5. **College of Social Work - Program Effectiveness – Outcomes Assessment**

The College has written learning outcomes for each of the degrees offered. These can be found at the following website: [http://learningoutcomes.utah.edu/college/12](http://learningoutcomes.utah.edu/college/12).

5.1 **Learning outcome assessment procedures**

The College of Social Work 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. The full EPAS document can be found via the following link on the CSWE website: [http://www.cswe.org/File.aspx?id=81660](http://www.cswe.org/File.aspx?id=81660). The EPAS describes an outcome performance approach to curriculum design in which social work programs are evaluated based on their ability to demonstrate students’ competency in identified practice behaviors. The BSW and MSW Programs are built around nine core competencies, as follows:

1. **Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior.**
   - make ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context;
   - use reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations;
   - demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication;
   - use technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes; and
   - use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior.

2. **Engage diversity and difference in practice.**
   - apply and communicate understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels;
   - present themselves as learners and engage clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences; and
   - apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies.

3. **Advance human rights and social and economic justice.**
   - apply their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels; and
   - engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice.

4. **Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.**
   - use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research;
   - apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative and qualitative research methods and research findings; and
   - use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery.
5. Engage in policy practice.
   • identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services;
   • assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services;
   • apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.

6. Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.
   • apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies; and
   • use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies.

7. Assess individuals, families, group, organization, and communities.
   • collect and organize data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies;
   • apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies;
   • develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies; and
   • select appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies.

8. Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.
   • critically choose and implement interventions to achieve practice goals and enhance capacities of clients and constituencies;
   • apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies;
   • use inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to achieve beneficial practice outcomes;
   • negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies; and
   • facilitate effective transitions and endings that advance mutually agreed-on goals.

9. Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities.
   • select and use appropriate methods for evaluation of outcomes;
   • apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes;
   • critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate intervention and program processes and outcomes; and
• apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.

For accreditation purposes, the CSW is required to demonstrate that our students have achieved competency in each of the nine areas. As a proactive step in the reaffirmation process, we are working on linking each syllabus and each assignment within a course to one or more of the core competencies. Additionally, the BSW and MSW Programs have devoted considerable time and attention to developing program effectiveness plans and procedures.

**Expected Learning Outcomes**

**BSW in Social Work**

The purpose of the BSW Program is to educate and train undergraduate students for entry-level, generalist professional social work practice on a local, national, and global level. Social work practice includes efforts designed to enhance the well-being of individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities. The BSW Program teaches undergraduate students the knowledge and skills necessary to promote social and economic justice, to shape institutional policies, and to enhance the delivery of social and human service case management assistance. Students enrolled in the BSW Program take courses prior to working in the field (i.e., practicum placement). Field work involves working part-time in an agency or with a program that strives to enhance human well-being; field placements are located primarily within Utah, though available internationally and in other states.

The BSW Program utilizes the Social Work Education Assessment Project (SWEAP) for tracking students through attainment of the CSWE core competencies. SWEAP provides a comprehensive package of six standardized instruments designed to assist undergraduate programs in tracking students from program entrance through alumni status (see [https://www.sweapinstruments.org/](https://www.sweapinstruments.org/)). Using SWEAP allows our program to compare our performance with over 300 programs across the country. Additionally, the BSW Program uses other sources of data, including the state licensure exam and class-based assessments. The assessment plan for the BSW Program includes multiple measures and tools to gauge the attainment of competencies by program graduates. The following table lists each of the measures and methods used by the BSW Program in its assessment plan, as well as the nature and frequency of assessments and applicable benchmarks.
## Assessment Plan Elements and Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Measure &amp; Description</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explicit Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEAP Entrance Instrument</td>
<td>Academic Advisor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Program Entrance at Orientation Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEAP Curriculum Instrument</td>
<td>Academic Advisor for Pre-Assessment/Director of Field Education for Post-Assessment</td>
<td>90% of students will correctly answer 85% of the questions correctly in each curricular area at Post Assessment</td>
<td>Program Entrance at Orientation Meeting/Program Exit at Field Seminar During Final Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEAP Field Instrument</td>
<td>Director of Field Education</td>
<td>90% of students will be given a rating of “5-Competent Performance” to “9-Master Performance” at the end of their field practicum</td>
<td>End of Field Placement at Field Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEAP Exit Instrument (Section E)</td>
<td>Director of Field Education</td>
<td>90% of students will give the program a rating of “5-Adequate” to “9-Very Well” at graduation</td>
<td>Program Exit at Field Seminar During Final Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEAP Employer/Supervisor Instrument</td>
<td>Departmental Executive Secretary</td>
<td>90% of employers will give our graduates a rating of “5-Adequate” to “9-Very Well” at two-years post-graduation</td>
<td>Survey is conducted two-years post-graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEAP Alumni Instrument</td>
<td>Departmental Executive Secretary</td>
<td>90% of graduates will give the program a rating of “5-Adequate” to “9-Very Well” at two years post-graduation</td>
<td>Survey is conducted two years post-graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course-based Assessments (e.g., papers, exams, reports, etc.)</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
<td>85% of students receive a minimum grade of B on target assignments</td>
<td>Each Semester Across the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSW Licensing Examination</td>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>75% First-time Pass</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implicit Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEAP Exit Instrument (Section F)</td>
<td>Director of Field Education</td>
<td>90% of students will give the program a rating of “5-Adequate” to “9-Very Well” at graduation</td>
<td>Program Exit at Field Seminar During Final Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor/Course Evaluation</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Minimum rating of 5</td>
<td>Each Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum Advisory Committee Feedback</td>
<td>Director of Field Education</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Under Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Strengths Inventory</td>
<td>Office of Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>Anticipated For Each Semester Across the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MSW in Social Work

The MSW curriculum was evaluated by Dr. Norma Harris and Dr. Jane Berdie multiple times during the MSW curriculum revisioning process. The focus of the evaluation was the MSW curriculum. The evaluators collected data from student course ratings and comments, student focus groups, instructor interviews, and field instructor interviews. The full evaluation of the Revised University of Utah MSW Curriculum Report is included as Appendix M. Please see the report summary below.

Report Summary: Based on this evaluation, there has been marked improvement in many areas over the past three years, although a few issues remain problematic. The themes themselves have not changed over the past three years, but there are significantly more positive views about several important areas. The findings include the following:

1. The great majority of students continue to be focused on clinical education and therefore many of their evaluative comments reflect their concerns about mastering clinical skills. They are highly appreciative of courses that help them to learn general skills such as forming therapeutic relationships and case formulation, as well as specific clinical interventions. They want to see and discuss demonstrations of skills when they practice skills in class, they want to receive feedback. A frequent student response is that they want more demonstration and structured practice and less general discussion in class. The classes with the highest student ratings appear to be those where the instructor provides these experiences frequently. A corollary to this is that students seem to be pleasantly surprised when what they are learning in class relates directly to what they are doing in practicum. They appreciate a limited amount of time in class to discuss their work in practicum. It would be useful to explore other ways for the class and the field to identify specific opportunities to integrate the two.

2. There have been significant improvements in many key courses; namely HBSE, research, Macro/Social Justice, and Reflexive. As a result, these courses are now seen as more relevant and manageable. More students now appear to have an awareness and appreciation for the role of social worker beyond that of the therapist, as well as greater insight into how issues such as those related to diversity, social justice, and evidence based practice affect therapeutic practice.

3. Generally, readings have improved in that they are seen as more relevant and manageable. That said, there are still concerns, including the following:
   - Students want to have a clear prioritized list of readings, i.e., which ones are essential to understanding the issues and which ones are augmenting. They don’t want any readings that essentially repeat other readings.
   - Students want readings addressed in class. They like brief discussion of the readings and for the instructor to reference readings that they were assigned to read before class. They seem to like pop quizzes on readings; they report that it helps them to discipline themselves to read. Many say that without these incentives, they stop reading the assignments as the class goes on. They are fully aware that this is less than exemplary graduate student behavior, but they are driven by expediency.
• If a text is required, students want it to be well integrated into the course. A frequent complaint is that they buy an expensive text and it is rarely referred to or otherwise integrated into the class.
• Occasionally students still say a text is outdated, although this complaint has diminished from previous years.
4. Generally, the mix of teaching methods in courses is quite good. Students appreciate the mix of lectures, speakers, discussions and in class activities, particularly those that give them opportunities to see skills being used and then to practice them and receive feedback from instructors.
5. Integration of learning has improved, but there remain many areas where improvements could be made. Sometimes various courses appear to repeat the content of other courses rather than build on the framework.

Field Instructor Summary: Field instructors reported that nearly all students have increased their competence over the year and that for somewhat over half of these students, this increase has been moderately high or high. Nearly all field instructors indicate that the MSW classes have contributed to this increase in competence. Nearly all said that the UU students were at least moderately more ready for practice than students from other schools whom they have supervised. About one in five said that current UU students were somewhat more competent than UU students they had four or more years ago, while about one in five said that they were less competent.

Several field instructors commented favorably on the clinical component of the MSW curriculum and on the components that address other competencies, e.g., those related to the values and history of the social work profession, research, community involvement, diversity, and other macro issues. One spoke positively about their openness to learning and feedback. One expressed concern that Advanced Standing students are not as prepared for clinical practice as are second year students.

Recent MSW Outcomes Assessment
More recently, the MSW Program has been working with researchers in the Social Research Institute to develop an instrument to survey students’ mastery of the core competencies. The survey would be delivered electronically and could be taken by students at multiple points in their educational sequence to account for change over time. The following is a plan for use of the Multi-Dimensional Curriculum Instrument (MDCI) to measure effectiveness of the MSW Program:

Plan for Evaluation of the MSW Program using the 2015 EPAS Core Competencies

The Multi-Dimensional Curriculum Instrument will directly measure the knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes associated with each of the nine Core Competencies of the 2015 EPAS. This assessment of multiple competency dimensions is possible through vignette-based, multiple-choice questions to be validated during the pilot phase before full implementation. The tool will be partly utilized as a pre- and post-test
analysis of competency gained through a student’s learning in a particular class and will help inform areas for curricular improvements. The tool will also explore attitudes regarding students’ experiences in general and whether any associations exist between reported experiences and competency gains. These data will be used to inform possible adjustments to the implicit, as well as explicit, curriculum.

It is anticipated that there will be two separate assessments:

1. Generalist Outcome Assessment (GOA)
2. Specialist Outcome Assessment (SOA)

The GOA will be administered at the beginning and end of the program’s first year, or at the time of generalist course completion for advanced standing or part-time students. Similarly, the SOA will be administered when students begin and end their specialized course of study. There are seven specializations, referred to hereafter as concentrations, as follows:

1. Aging in Social Work
3. Forensic Social Work
4. Global Social Work
5. Health in Social Work
6. Mental Health in Social Work
7. Substance Use in Social Work

As each of the nine Core Competencies will be specifically tailored to both the generalist assessment and the specialist assessment, the tool will have questions based on student’s concentrations during their second year program of study.

Question structure and format may look similar to the following assessment examples*

Example 1:

*A mental health social worker is subpoenaed in a child custody battle between two parents involved in a bitter and sometimes violent divorce. The social worker has been treating the mother. The father’s attorney asks a specific question about a statement that the mother might have made while in treatment. Which statement best reflects the social worker’s legal obligation to the client and the expectations of the profession?

1. The social worker should claim client-social worker confidentiality and refuse to answer the question.
2. The social worker should claim client-social worker confidentiality and refuse to answer the question, unless ordered to respond by the judge.
3. The social worker should ask for a temporary adjournment while she confers with the agency attorney.
4. The social worker should answer any question that seems legitimate and can help her client.
Example 2:

A 27-year-old engineer is convinced he was refused a promotion by his female supervisor because she favors women. He was told he needs further experience, that his work is satisfactory and that she would consider him again for promotion within a reasonable period. He tells his social worker that though no one has said it, he was turned down because he is too aggressive and that unless he adapts to a female supervisor he will be denied promotion again. The worker’s best response is

1. “Yes, you’re probably not sensitive to the needs of female supervisors.”
2. “Why do you choose to believe something for which there is no evidence?”
3. “You may be right, but what do you want to do about it?”
4. “That’s the way female bosses are.”

Example 3:

A mother of a teenage boy is in the working or intervention phase of counseling with a social worker in a neighborhood health center. Her son has told her that he is gay and she is very upset. Which of the following statements is least helpful to the mother?

1. Her son may be mistreated in school and he will need her support and some advocacy assistance from her.
2. There is nothing to worry about because kids outgrow these feelings.
3. Gay teenage boys are susceptible to serious depression and she will need to understand the source of his feelings.
4. There are support groups in the community for youngsters who have “come out.”

Example 4:

A worker has reached an agreement with a frail 87 year old woman with multiple chronic conditions to move to an assisted living facility. The client talks about her fear of moving to a place where she won’t know anyone and will be alone. The worker’s best response is

1. Don’t worry, you’ll make new friends.
2. I guess you’d rather stay where you are.
3. It seems like part of you wants to move to a more comfortable place and another part feels scared and wants to stay with people you know.
4. Most older people feel just like you, but then feel better after they move.

Example 5:

Maria is a fifteen-year-old Puerto Rican-American girl who has been referred by the court to the state’s public child welfare agency. She has been placed in a residential school for children who have a history of delinquent behavior and whose parents cannot discipline them constructively. When confronted with authority, she tends to either fight or flee. At the school, her case
manager establishes that the agency’s initial priority is to help Maria adjust to the school and understand how she can be helped in this setting. The most important activity to accomplish this goal is to

1. **Provide her with written guidelines describing student obligations.**
2. **Put her on a token system for completing tasks and acting respectful.**
3. **Ensure that she is not the only minority group member of a psychoeducational group.**
4. **Assign a Puerto Rican counselor to talk with her daily about her adjustment to the school.**


### University of Utah MSW Program Outcome Evaluation Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Develop Assessment Metrics</th>
<th>Pilot Assessment Tools</th>
<th>Revise</th>
<th>Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Create a committee that will help guide the assessment effort</td>
<td>• Item development and links to competencies</td>
<td>• Train applicable faculty and staff involved in the administration/scoring of tools</td>
<td>• Gather feedback from involved faculty, staff, and other stakeholders</td>
<td>• Begin full scale implementation of assessment administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct literature review in the assessment of competencies</td>
<td>• Both for GOA and SOA</td>
<td>• Validate assessment tools/rubrics through pilot during Summer 2017 semester</td>
<td>• Revise assessment tools or scoring rubrics as appropriate</td>
<td>• Analyze data as they are being gathered for real-time monitoring and reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine if current MSW learning outcomes need to be modified</td>
<td>• Consultation of assessment items by MSW advisory committee and concentration chairs</td>
<td>• Create scoring rubrics for faculty to measure other metrics if used</td>
<td>• Such as student portfolios, mock interviews, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine assessment metric(s) that will be used</td>
<td>• Finalize assessment metric(s) format, delivery method(s), and timeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finalize assessment metric(s) format, delivery method(s), and timeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other possible tools that will be considered in the assessment for both the explicit and implicit curriculum may be:
Self-efficacy scale
Implicit Association Test (of implicit bias)
Student portfolios
Capstone writing project/thesis
Mock interviews
Licensure exam pass rates

PhD Program
The doctoral program is continuously evaluated by the members of the PhD Program Committee; the membership includes two current students who participate regularly in meetings. We assess the program through discussion of learning outcomes, quality and sequencing of courses, measurements of student success (e.g. GPA, timely progress through program, papers presented and published, formal reviews of students not making progress), and student satisfaction assessed by our doctoral students.

As described in the PhD Handbook, students are reviewed informally for progress each year; students failing to make adequate progress are carefully reviewed and offered support deemed appropriate by the PhD Committee. The committee also reviewed the guidelines for the Qualifying Exam and the dissertation to clarify and streamline the guidelines to improve the process for students and advising faculty, as well as to expedite completion.

Doctoral curriculum was recently modified in accordance with our desire to develop and graduate strong research scholars in social work, who are able to be productive here during their doctoral studies and later are able to compete on the job market for academic positions at top schools.

Field Placement
The BSW and MSW Programs require students to engage in field placement as a major component of their studies. The Council on Social Work Education considers field placement to be the “signature pedagogy” of a social work education. BSW and MSW field placement assessment forms are included as Appendix N.

5.2 Outcomes assessment feedback

Following are examples of changes made by programs as a result of feedback over the past seven years:

BSW Program
- Splitting of SW 4201 - Social Work Practice II into two classes (SW 4220 - Social Work Practice II: Couples and Families and SW4330 - Social Work Practice III: Groups) to better address Competency 2.1.10(a)–(d)—Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.
• Addition of evening sections of classes to permit greater flexibility in scheduling for students who work full-time.
• At the request of the State of Utah, the creation of an elective course (SW 312 - Case Management: International Communication) to provide paraprofessional training to refugees working within social service agencies in their communities.
• Changes were made to the course content and assignments within SW 4444 - Advanced Social Work Writing to increase the opportunity for our students to participate in the Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (UROP).
• The BSW Program hired a full-time, professional Academic Advisor with an MSW degree to assist students in planning and completing their social work education. Previously, this function was provided by an office staff member.
• The BSW Program faculty has sought to increase textbook options (e.g., textbook rentals) for our students to reduce costs.

**MSW Program**
• Strengthened instructors’ teaching skills by reviewing all student course evaluations and subsequently providing supportive services to instructors as needed.
• Modified MSW curriculum to provide opportunities for students to take more electives and make more curricular choices in the 2nd year of the program.
• Hired three career-line faculty to provide more consistent teaching in MSW curricular sequences which had been covered mostly by a changing group of contract instructors.
• Instituted a background check system to ensure that MSW applicants whom we wanted to admit would be eligible to complete practicum.

**PhD Program**
• Increased options for students to take electives outside of the CSW;
• Curriculum shifted to focus more on methods and analyses.
• Increased scholarship opportunities to fund students.
• Shifted teaching responsibilities to diversify students’ exposure to faculty.
• Based on a review of doctoral programs and published research, a third semester of required statistics, a required course in secondary data analysis, one in systematic reviews, and a third course in intervention research and grantwriting were added to the program.
• As a result of student assessment of satisfaction, the mentoring system was modified to a more formal approach that requires students and faculty mentors to fill out a contract specifying frequency of meetings, topics to be covered, products expected each semester, and mutual expectations for mentoring; these contracts are filed with the Program Coordinator.
5.3 Degree completion data

See Table 5.1 for Graduate Degree Completion/Attrition Data.

Attrition rate for the Master’s degree summed over the seven years was 8%. The attrition rate for the doctoral degree summed over the seven years was 16%. It should be noted that the doctoral rate is based upon a smaller number (8-12% of the total for each year) and, therefore, may be a less stable statistic.

Table 5.1: Graduate Degree Completion/Attrition Data
College of Social Work AY 2009-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entering Student Cohort Academic Year</th>
<th>Number of students admitted to master’s program</th>
<th>Number of students admitted to doctoral program</th>
<th>Number of students who left before completing master’s degree</th>
<th>Number of students who completed master’s degree</th>
<th>Number of students who left before completing doctoral degree</th>
<th>Number of students who completed doctoral degree</th>
<th>Average time to complete master’s degree</th>
<th>Average time to complete doctoral degree</th>
<th>Number of students remaining in graduate programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9 semesters</td>
<td>11.42 semesters</td>
<td>410 MSW 55 PhD 465 TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>TED 10 Campus 8 18 TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.03 semesters</td>
<td>11.39 semesters</td>
<td>415 MSW 54 PhD 469 TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.30 semesters</td>
<td>9.73 semesters</td>
<td>410 MSW 56 PhD 466 TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.93 semesters</td>
<td>8.91 semesters</td>
<td>416 MSW 50 PhD 466 TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.89 semesters</td>
<td>10.46 semesters</td>
<td>396 MSW 44 PhD 440 TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.82 semesters</td>
<td>13.5 semesters</td>
<td>391 MSW 39 PhD 430 TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.47 semesters</td>
<td>13.75 semesters</td>
<td>409 MSW 38 PhD 447 TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Employment

Social work is an academically well-defined profession. Within the job market, it becomes more complicated to define what is social work because there are competing titles and licensures which vary between geographic entities. There are also several niches within social work, such as child and family services, gerontology, medical social work, and mental health. It is somewhat difficult to explain or predict the job market for social work graduates because the outlook varies by specialization.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Employment Projections program (http://www.bls.gov/ooh/community-and-social-service/social-workers.htm#tab-6), the 2015 median pay for a social worker was $45,900 per year. “Overall employment of social workers is projected to grow 12 percent from 2014 to 2024, faster than the average for all occupations.” Increased demand will be strong for healthcare social workers, projected to grow 19% from 2014 to 2024. Demand will be high for mental health and substance abuse social workers as well, at 19% growth from 2014 to 2024. Employment of child and family social workers and school social workers is expected to be limited by state and federal budgets and to grow at a slower rate of 6%.

The Utah job outlook is more difficult to interpret because Utah government divides social workers into a number of categories, including mental health counselors; marriage and family therapists; child, family, and school social workers; health care social workers; mental health and substance abuse social workers, etc. (see Utah Job Outlook, Department of Workforce Services at https://jobs.utah.gov/wi/pubs/outlooks/viz.html). Marriage and family therapists have the highest projected annual growth from 2012 to 2022 at 4.9%, followed by healthcare social workers at 4.0%. These are also the highest paid categories of social workers at $23.50 and $26.40 per hour respectively. The overall category of “Counselors, Social Workers and Other Community and Social Service Specialists” has projected annual growth between 2012 and 2022 of 3.2%. This is healthy compared to the annual growth rate for the same period of time for all occupations in Utah, at 2.4%.