areas for similarly ranked institutions follows.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Concentrations</th>
<th>Columbia</th>
<th>UNC-Chapel Hill</th>
<th>UC-Berkeley</th>
<th>UT- Austin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tied #5</td>
<td>Tied #5</td>
<td>Tied #7</td>
<td>Tied #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advanced Clinical Social Work Practice</td>
<td>• Direct Practice</td>
<td>• Direct Practice in Child and Family Services</td>
<td>• Clinical Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advanced Generalist Practice and Programming</td>
<td>• Community, Management and Policy Practice</td>
<td>• Direct Practice in Child and Family Services/Title IV-E Child Welfare Program</td>
<td>• Community &amp; Administrative Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy Practice</td>
<td>• Self-Directed</td>
<td>• Direct Practice in Community Mental Health Services</td>
<td>• Direct Practice in Health Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Enterprise Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct Practice in Gerontology Services</td>
<td>• Direct Practice in Gerontology Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Management and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for the development, review, and improvement of PhD programs in social work. The specific requirements and structure of PhD programs in social work will depend in large part on the PhD policies and procedures of the college or university, as well as the chosen focus of the program. Thus, some variability in and diversity of programs across institutions can be expected. This document is not meant to be proscriptive, but instead provides guidelines to which programs may aspire. This document was approved by the GADE membership at its annual meeting in April 2013.

These 2013 guidelines build upon and advance previous similar efforts, including a special edition of Arete in Spring 2001 and GADE quality guidelines issued in 1992 and revised in 2003. Scholarship disseminated over the past decade has informed this current document, including further work from the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (Walker et al., 2008), a study of social work doctoral education involving student respondents (Anastas, 2012), and a national initiative regarding the science of social work (Brekke, 2012; Fong, 2012). In addition to these sources, this document is informed by the results of a national survey of 416 social work faculty, administrators, and PhD students that was conducted in December 2012 by the GADE Task Force on Quality Guidelines. This survey asked respondents to express opinions about the importance of various aspects of a social work PhD program.

7 The guidelines provided here are specifically for PhD programs in social work; for more information on the Doctorate in Social Work (DSW), the Report of the Task Force on the DSW Degree Convened by the Social Work Leadership Forum is available from GADE at www.gadephd.org.

8 Parts of this survey were originally administered in 2005 by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as part of the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate. The findings of the study were reported in the 2008 book The Formation of Scholars: Rethinking Doctoral Education for the Twenty-First Century by George Walker, Chris M. Golde, Laura Jones, Andrea Conklin Bueschel, and Pat Hutchings.
Purpose of Social Work PhD Education

As is the case with PhD education in other fields and disciplines, the purpose of the PhD in social work is to prepare students to be scholars who function as “stewards of the discipline.” The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate articulated that a steward of the discipline is one who generates and critically evaluates new knowledge, conserves the most important ideas and findings that are the legacy of the discipline, understands how knowledge is transforming the discipline and the larger world, and communicates their knowledge responsibly to others (Walker et al., 2008). Thus, PhD-trained social work scholars improve the art and science of social work by generating, disseminating, and conserving the knowledge that informs and transforms professional practice. The domains of social work inquiry derive from the social work’s mission and purpose: “to enhance human well-being and help meet the needs of all people, with particular attention to the needs and empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty” (NASW Code of Ethics).

With this purpose in mind, a social work PhD program should be organized with sufficient structure and resources for PhD scholars, upon completion of their PhD programs, to have specific skills and knowledge in the following areas: in-depth knowledge of social work as a profession and discipline, research and scholarship, and teaching.

Quality Guidelines Knowledge of Social Work as a Profession and Discipline

Graduates of PhD programs in social work should have in-depth knowledge of social work as a profession and discipline. It is important that the new knowledge that PhD stewards of the discipline develop and disseminate be contextualized within the distinguishing characteristics and most important ideas and findings that constitute the legacy of the social work profession. Students with an MSW bring a solid foundational knowledge of social work as a professional practice, which is deepened and expanded in the PhD program relative to theory, research, and knowledge development. Students without an MSW need opportunities to develop foundational knowledge about the social work profession through independent learning and/or selected coursework. Quality PhD programs should build expertise and skills in the following areas:

Core Expertise and Skills
Graduates are able to:

- Locate their work in the intellectual landscape of social work.
- Critically analyze theories, practices, policies, and research.
- Understand the relations among social work education, research, and practice.
- Understand how knowledge in social work is relevant to public issues, including promoting social justice and increasing equity.
• Understand the role and importance of social work values and ethics in research and knowledge development.
• Develop expertise in at least one specialized area of knowledge.

Additional Recommended Expertise and Skills
Graduates are able to:
• Articulate the major issues and controversies in social work, both past and present.
• Understand the contributions of social work to society.
• Know the state-of-the-art practices/interventions within the student’s field of inquiry.
• Analyze social policies at an advanced level.

Research / Scholarship

Because social work PhD graduates are charged with generating knowledge, they must be able to conduct high quality research and communicate the findings to diverse audiences. Research skills, broadly defined, involve the systematic collection and analysis of data that shed light on research questions relevant to social work. Quality PhD programs build expertise among their graduates in the following areas:

Core Expertise and Skills
Graduates are able to:
• Conceptualize significant, meaningful, and relevant social work research questions.
• Critically evaluate and review published work in the student’s area of expertise.
• Identify the strengths and limitations of their own research.
• Conduct research that is guided by theory.
• Understand both the technical aspects and conceptual underpinnings of a broad range of methodological and statistical techniques.
• Demonstrate in-depth knowledge in the selection and application of the most rigorous, feasible, and appropriate methodological and data analysis approach(es) for the research question(s) posed.
• Proactively and consistently implement plans for the responsible and ethical conduct of research.
• Design and implement appropriate procedures for sampling and data collection.
• Widely disseminate knowledge that contributes to the advancement of social work research, practice, and policy, including: writing publishable, peer-reviewed manuscripts; presenting at local, national and international conferences; and producing policy briefs/white papers.

Additional Expertise and Skills
Graduates will be able to:
• Develop research and funding proposals, both independently and in collaboration with others.
• Develop a research career plan or trajectory.
• Participate in an interdisciplinary research team.

Teaching

Most PhD students in social work aspire to work in settings in which they have opportunities to both conduct research and to teach (Anastas, 2012; Task Force Survey, 2012). This aspiration is congruent with being a steward of the discipline, who both develops and disseminates knowledge. In addition, PhD programs of all types have long been criticized for failing to adequately prepare students to teach. Quality PhD programs recognize that preparation for quality teaching involves more than helping PhD students become knowledge experts, it also involves developing competency in relevant classroom teaching skills and understanding the relationship between their research and their teaching. A common approach to building these skills is for students to complete a required or elective course on the theory and practice of teaching social work. Competencies in the teaching arena are:

Core Expertise and Skills
Graduates will be able to:
• Understand and apply theories of adult learning.
• Design and teach a course in a social work curriculum.
• Create a learning culture and classroom climate that is inclusive of a diverse population of students and diverse learning styles.
• Address ethical dilemmas that might arise in teaching.
• Understand the place of social work education within the larger context of higher education.

Additional Recommended Expertise and Skills
Graduates will be able to:
• Engage students using a variety of instructional strategies.
• Apply state-of-the-art instructional technology and strategies.
• Understand CSWE accreditation issues and processes.
• Develop a written teaching philosophy.
• Understand contemporary issues in social work education, including online teaching, student motivation, and academic integrity.

Resources / Administration / Structures

In order to achieve the competencies described above, the students, faculty, and administrators in PhD social work programs require a variety of structures and supports. Students require financial support, appropriate mentoring, and clear, concise expectations that facilitate timely completion of program milestones leading to successful program completion. Faculty and administrators need recognition and workload assignments that
place value on the importance of the amount of faculty commitment, time, energy, and expertise that is required to administer PhD programs and to teach and mentor PhD students. Quality programs set clear and rigorous criteria for PhD admission, collect data to inform periodic reviews of the entire program, and set goals for and monitor student progress toward degree. Students have a right to learn in a learning climate that is safe, secure, non-threatening, and inclusive.

Core Supports for All Students
- Opportunities for appointments as Graduate Research Assistants (GRAs) and/or Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs). These are essential both for skill development and to provide financial aid.
- Tuition assistance and/or other forms of financial support, such as tuition waivers and work-free stipends, fellowships, or scholarships.
- Professional development funds for travel and/or advanced training.
- Assignment to an official, formal academic adviser/mentor who serves as a part of a larger mentoring team of faculty, staff, and peers.
- Opportunities to take interdisciplinary courses and/or courses with students from other disciplines.
- Adequate workspace provided by the school or university.
- Access to affordable and quality health and mental health services.
- Resources to refine writing, data analysis, presentation, and other core skills at no additional cost to the student.
- Full access to state-of-the-art library resources.

Core Characteristics and Resources for Program Administration
- The courses in the PhD curriculum are logically connected and sequenced, and students have opportunity for individualized electives.
- The required minimum number of coursework or credit hours, excluding enrollment for exams and dissertation, is generally set by the academic institution, but typically ranges from 36 to 54, but may be higher in some programs, especially those that do not require the MSW for admission.
- The PhD program has clear written expectations for students and engages in continuous monitoring of student progress, including processes for dismissal that are consistent with institutional and program guidelines.
- Comprehensive examinations have a clear rationale, purpose, and timeline for completion.
- Dissertations are conducted within a supportive climate that provides the necessary resources for successful completion within a reasonable timeframe.
- The PhD program regularly reviews admission criteria and course content, including external reviews and assessment every 7-10 years.
- The PhD program director has senior rank at the associate or full professor level and operates within clearly defined role and responsibilities with adequate staff support.
• The PhD program director has adequate percent effort, salary compensation above the base salary, and funded professional development opportunities to successfully lead the program.
• Faculty who work with students beyond the classroom receive workload credit and recognition in tenure and promotion procedures.
• Faculty who teach in the PhD program have a demonstrated record of scholarship and quality teaching.
• The social work PhD program is located in an accredited college or university that also houses an accredited MSW program and has adequate opportunities for collaboration across disciplines and departments.
• Admissions criteria are clear and transparent to applicants, although the specifics of such criteria may vary from one program to another based on program focus, mission, and objectives. When applicable, programs follow the guidelines of their institutions and/or those of the Council of Graduate Schools (see http://www.cgsnet.org/april-15-resolution).
• The PhD program ensures that international students have adequate English language proficiency upon admission.
• The program actively recruits diverse student cohorts.

Recommended Aspirational Outcomes for Students

PhD programs and students have a vested interest in each student completing the PhD program in a reasonable time, with a record of scholarship and teaching that enables them to compete for the employment opportunities of their choice.

Toward that end, programs should establish goals regarding measurable outcomes for students, such as:
• At least 80% of those who initially enroll graduate with a PhD within the timeframe established by the host institution.
• The median time to degree when admitted with an MSW (or related master’s degree) is 4 to 6 years for full time students.
• Dissertations are successfully completed within 1-2 years of dissertation proposal defense. Prior to graduation, students have:
  • Made at least two or three presentations at national or international conferences.
  • Published at least one sole or first authored, peer-reviewed journal article.
  • Published at least two or three co-authored peer-reviewed journal articles.
  • Independently taught at least one course at the BSW and/or MSW level as the instructor of record.
  • Opportunities to substantively contribute to the development of a research proposal submitted for internal or external funding.
Conclusion

These guidelines are aspirational, intended to help institutions develop and improve PhD programs in social work. They do not constitute accreditation standards, as is the case for bachelor’s level (BSW) and master’s level (MSW) professional programs in social work, which are accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). Quality PhD programs in social work set high standards and supply adequate resources to meet those standards. These guidelines are intended to be a dynamic document that should be regularly updated to reflect the latest knowledge about quality doctoral education.
Appendix B
Council on Social Work Education
Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards

Purpose: Social Work Practice, Education, and Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards

The purpose of the social work profession is to promote human and community well-being. Guided by a person and environment construct, a global perspective, respect for human diversity, and knowledge based on scientific inquiry, social work’s purpose is actualized through its quest for social and economic justice, the prevention of conditions that limit human rights, the elimination of poverty, and the enhancement of the quality of life for all persons.

Social work educators serve the profession through their teaching, scholarship, and service. Social work education—at the baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral levels—shapes the profession’s future through the education of competent professionals, the generation of knowledge, and the exercise of leadership within the professional community.

The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) uses the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) to accredit baccalaureate- and master’s-level social work programs. EPAS supports academic excellence by establishing thresholds for professional competence. It permits programs to use traditional and emerging models of curriculum design by balancing requirements that promote comparability across programs with a level of flexibility that encourages programs to differentiate.

EPAS describe four features of an integrated curriculum design: (1) program mission and goals; (2) explicit curriculum; (3) implicit curriculum; and (4) assessment. The Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards are conceptually linked. Educational Policy describes each curriculum feature. Accreditation Standards (in italics) are derived from the Educational Policy and specify the requirements used to develop and maintain an accredited social work program at the baccalaureate (B) or master’s (M) level.

1. Program Mission and Goals

Educational Policy 1.0—Program Mission and Goals
The mission and goals of each social work program address the profession’s purpose, are grounded in core professional values (EP 1.1), and are informed by context (EP 1.2).

9 http://www.cswe.org/File.aspx?id=41861
Educational Policy 1.1—Values
Service, social justice, the dignity and worth of the person, the importance of human relationships, integrity, competence, human rights, and scientific inquiry are among the core values of social work. These values underpin the explicit and implicit curriculum and frame the profession’s commitment to respect for all people and the quest for social and economic justice.

Educational Policy 1.2—Program Context
Context encompasses the mission of the institution in which the program is located and the needs and opportunities associated with the setting. Programs are further influenced by their historical, political, economic, social, cultural, demographic, and global contexts and by the ways they elect to engage these factors. Additional factors include new knowledge, technology, and ideas that may have a bearing on contemporary and future social work education and practice.

Accreditation Standard 1.0—Mission and Goals
The social work program’s mission and goals reflect the profession’s purpose and values and the program’s context.

1.0.1 The program submits its mission statement and describes how it is consistent with the profession’s purpose and values and the program’s context.

1.0.2 The program identifies its goals and demonstrates how they are derived from the program’s mission.

2. Explicit Curriculum

Educational Policy 2.0—The Social Work Curriculum and Professional Practice
The explicit curriculum constitutes the program’s formal educational structure and includes the courses and the curriculum. Social work education is grounded in the liberal arts, which provide the intellectual basis for the professional curriculum and inform its design. The explicit curriculum achieves the program’s competencies through an intentional design that includes the foundation offered at the baccalaureate and master’s levels and the advanced curriculum offered at the master’s level. The BSW curriculum prepares its graduates for generalist practice through mastery of the core competencies. The MSW curriculum prepares its graduates for advanced practice through mastery of the core competencies augmented by knowledge and practice behaviors specific to a concentration.

Educational Policy 2.1—Core Competencies
Competency-based education is an outcome performance approach to curriculum design. Competencies are measurable practice behaviors that are comprised of knowledge, values, and skills. The goal of the outcome approach is to demonstrate the integration and

---

application of the competencies in practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. The ten core competencies are listed below [EP 2.1.1–EP 2.1.10(d)], followed by a description of characteristic knowledge, values, skills, and the resulting practice behaviors that may be used to operationalize the curriculum and assessment methods. Programs may add competencies consistent with their missions and goals.

Educational Policy 2.1.1—Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.
Social workers serve as representatives of the profession, its mission, and its core values. They know the profession’s history. Social workers commit themselves to the profession’s enhancement and to their own professional conduct and growth. Social workers

• Advocate for client access to the services of social work;
• Practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development;
• Attend to professional roles and boundaries;
• Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication;
• Engage in career-long learning; and
• Use supervision and consultation.

Educational Policy 2.1.2—Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.
Social workers have an obligation to conduct themselves ethically and to engage in ethical decision-making. Social workers are knowledgeable about the value base of the profession, its ethical standards, and relevant law. Social workers

• recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice;
• make ethical decisions by applying standards of the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics\textsuperscript{11} and, as applicable, of the International Federation of Social Workers/International Association of Schools of Social Work Ethics in Social Work, Statement of Principles;\textsuperscript{12}
• tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts; and
• apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions.


Educational Policy 2.1.3—Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.
Social workers are knowledgeable about the principles of logic, scientific inquiry, and reasoned discernment. They use critical thinking augmented by creativity and curiosity. Critical thinking also requires the synthesis and communication of relevant information. Social workers

- distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom;
- analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation; and
- demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues.

Educational Policy 2.1.4 — Engage diversity and difference in practice.
Social workers understand how diversity characterizes and shapes the human experience and is critical to the formation of identity. The dimensions of diversity are understood as the intersectionality of multiple factors including age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, political ideology, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation. Social workers appreciate that, as a consequence of difference, a person’s life experiences may include oppression, poverty, marginalization, and alienation as well as privilege, power, and acclaim. Social workers

- recognize the extent to which a culture’s structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create or enhance privilege and power;
- gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups;
- recognize and communicate their understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences; and
- view themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants.

Educational Policy 2.1.5—Advance human rights and social and economic justice.
Each person, regardless of position in society, has basic human rights, such as freedom, safety, privacy, an adequate standard of living, health care, and education. Social workers recognize the global interconnections of oppression and are knowledgeable about theories of justice and strategies to promote human and civil rights. Social work incorporates social justice practices in organizations, institutions, and society to ensure that these basic human rights are distributed equitably and without prejudice. Social workers

- understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination;
- advocate for human rights and social and economic justice; and
- engage in practices that advance social and economic justice.
Educational Policy 2.1.6—Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.
Social workers use practice experience to inform research, employ evidence-based interventions, evaluate their own practice, and use research findings to improve practice, policy, and social service delivery. Social workers comprehend quantitative and qualitative research and understand scientific and ethical approaches to building knowledge. Social workers

- use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry and
- use research evidence to inform practice.

Educational Policy 2.1.7—Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.
Social workers are knowledgeable about human behavior across the life course; the range of social systems in which people live; and the ways social systems promote or deter people in maintaining or achieving health and well-being. Social workers apply theories and knowledge from the liberal arts to understand biological, social, cultural, psychological, and spiritual development. Social workers

- utilize conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation; and
- critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.

Educational Policy 2.1.8—Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.
Social work practitioners understand that policy affects service delivery, and they actively engage in policy practice. Social workers know the history and current structures of social policies and services; the role of policy in service delivery; and the role of practice in policy development. Social workers

- analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being; and
- collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action.

Educational Policy 2.1.9—Respond to contexts that shape practice.
Social workers are informed, resourceful, and proactive in responding to evolving organizational, community, and societal contexts at all levels of practice. Social workers recognize that the context of practice is dynamic, and use knowledge and skill to respond proactively. Social workers

- continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services; and
- provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services.
Educational Policy 2.1.10(a)–(d)—Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Professional practice involves the dynamic and interactive processes of engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation at multiple levels. Social workers have the knowledge and skills to practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Practice knowledge includes identifying, analyzing, and implementing evidence-based interventions designed to achieve client goals; using research and technological advances; evaluating program outcomes and practice effectiveness; developing, analyzing, advocating, and providing leadership for policies and services; and promoting social and economic justice.

Educational Policy 2.1.10(a)—Engagement

Social workers

• substantively and affectively prepare for action with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities;
• use empathy and other interpersonal skills; and
• develop a mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes.

Educational Policy 2.1.10(b)—Assessment

Social workers

• collect, organize, and interpret client data;
• assess client strengths and limitations;
• develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives; and
• select appropriate intervention strategies.

Educational Policy 2.1.10(c)—Intervention

Social workers

• initiate actions to achieve organizational goals;
• implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities;
• help clients resolve problems;
• negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients; and
• facilitate transitions and endings.

Educational Policy 2.1.10(d)—Evaluation

Social workers critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions.

Educational Policy B2.2—Generalist Practice

Generalist practice is grounded in the liberal arts and the person and environment construct. To promote human and social well-being, generalist practitioners use a range of prevention and intervention methods in their practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. The generalist practitioner identifies with the social work profession and applies ethical principles and critical thinking in practice. Generalist practitioners incorporate diversity in their practice and advocate for human rights and
social and economic justice. They recognize, support, and build on the strengths and resiliency of all human beings. They engage in research-informed practice and are proactive in responding to the impact of context on professional practice. BSW practice incorporates all of the core competencies.

**Educational Policy M2.2—Advanced Practice**

Advanced practitioners refine and advance the quality of social work practice and that of the larger social work profession. They synthesize and apply a broad range of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary knowledge and skills. In areas of specialization, advanced practitioners assess, intervene, and evaluate to promote human and social well-being. To do so they suit each action to the circumstances at hand, using the discrimination learned through experience and self-improvement. Advanced practice incorporates all of the core competencies augmented by knowledge and practice behaviors specific to a concentration.

**Educational Policy 2.3—Signature Pedagogy: Field Education**

Signature pedagogy represents the central form of instruction and learning in which a profession socializes its students to perform the role of practitioner. Professionals have pedagogical norms with which they connect and integrate theory and practice. In social work, the signature pedagogy is field education. The intent of field education is to connect the theoretical and conceptual contribution of the classroom with the practical world of the practice setting. It is a basic precept of social work education that the two interrelated components of curriculum—classroom and field—are of equal importance within the curriculum, and each contributes to the development of the requisite competencies of professional practice. Field education is systematically designed, supervised, coordinated, and evaluated based on criteria by which students demonstrate the achievement of program competencies.

**Accreditation Standard B2.0—Curriculum**

The 10 core competencies are used to design the professional curriculum. The program

- **B2.0.1** Discusses how its mission and goals are consistent with generalist practice as defined in EP B2.2.
- **B2.0.2** Identifies its competencies consistent with EP 2.1 through 2.1.10(d).
- **B2.0.3** Provides an operational definition for each of its competencies used in its curriculum design and its assessment [EP 2.1 through 2.1.10(d)].
- **B2.0.4** Provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field (EP 2.0).
- **B2.0.5** Describes and explains how its curriculum content (knowledge, values, and skills) implements the operational definition of each of its competencies.

---

Accreditation Standard M2.0—Curriculum

The 10 core competencies are used to design the foundation and advanced curriculum. The advanced curriculum builds on and applies the core competencies in an area(s) of concentration. The program

**M2.0.1** Identifies its concentration(s) (EP M2.2).

**M2.0.2** Discusses how its mission and goals are consistent with advanced practice (EP M2.2).

**M2.0.3** Identifies its program competencies consistent with EP 2.1 through 2.1.10(d) and EP M2.2.

**M2.0.4** 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].

**M2.0.5** Provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design (foundation and advanced), demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field (EP 2.0).

**M2.0.6** Describes and explains how its curriculum content (relevant theories and conceptual frameworks, values, and skills) implements the operational definition of each of its competencies.

Accreditation Standard 2.1—Field Education

The program discusses how its field education program

**2.1.1** Connects the theoretical and conceptual contribution of the classroom with the practice setting, fostering the implementation of evidence-informed practice.

**B2.1.2** Provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate the core competencies.

**M2.1.2** Provides advanced practice opportunities for students to demonstrate the program’s competencies.

**2.1.3** Provides a minimum of 400 hours of field education for baccalaureate programs and 900 hours for master's programs.

**2.1.4** Admits only those students who have met the program’s specified criteria for field education.

**2.1.5** Specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for selecting field settings; placing and monitoring students; maintaining field liaison contacts with field education settings; and evaluating student learning and field setting effectiveness congruent with the program’s competencies.

**2.1.6** Specifies the credentials and practice experience of its field instructors necessary to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program competencies. Field instructors for baccalaureate students hold a baccalaureate or master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. Field instructors for master's students hold a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. For cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited social work degree, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.
2.1.7 Provides orientation, field instruction training, and continuing dialog with field education settings and field instructors.

2.1.8 Develops policies regarding field placements in an organization in which the student is also employed. To ensure the role of student as learner, student assignments and field education supervision are not the same as those of the student’s employment.

3. Implicit Curriculum

Educational Policy 3.0—Implicit Curriculum: The Learning Environment
The implicit curriculum refers to the educational environment in which the explicit curriculum is presented. It is composed of the following elements: the program’s commitment to diversity; admissions policies and procedures; advisement, retention, and termination policies; student participation in governance; faculty; administrative structure; and resources. The implicit curriculum is manifested through policies that are fair and transparent in substance and implementation, the qualifications of the faculty, and the adequacy of resources. The culture of human interchange; the spirit of inquiry; the support for difference and diversity; and the values and priorities in the educational environment, including the field setting, inform the student’s learning and development. The implicit curriculum is as important as the explicit curriculum in shaping the professional character and competence of the program’s graduates. Heightened awareness of the importance of the implicit curriculum promotes an educational culture that is congruent with the values of the profession.\(^\text{14}\)

Educational Policy 3.1—Diversity
The program’s commitment to diversity—including age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, political ideology, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation—is reflected in its learning environment (institutional setting; selection of field education settings and their clientele; composition of program advisory or field committees; educational and social resources; resource allocation; program leadership; speaker series, seminars, and special programs; support groups; research and other initiatives; and the demographic make-up of its faculty, staff, and student body).

Accreditation Standard 3.1—Diversity

3.1.1 The program describes the specific and continuous efforts it makes to provide a learning environment in which respect for all persons and understanding of diversity and difference are practiced.

3.1.2 The program describes how its learning environment models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference.

3.1.3 The program discusses specific plans to improve the learning environment to affirm and support persons with diverse identities.

Educational Policy 3.2—Student Development

Educational preparation and commitment to the profession are essential qualities in the admission and development of students for professional practice. To promote the social work education continuum, BSW graduates admitted to MSW programs are presented with an articulated pathway toward a concentration. Student participation in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs are important for the student’s professional development.

Accreditation Standard 3.2—Student Development: Admissions; Advisement, Retention, and Termination; and Student Participation

Admissions

**B3.2.1** The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission.

**M3.2.1** The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission. The criteria for admission to the master’s program must include an earned bachelor’s degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association.

**3.2.2** The program describes the process and procedures for evaluating applications and notifying applicants of the decision and any contingent conditions associated with admission.

**M3.2.3** BSW graduates entering MSW programs are not to repeat what has been mastered in their BSW programs. MSW programs describe the policies and procedures used for awarding advanced standing. These policies and procedures should be explicit and unambiguous. Advanced standing is awarded only to graduates holding degrees from baccalaureate social work programs accredited by CSWE, those recognized through its International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Service, or covered under a memorandum of understanding with international social work accreditors.

**3.2.4** The program describes its policies and procedures concerning the transfer of credits.

**3.2.5** The program submits its written policy indicating that it does not grant social work course credit for life experience or previous work experience. The program documents how it informs applicants and other constituents of this policy.

Advisement, retention, and termination

**3.2.6** The program describes its academic and professional advising policies and procedures. Professional advising is provided by social work program faculty, staff, or both.

**3.2.7** The program spells out how it informs students of its criteria for evaluating their academic and professional performance, including policies and procedures for grievance.

**3.2.8** The program submits its policies and procedures for terminating a student’s enrollment in the social work program for reasons of academic and professional performance.
Student participation

3.2.9 The program describes its policies and procedures specifying students’ rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs.
3.2.10 The program demonstrates how it provides opportunities and encourages students to organize in their interests.

Educational Policy 3.3—Faculty
Faculty qualifications, including experience related to the program’s competencies, and an appropriate student-faculty ratio are essential for developing an educational environment that promotes, emulates, and teaches students the knowledge, values, and skills expected of professional social workers. Through their teaching, scholarship, and service—as well as their interactions with one another, administration, students, and community—the program’s faculty models the behavior and values expected of professional social workers.

Accreditation Standard 3.3—Faculty 3.3.1
3.31 The program identifies each full and part-time social work faculty member and discusses her/his qualifications, competence, expertise in social work education and practice, and years of service to the program. Faculty who teach social work practice courses have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least two years of social work practice experience.
3.3.2 The program discusses how faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; class size; number of students; and the faculty's teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities. To carry out the ongoing functions of the program, the full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio is usually 1:25 for baccalaureate programs and 1:12 for master’s programs.
B3.3.3 The baccalaureate social work program identifies no fewer than two full-time faculty assigned to the program, with full-time appointment in social work, and whose principal assignment is to the baccalaureate program. The majority and no fewer than two of the full-time faculty have either a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program, with a doctoral degree preferred, or a baccalaureate degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and a doctoral degree preferably in social work.
M3.3.3 The master’s social work program identifies no fewer than six full-time faculty with master’s degrees in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and whose principal assignment is to the master’s program. The majority of the full-time master’s social work program faculty has a master’s degree in social work and a doctoral degree preferably in social work.
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.
3.3.5 Faculty demonstrate ongoing professional development as teachers, scholars, and practitioners through dissemination of research and scholarship, exchanges with external constituencies such as practitioners and agencies, and through other professionally relevant creative activities that support the achievement of institutional priorities and the program’s mission and goals.

3.3.6 The program describes how its faculty models the behavior and values of the profession in the program’s educational environment.

Educational Policy 3.4—Administrative Structure
Social work faculty and administrators, based on their education, knowledge, and skills, are best suited to make decisions regarding the delivery of social work education. They exercise autonomy in designing an administrative and leadership structure, developing curriculum, and formulating and implementing policies that support the education of competent social workers.

Accreditation Standard 3.4—Administrative Structure

3.4.1 The program describes its administrative structure and shows how it provides the necessary autonomy to achieve the program’s mission and goals.

3.4.2 The program describes how the social work faculty has responsibility for defining program curriculum consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards and the institution’s policies.

3.4.3 The program describes how the administration and faculty of the social work program participate in formulating and implementing policies related to the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of program personnel.

3.4.4 The program identifies the social work program director. Institutions with accredited BSW and MSW programs appoint a separate director for each.

B3.4.4(a) The program describes the BSW program director’s leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in social work. The program documents that the director has a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program with a doctoral degree preferred or a baccalaureate degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and a doctoral degree, preferably in social work.

B3.4.4(b) The program provides documentation that the director has a full-time appointment to the social work program.

B3.4.4(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 25% assigned time is required at the baccalaureate level. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.
M3.4.4(a) The program describes the MSW program director’s leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in social work. The program documents that the director has a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. In addition, it is preferred that the MSW program director have a doctoral degree, preferably in social work.

M3.4.4(b) The program provides documentation that the director has a full-time appointment to the social work program.

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.

3.4.5 The program identifies the field education director.

3.4.5(a) The program describes the field director’s ability to provide leadership in the field education program through practice experience, field instruction experience, and administrative and other relevant academic and professional activities in social work.

3.4.5(b) The program documents that the field education director has a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post-baccalaureate or post-master’s social work degree practice experience.

B3.4.5(c) The program describes the procedures for determining the field director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education. To carry out the administrative functions of the field at least 25% assigned time is required for baccalaureate programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.

M3.4.5(c) The program describes the procedures for determining the field director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education. To carry out the administrative functions of the field at least 50% assigned time is required for master’s programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.

Educational Policy 3.5—Resources

Adequate resources are fundamental to creating, maintaining, and improving an educational environment that supports the development of competent social work practitioners. Social work programs have the necessary resources to support learning and professionalization of students and program improvement.
Accreditation Standard 3.5—Resources
  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.
  3.5.2 The program describes how it uses resources to continuously improve the program and address challenges in the program’s context.
  3.5.3 The program demonstrates sufficient support staff, other personnel, and technological resources to support itself.
  3.5.4 The program submits the library form to demonstrate comprehensive library holdings and/or electronic access and other informational and educational resources necessary for achieving its mission and goals.
  3.5.5 The program describes and demonstrates sufficient office and classroom space and/or computer-mediated access to achieve its mission and goals.
  3.5.6 The program describes its access to assistive technology, including materials in alternative formats (e.g., Braille, large print, books on tape, assistive learning systems).

4. Assessment

Educational Policy 4.0—Assessment
Assessment is an integral component of competency-based education. To evaluate the extent to which the competencies have been met, a system of assessment is central to this model of education. Data from assessment continuously inform and promote change in the explicit and implicit curriculum to enhance attainment of program competencies.

Accreditation Standard 4.0—Assessment
  4.0.1 The program presents its plan to assess the attainment of each of its competencies. The plan specifies procedures, multiple measures of each practice behavior, and benchmarks employed to assess the attainment of each of the program’s competencies (AS B2.0.3; AS M2.0.4).
  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.
  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.
  4.0.4 The program uses Form AS 4 (B) and/or Form AS4 (M) to report its most recent assessment outcomes to constituents and the public on its website and routinely updates (minimally every 2 years) these postings.
  4.0.5 The program appends copies of all assessment instruments used to assess the program competencies.