

## **Joint Doctor of Philosophy Program in Social Work Statement of Context**

Data from the APR spreadsheet only track UNCG home students. The NCAT host students are not represented, which is problematic for ratings. For example, 9 NCAT home students are missing in the data for applications, admissions, and new enrollment. Accounting for these students, we estimate that the average 3-year percentile ranks would have been at the 52<sup>nd</sup> percentile for applicants, 79<sup>th</sup> percentile for admissions, and 27<sup>th</sup> for enrollment headcount. These ranks move the needle from “needs examination” to “meets expectations” for applications/admissions and “approaching expectations” for headcount enrollment. If we weren’t a new program, we would have operated at full capacity for the 3-year review period and had an approximate headcount enrollment at the 61<sup>st</sup> percentile rank.

To date, we have graduated 6 students (50%) from the initial 2019 cohort (12 matriculated) and 4 more are on track to graduate in Spring 2024. Note that the APR data only reflects 3 degrees conferred because only half the students who graduated are UNCG home students; while the other 3 are NCAT home students and, consequently, do not show in the data. If we were to count the 6 students who have degrees conferred, then we would approximately be between the 60 – 65<sup>th</sup> percentile rank in degrees conferred in 2022-23. Likewise, data are zero for academic years 2020-21/2021-22 because no student was eligible to graduate given that the JPhD program began 4 years prior. Thus, the percentile rank for degrees conferred was rated in the 8<sup>th</sup> percentile across the 3 years being reviewed. Data in category 5 are rated as “needs examination”, but it is affected by only 3 students being represented in 2022-23 and zero students in 20/21 and 21/22 since no students were within the timeline to graduate.

The JPhD Program has established itself as an important asset to both UNCG and NCA&T SU given its success in attracting well qualified students at a level that exceeds the only other PhD program in Social Work in North Carolina. When accounting for the NCAT students in our data, we are a program with solid applicants, admissions, and enrollment. See the table below for a general comparison of the JPhD Program with the UNC-CH PhD Program:

| <b>Area</b>        | <b>JPhD (UNCG &amp; NCAT Combined)</b> | <b>UNC-CH</b>              |
|--------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Number of Students | 32 active (5 in candidacy)             | 22 active (2 in candidacy) |
| Number of Faculty  | 10-12 active                           | 29 active                  |
| Racial Diversity   | 74% BIPOC                              | 55% BIPOC                  |

## Areas of Investment

Priority areas of investment to keep the JPhD program viable, efficient, and effective are:

1. Ensure that there is a minimum of 8 faculty (4 from each institution) to operate the program.
  - a. We recommend a ratio of no more than 4 students per faculty member dedicated to the PhD program, e.g., 4 students per faculty with 8 dedicated faculty (4 from each university) would serve 32 students.
  - b. Examine committee structure to include a minimum of 2 full-time faculty (1 from each institution) and 1 external committee member. This structure will reduce the amount of committee membership work for faculty.
  - c. The 3 new faculty approved for searches and then Dr. John Rife's line will have the ability to teach across programs (BSW, JMSW, JPhD), so long as they also receive dedicated time for one-on-one mentoring for doctoral students.
    - i. Social work will have a 24 course deficits next academic year if no positions are hired. Fifteen courses can be covered by new faculty and doctoral students will teach the remaining 9.
    - ii. A replacement line for Dr. Rife will be needed for his current teaching load and then teaching vacant courses from others receiving more time to mentor.
    - iii. Since JPhD students will be charged differential tuition, revenue can be used on part-time instructors to provide JPhD faculty with more mentoring time.
2. Ensure that there is administrative support dedicated to the PhD program by hiring a person that works for both universities to facilitate registration and other administrative needs. Differential tuition could be used to support this hire if necessary.
3. Ensure equity between campuses that honors faculty time and effort in working with PhD students. Faculty must have time dedicated to advise doctoral students and consequently teach less organized courses; however, structure needs to be in place to ensure both students and faculty are accountable for the time spent on one-on-one mentoring.
4. Work with administrators, registrars, and financial aid staff on both campuses to clearly identify sticking points and work to dissolve barriers, e.g., registering for electives on the host campus, access to funding on host campus, etc.
5. Provide increase amounts of stipends and waivers for PhD students to strengthen their engagement in the undergraduate teaching mission. Currently, students teach 1-2 courses in the undergraduate program per semester. We also can utilize PhD students' services for undergraduate advising to assist in keeping students on a 4-year graduation track and to meet with community college students to ensure a seamless transition into our final 2 years of the cohort BSW program.

## Considerations

At this juncture of the JPhD program, it is important to consider alternative models as a way of moving forward and making the program sustainable and productive. Some considerations are listed below:

### Structural

1. Move administration of the program to one university to simplify admission and registration. Students would all be admitted to one campus and would only register on

that campus. The administrative campus would buy out faculty time on the affiliate campus for faculty from both campuses to teach courses and serve on dissertation committees.

2. Keeping the current model of splitting the students between campuses and have the home campus students register only on the home campus.

### **Program**

1. Consider an alternate model to the current cohort model, which may create more demand for faculty time if courses are not taught in sequence.
2. Revise the current curriculum based on faculty and student recommendations – this is important as the program passes the 5-year mark. A consultant would be helpful in this undertaking.