MSW ASSESSMENT PLAN & RESULTS

2017 - 2018

PREPARED FOR
Council on Social Work Education

PREPARED BY
Jessica L. Lucero
Susan Egbert
Becky Montoya

MSW Program Assessment Plan

Learning Objectives

The Social Work MSW Program is accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) and adheres to its accreditation standards that require each social work program to   have an assessment plan and procedures through which to evaluate program outcomes. Each individual course contains student **learning objectives and outcomes** that link back to   professional competencies and associated practice behaviors. The   Social Work program uses all assessment information to affirm or improve our course content   in relation to our learning objectives.

Assessment Plan

The assessment plan utilizes two separate measures, and per CSWE policy, the measures focus on the practice behaviors. The first measure is a field instructor assessment (PIESI) of student performance in the field practicum experience. This measure is also administered proximate to completion of the foundation and advanced field practicum experience. Each of these measures has a foundation (PIESI-F) and advanced version (PIESI-A) that directly evaluates a student's ability to perform the appropriate foundation and advanced practice behaviors. A summary description PIESI-F and PIESI-A is provided below which indicates who is evaluated, what is being evaluated, when the evaluation occurs, how the evaluation is conducted, and the benchmarks associated with the measures. Prior to 2017, we used a student self-report of competency called the Student Self-Efficacy Assessment (SEAA). Following COA's new guidelines regarding student self-reports, we discontinued the SEEA and adopted a faculty measure. The second measure is a culminating faculty assessment of students' competencies developed in the classroom and the field called the Integrative Assignment Assessment (IAA). The IAA is derived from a written reflection assignment administered in field seminar to all advanced year students prior to graduation (See appendix A for details). The IAA integrates all advanced competencies, and is evaluated independent of the field seminar course by the Graduate Assessment Committee (GAC). The writing prompts for the IAA can be found below as well as a description of who is evaluated, what is being evaluated, when the evaluation occurs, how the evaluation is conducted, and the benchmarks associated with the measure. Given the timing of admission across our programs, the IAA has only been administered once to the Logan Main Campus.

Field Instructor Assessment

<u>Instruments.</u> Foundation Practicum Instructor Evaluation of Student (PIESI-F), Advanced Practicum Instructor Evaluation of Student (PIESI-A).

<u>Population</u>. All MSW students completing the foundation or advanced field practicum experience.

<u>When evaluated</u>. Evaluation occurs twice: first, at the end of the student's foundation field practicum experience; second, at the end of the student's advanced field practicum experience.

<u>Who evaluates</u>. Field instructors evaluate the students they supervise.

<u>What is evaluated</u>. The ability to perform the foundation and advanced practice behaviors associated with the core competencies as applied in the context of the field practicum agency.

How evaluated. The PIESI-F and PIESI-A instruments are completed online. Field instructors complete these evaluations at the end of each semester's field practicum experience. The evaluation assesses the student's ability to perform practice behaviors that demonstrate mastery of the core competencies. Students are rated as *not yet competent*, *competent*, or *highly competent*. Instructors are encouraged to provide written comments in support of the ratings given to help add context for their ratings.

Benchmark. A student is considered competent on an individual core competency if she or he is rated as *competent* or *highly competent* on each practice behavior associated with that particular competency. We consider ourselves as achieving our benchmark for each competency if, on average, at least 90% of the students are rated as *competent* or *highly competent* for the practice behaviors associated with a particular competency. An average below 90% for all combined practice behavior ratings for a given competency signals a concern. We also take note of any single practice behavior average that falls below 90%.

Faculty Assessment

Instrument. Integrative Assignment Assessment (IAA).

Population. All MSW students completing the advanced year.

When evaluated. Evaluation occurs once: at the end of the student's advanced field practicum experience.

Who evaluates. Faculty from the Graduate Assessment Committee evaluate.

What is evaluated. The ability to demonstrate applied knowledge of advanced practice behaviors associated with the core competencies as applied in the context of the classroom and field.

How evaluated. The IAA instrument is derived from a culminating assignment in field seminar that asks students to respond to 8 questions that require students to analyze their own practice experience in both complex direct and indirect practice situations with a view for autonomous practice, supervisory roles, and administrative roles in organizations. The written assignment for each student is then assessed by the Graduate Assessment Committee who independently rate the level of mastery displayed in each assignment. Students are rated as *not yet competent*, *competent*, or *highly competent* on a scale of 1 - 3.

Benchmark. A student is considered competent on an individual core competency if she or he is rated as *competent* or *highly competent* on each practice behavior associated with that particular competency. We consider ourselves as achieving our benchmark for each competency if, on average, at least 90% of the students are rated as *competent* or *highly competent* for the practice behaviors associated with a particular competency. An average below 90% for all combined practice behavior ratings for a given competency signals a concern. We also take note of any single practice behavior average that falls below 90%.

MSW Program Sequence

Delivery, Type, and Timing of Program

Utah State University offers Part-Time and Full-Time of both Advanced Standing and Traditional programs. The Part-Time program is administered through our Regional Campus (RC) system and the Full-Time program is administered through our main Logan Campus. Within the RC system, the students are admitted every 3 years. At the Logan campus, Traditional students are admitted every 2 years and starting in 2018, Advanced Standing

students have been admitted every year. The curriculum is uniform between RC and Logan campuses, and between Full-Time and Part-Time programs. However, it is important to keep in mind the delivery, type, and timing of each program because it impacts what evaluation measure is used and when. Table 1 below provides a breakdown of delivery, type, timing, and assessment tool over a sample 3-year period between 2016 -2019.

Table 1. Assessment Tool Administration over Sample 3-Year Period, 2017-2020

Assessment Tool	Regional Campus (PT)		Main Campus (FT)	
	Traditional (Admitted Fall 2017)	Advanced Standing (Admitted Spring 2018)	Traditional (Admitted Fall 2017)	Advanced Standing (Admitted Fall 2017,18, 19)
PIESI-F	Spring 2019	n/a	Spring 2017[*] '19	n/a
PIESI-A	Spring 2020	Spring 2020	Spring 2018 [*] '20	Spring 2018[*] '19 & '20
IAA	Spring 2020	Spring 2020	Spring 2018 [*] '20	Spring 2018[*] '19 & '20

* Indicates Data has been collected and is reported below

MSW Program Assessment Results

Foundation Year Results

Since our Part-Time students are currently enrolled in their foundation practicum (Spring 2019), we only have foundation year assessment result for our Full-Time Traditional students' foundation practicum (Spring 2017) for the data period reporting period in question (2017-2020). Results from the foundation year PIESI-F can be found in table 2 below. In each competency area, student met the 90% bench mark with the exception of assessing with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Table 2. PIESI-F Results from Spring 2017, N=13 (Logan Main Campus, Traditional Students Only)

COMPETENCY	Mean	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK (Foundation Year)	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	2.66	90%	92%
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	2.61	90%	100%
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	2.77	90%	100%
Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	2.31	90%	92%
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	2.56	90%	92%
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	2.61	90%	100%

COMPETENCY	Mean	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK
Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	2.46	90%	84.6%
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	2.58	90%	100%
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	2.48	90%	92%

Notes: Foundation Practice Behavior Practicum Instructor Ratings, USU MSW Program Spring 2017, N=13. Practice Behavior ratings ranged from 0-2 with higher scores indicating higher ratings of competence. Specifically, 1=On the Cusp or Needs More Training/Not Yet Competent; 2=Ready for Practice/Competent; and 3= Exemplary/Highly Competent.

Advanced Year Results

Our Part-Time students will not enter their advanced year practicums until Fall 2019, and thus we only have 2018 Full-Time advanced year data to report for the period in question (2017-2020). We report findings from the PIESI-A and the IAA in tables 3 and 4 below. According to PIESI-A results, students met the competency benchmark in every domain except for *Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice* and *Evaluating Practice*.

Table 3. PIESI-A Results from Spring 2018, N=33 (Logan Main Campus, Traditional and Advanced Standing Combined)

COMPETENCY	Mean	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK (ADVANCED GENERALIST)	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	2.52	90%	90.7%
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	2.48	90%	90.7%
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	2.48	90%	92.6%
Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	2.12	90%	87.0%
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	2.25	90%	90.7%
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	2.52	90%	92.6%
Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	2.33	90%	92.6%

Competency	Mean	Benchmark	Percentage
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	2.30	90%	92.6%
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	2.15	90%	87.0%

Notes: Advanced Practice Behavior Practicum Instructor Ratings, USU MSW Program Spring 2018, N=33. Practice Behavior ratings ranged from 1-3 with higher scores indicating higher ratings of competence. Specifically, 1=On the Cusp or Needs More Training/Not Yet Competent; 2=Ready for Practice/Competent; and 3= Exemplary/Highly Competent.

Table 4. IAA Results from Spring 2018, N=33 (Logan Main Campus, Traditional and Advanced Standing Combined)

COMPETENCY	Mean	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK (ADVANCED GENERALIST)	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	3.13	90%	100.0%
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	3.66	90%	100.0%
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	3.72	90%	100.0%
Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	3.37	90%	93.0%
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	3.28	90%	100.0%
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	3.37	90%	100.0%
Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	3.66	90%	100.0%
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	3.72	90%	100.0%
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	3.37	90%	93.0%

Notes: Each practice behavior associated with core competencies are assessed by the Graduate Assessment Committee (GAC). The GAC scores each domain on a 1-4 scale, with 1 demonstrating no knowledge and minimal mastery of competency and 4 demonstrating clear accurate, detailed, and comprehensive knowledge and superior mastery. Students meet the benchmark if they receive a 3 or 4 in their GAC assessed score for each competency.

Appendix A. Integrative Assignment Assessment (IAA) Questions

Note: The below questions are posed to students in their final field seminar course. Students are expected to write a narrative response to each question. Faculty from the Graduate Assessment Committee (GAC) then rate students responses in terms of advanced social work competencies.

- Reflect on your definition of social work practice and why you selected social work as a profession. In what ways does an MSW social work education fit your goals for the future?
- Describe your social work experience over the last two years in both of your practicum agency placements (for advanced standing MSW students include your BSW practicum experience) and what you have learned about the profession and current issues that we face. Discuss how your practicum internships have helped you to develop a professional use of self, a commitment to ethical decision-making, self-improvement, and self-care commensurate with advanced practice at all levels.
- Discuss the development of your personal conceptual framework of practice that helps you to integrate and differentially apply theories to guide practice at all levels.
- The paper should include a discussion of your philosophy about the following aspects of social work practice:
  - The importance of practice-informed research and research-informed practice. Share an experience of how you have used critical thinking to monitor and evaluate interventions at all levels of practice through the application of research and practice/program evaluation knowledge and skills.
  - Share an experience and discuss what you have learned about working competently with diverse populations using culturally relevant, strengths-based and empowering methods, programs, policies and services.
  - Discuss how you have developed a commitment to social, economic, and environmental justice through experiences at your various agency internships. Share several examples of how you see yourself providing leadership in this area within agencies, communities, and/or state, national and international forums.
  - Share an experience and discuss what you have learned about the importance of policy as a leadership and practice method for effecting change at all levels of practice.
  - Share several experiences regarding the development of your competencies in engaging, assessing, intervening, and monitoring & evaluating interventions with clients through a well-developed, professional use of self, as well as application of integrated theoretical knowledge and skills.