

Social Work Program MSW Assessment 2012-2015

The Social Work Program is accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) and adheres to its accreditation standards that require each program to have an assessment plan and procedures through which to evaluate program outcomes. Our Social Work program assessment plan is tied to the 2008 EP Competencies. Each individual course contains student learning objectives and outcomes that link back to the EP Competencies. The Social Work program uses all assessment information to affirm or improve our course content in relation to our learning objectives.

Social Work Mission

The social work program's guiding philosophy is based on two broad traditions: generalist social work practice and the land-grant university heritage. The program mission is to prepare social workers for beginning practice in a diverse society and to equip students with the knowledge and skills essential to the general tasks of promoting social welfare in institutions such as education, health, employment, housing and criminal justice. The program provides grounding in the fundamental generalist skills, knowledge, and values of social work, such as critical thinking, clarification of personal values, awareness of diversity, professional use of self, and communication and interpersonal relationship skills.

Social Work Program Goals

The two fundamental goals that guide the Social Work Program are:

1. To prepare students for employment as advanced generalist social workers through education in a professional foundation and advanced curriculum.
2. To prepare leaders for responsible citizenship, a commitment to respect for all people, and the quest for social and economic justice as informed by their application of advanced generalist social work knowledge, values, and skills.

Summary of Assessment Instruments and Methods

The assessment plan utilizes two separate measures, each administered at multiple points. The first measure is a student self assessment (SSEA) conducted proximate to completion of the foundation (SSEA-F) and advanced curricula (SSEA-A). The second 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 curriculum 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 each foundation and advanced practice behavior. A summary description of these measures is provided below. The summary indicates who is evaluated, what is being evaluated, when the evaluation occurs, how the evaluation is conducted, and the benchmarks associated with the measures.

Student Self-Assessment

Instruments. Foundation Student Self-Efficacy Assessment (SSEA-F), Advanced Student Self-Efficacy Assessment (SSEA-A).

Population. All MSW students completing the foundation or advanced segments of the curriculum.

When evaluated. Evaluation occurs at two time points: first, when a student completes the foundation curriculum including the foundation field practicum experience; second, when a student completes the advanced curriculum, including the advanced field practicum experience.

Who evaluates. Students assess themselves.

What is evaluated. Ability to perform the foundation (41) and advanced (10) practice behaviors associated with the 10 core competencies.

How evaluated. Students complete the self-assessment online via Survey Monkey, typically at the end of the foundation and advanced field practicum experiences. Students assess their ability to perform practice behaviors that demonstrate mastery of the 10 core competencies. Ratings are based on a scale of 0 to 2 (where 0 = “not yet competent,” 1 = “competent,” and 2 = “highly competent”).

Benchmark. A student is considered competent on an individual core competency if she or he rates himself as “competent” or “highly competent” on each practice behavior associated with that particular competency. As a program, we consider ourselves as achieving our benchmark for each competency if, on average, at least 90% of the students rate themselves as “competent” or “highly competent” for all 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 program average that falls below 90% for a particular measure.

Field Instructor Assessment

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

Population. All MSW students completing the foundation or advanced field practicum experience.

When evaluated. 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.

Who evaluates. Field instructors evaluate the students they supervise.

What is evaluated. The ability to perform the foundation (41) and advanced (10) practice behaviors associated with the 10 core competencies as applied in the context of the field practicum agency.

How evaluated. The PIESI-F and PIESI-A instruments are completed via Survey Monkey. 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 10 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 which help add context for their ratings.

Benchmark. As a benchmark measure, 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" (new form) 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 program average that falls below 90% for a particular measure.

Table 1 below summarizes the assessment data and outcomes for each program competency, including the percentage of students achieving each competency benchmark. The "N" for each measure varies due to several factors including the addition of advanced standing students during the second year of the 2012-2014 full-time cohort and the voluntary nature of the student self-assessment. In the future the self-assessment will be a required course assignment. The number of students that completed the foundation and advanced self assessment represents at least 70% of the student body. Virtually all students were rated by field instructors using the field instructor rating form. The data reported below represents the graduating class of 2014 which consists of students in the 2012-2014 full-time cohort, the 2011-2014 part-time cohort, and the 2013-2014 advanced standing cohort.

For Competency 1 (Professional Identity), more than 90% (benchmark for all competencies) of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on both foundation measures and advanced measures for all practice behaviors (7 foundation, 1 advanced). Thus, the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 2 (Ethical Behavior), more than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on both foundation measures and advanced measures for all practice behaviors (4 foundation, 1 advanced). Thus, the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 3 (Critical Thinking), more than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on both foundation measures and advanced measures for 1 of 3 foundation practice behaviors and the advanced practice behavior. Fewer than 90% of students were rated as competent or highly competent on the self assessment instrument for foundation practice behaviors 1 (Distinguish) and 2 (Analyze). However, field instructors rated more than 90% of students as competent or highly competent on these practice behaviors. Thus, when the percentages for all measures were averaged the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 4 (Diversity), more than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on both foundation measures and advanced measures for all practice behaviors (4 foundation, 1 advanced). Thus, the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 5 (Social Justice), more than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on both foundation measures and advanced measures for 1 of 3 foundation practice behaviors and the advanced practice behavior. Fewer than 90% of students were rated as competent or highly competent on the self assessment instrument for foundation practice behaviors 2 (Advocate) and 3 (Engage). However, field instructors rated more than 90% of students as competent or highly competent on these practice behaviors. Thus, when the percentages for all measures were averaged the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 6 (Research), more than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on one of two foundation measures and both advanced measures for both foundation practice behaviors and the advanced practice behavior. Fewer than 90% of students were rated as competent or highly competent on the self assessment instrument for foundation practice behaviors 1 (Practice Informs Scientific Inquiry) and 2 (Research Informs Practice). However, field instructors rated more than 90% of students as competent or highly competent on these practice behaviors. Thus, when the percentages for all measures were averaged the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 7 (HBSE), more than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on one of two foundation measures and both advanced

measures for both foundation practice behaviors and the advanced practice behavior. Fewer than 90% of students were rated as competent or highly competent on the self assessment instrument for foundation practice behaviors 1 (Use Conceptual Frameworks) and 2 (Critique and Apply Theories). However, field instructors rated more than 90% of students as competent or highly competent on these practice behaviors. Thus, when the percentages for all measures were averaged the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 8 (Policy), more than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on one of two foundation measures and both advanced measures for both foundation practice behaviors and the advanced practice behavior. Fewer than 90% of students were rated as competent or highly competent on the self assessment instrument for foundation practice behaviors 1 (Analyze, Formulate, Advocate) and 2 (Collaborate). However, field instructors rated more than 90% of students as competent or highly competent on these practice behaviors. Thus, when the percentages for all measures were averaged the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 9 (Respond to Contexts), more than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on one of two foundation measures and both advanced measures for both foundation practice behaviors and the advanced practice behavior. Fewer than 90% of students were rated as competent or highly competent on the self assessment instrument for foundation practice behaviors 1 (Discover, Appraise, and Attend) and 2 (Provide Leadership). However, field instructors rated more than 90% of students as competent or highly competent on these practice behaviors. Thus, when the percentages for all measures were averaged the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 10a (Engage), more than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on both foundation measures and advanced measures for 2 of 3 foundation practice behaviors and the advanced practice behavior. Fewer than 90% of students were rated as competent or highly competent on the self assessment instrument for foundation practice behavior 1 (Prepare for Action). However, field instructors rated more than 90% of students as competent or highly competent on this practice behavior. Thus, when the percentages for all measures were averaged the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 10b (Assess), more than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on both foundation measures and advanced measures for 1 of 4 foundation practice behaviors and the advanced practice behavior. Fewer than 90% of students were rated as competent or highly competent on the self assessment instrument for foundation practice behaviors 1 (Collect, Organize, Interpret), 3 (Develop Goals), and 4 (Select Interventions). However, field instructors rated more than 90% of students as competent or highly competent on these practice behaviors. Thus, when the percentages for all measures were averaged the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 10c (Intervene), fewer than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on the self assessment foundation measure for all 5 foundation practice behaviors. However, more than 90% were rated as competent or highly competent on the field instructor foundation measure for all five foundation practice behaviors and both (self assessment and field instructor) of the advanced practice behavior measures. Thus, when the percentages for all measures were averaged the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

For Competency 10d (Evaluate), fewer than 90% of students were rated as being highly competent or competent on the self assessment foundation measure for the one foundation practice behavior associated with this competency (Analyze, Monitor, and Evaluate Interventions). However, more than 90% were rated as competent or highly competent on the foundation field instructor measure for this foundation practice behavior and both (self assessment and field instructor) of the advanced practice behavior measures. Thus, when the percentages for all measures were averaged the benchmark for this competency was achieved.

Summary

Our assessment measures show that, overall, more than 90% of students achieved each of the 10 core competencies as operationalized through 41 foundation and 10 advanced practice behaviors. Our outcome measures rely on student and field supervisor ratings. Although this type of assessment has its strengths it can be prone to bias particularly given the inherent incentives for each rater to select a “competent” score. Even so, we feel that these types of measures are adequate for identifying specific problem areas for individual students and the overall curriculum. Even though the program achieved the benchmark it set for each competency, fewer than 90% of students rated themselves as “not yet competent” on several of the practice behaviors assessed with the Student Self-Efficacy Assessment (SSEA) instrument. While these sub-par ratings did not prevent the program from reaching its competency benchmarks, we still take note of these ratings and discuss their implications. In the next section we discuss changes we have made or plan to make in response to these ratings.

Table 1. Summary Data and Outcomes for Core Competencies and Foundation & Advanced Practice Behaviors

Competency	Competency Benchmark	Practice Behavior	Outcome Measure Benchmark	% Attaining Measure 1 & Measure 2	% Students Achieving Competency	Competency Attained?	
2.1.1 Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.	90% of students will demonstrate competency.	Advocate for client access to the services of social work	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1: (N=52): 94%	97.92%	Yes	
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2: (N=68): 98%			
			Measure 1 SSEA : <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1: (N=52): 98%			
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2: (N=68): 98%			
		Practice personal reflection and self-correction	Measure 1 SSEA : <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1: (N=52): 98%	97.92%		Yes
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2: (N=68): 98%			
			Measure 1 SSEA : <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1: (N=52): 100%			
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2: (N=68): 98%			
Attend to professional roles and boundaries	Measure 1 SSEA : <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1: (N=52): 100%	97.92%	Yes			
	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2: (N=68): 98%					
	Measure 1 SSEA : <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1: (N=52): 98%					
	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2: (N=68): 98%					
Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication	Measure 1 SSEA : <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1: (N=52): 98%	97.92%		Yes		
	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2: (N=68): 98%					
Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication	Measure 1 SSEA : <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1: (N=52): 98%	97.92%			Yes	
	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2: (N=68): 98%					

	Engage in career-long learning	Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	(N=68): 98%	Measure 1 (N=52): 96%
	Use supervision and consultation	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations Measure 1 SSEA : <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 (N=68): 98%	Measure 1 (N=52): 98%
		Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 98%	

Advanced Practice Behavior

	Demonstrate a clear commitment to professional self-improvement and self-care commensurate with advanced practice at all levels.	Measure 1 Advanced SSEA <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=57): 100%
		Measure 2 Advanced PIESI <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 (N=79): 99%

2.1.2—Apply social work ethical principles to

90% of students will demonstrate competency.

Recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice

Measure 1 SSEA:
Competent or Highly competent

Measure 1
(N=52): 98%

98.2%

Yes

**guide
professional
practice.**

	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%
Make ethical decisions by applying standards of the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics	Measure 1 SSEA: Competent or <i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 94%
	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%
Tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 100%
	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%
Apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions	Measure 1 SSEA <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 90%
	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%
Advanced Practice Behavior		
Understand how to research relevant laws, professional standards	Measure 1 Advanced SSEA <i>Competent or</i>	Measure 1 (N=57): 100%

2.1.3—Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.	90% of students will demonstrate competency.	and ethical guidelines and demonstrate consistent application of such to increasingly complex advanced practice situations.	<i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 Advanced PIESI	Measure 2 (N=79):100%		
		Distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based-knowledge and practice wisdom	<i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 88%	94.5%	Yes
		Analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation	<i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 N=68): 98%		
			<i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 86%		
			<i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 N=68): 98%		
		Demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues	<i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 96%		
			<i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2- Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 N=68): 98%		
Advanced Practice Behavior							
		Effectively apply critical thinking in increasingly independent practice,		Measure 1 Advanced SSEA <i>Competent or</i>	Measure 1 (N=57): 96%		

2.1.4—Engage diversity and difference in practice.	90% of students will demonstrate competency.	leadership, supervisory, and administrative roles and contexts	<i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 2-Advanced PIESI <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 (N=79): 96%	97.7%	Yes
		Recognize the extent to which a culture's structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create or enhance privilege and power	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 90%			
		Gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups	Measure 2-Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%			
		Recognize and communicate their understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 94%			
		View themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%			
			Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 96%			
			Measure 2-Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%			
			Measure 1 : <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 98%			

			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> Expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%		
Advanced Practice Behavior						
		Work competently with diverse populations using culturally-relevant, strengths-based and empowering methods, programs, policies and services.	Measure 1 Advanced SSEA <i>“Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=57): 100%		
			Measure 2 Advanced PIESI <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 (N=79): 99%		
2.1.5—Advance human rights and social and economic justice.	90% of students will demonstrate competency.	Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 90%	94.5%	Yes
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded expectations”</i>	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%		
		Advocate for human rights and social and economic justice	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 88%		
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded expectations</i>	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%		
		Engage in practices that advance social and economic justice	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 83%		

			Measure 2- Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%		
Advanced Practice Behavior						
		Demonstrate commitment to social and economic justice through leadership within agencies, communities, and state, national and international forums.	Measure 1 Advanced SSEA <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=57): 95%		
			Measure 2 Advanced PIESI <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 (N=79): 100%		
2.1.6—Engage in research- informed practice and practice- informed research.	90% of students will demonstrate competency.	Use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry	Measure 1 SSEA: "Competent" or "Highly competent"	Measure 1 (N=52): 81%	92.17%	Yes
			Measure 2- Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%		
		Use research evidence to inform practice	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 81%		
			Measure 2- Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%		
Advanced Practice Behavior						
		Monitor and evaluate interventions at all levels of practice through the	Measure 1 Advanced SSEA <i>Competent or</i>	Measure 1 (N=57): 91%		

		application of research and program evaluation knowledge and skills.	<i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 Advanced PIESI <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 (N=79): 100%		
2.1.7—Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.	90% of students will demonstrate competency.	Use conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 85%	99.5%	Yes	
							Measure 2- Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations
		Critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 88%			
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%			
Advanced Practice Behavior							
		Articulate a personal conceptual framework of practice to integrate and differentially apply theories of HBSE to guide practice at all levels.	Measure 1 Advanced SSEA <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=57): 98%			
			Measure 2- Advanced PIESI <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 (N=79): 97%			
2.1.8—Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic	90% of students will demonstrate competency.	Analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 71%	92%	Yes	

well-being and to deliver effective social work services.

		Measure 2- Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%
	Collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 83%
		Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%

Advanced Practice Behavior

Articulate a personal conceptual framework of practice to integrate and differentially apply theories of HBSE to guide practice at all levels.	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=57): 98%
	Measure 2- PIESI: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 (N=79): 100%

2.1.9—Respond to contexts that shape practice.

90% of students will demonstrate competency	Continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 79%	93.16%	Yes
	Provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%		
		Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 85%		
		Measure 2	Measure 2		

social services	Foundation PIESI (2012 version): "Met", "Exceeded", or "Far Exceeded" expectations	(N=68): 100%
-----------------	---	--------------

Advanced Practice Behavior

Engage in leadership and administrative activities to evaluate key contextual issues and to respond to changing practice conditions.	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent</i> or <i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=57): 96%
	Measure 2 PIESI: <i>Competent</i> or <i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 (N=79): 99%

2.1.10(a) Engage, with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	90% of students will demonstrate competency	Substantively and affectively prepare for action with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent</i> or <i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 85%	95.75%	Yes
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 98%		
		Use empathy and other interpersonal skills	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent</i> or <i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 96%		
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 98%		
		Develop a mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent</i> or <i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 92%		
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI	Measure 2 (N=68): 98%		

(2012 version):
*Met, Exceeded, or
 Far Exceeded*
 expectations

Advanced Practice Behavior

2.1.10(b) <u>Assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</u>	90% of students will demonstrate competency	<u>Engage</u> , assess and intervene in integrated, autonomous, evidence-based and ethical practice with all client systems through a well-developed professional use of self.	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=57): 100%	94.2%	Yes
		Collect, organize, and interpret client data	Measure 2 PIESI Evaluation: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 (N=79): 99%		
		Assess client strengths and limitations	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 83%		
		Develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives	Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%		
			Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 94%		
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%		
			Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 86%		
			Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version):	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%		

		Select appropriate intervention strategies	<p><i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations</p> <p>Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i></p> <p>Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations</p>	<p>Measure 1 (N=52): 79%</p> <p>Measure 2 (N=68): 100%</p>		
Advanced Practice Behavior						
		Engage, <u>assess</u> and intervene in integrated, autonomous, evidence-based and ethical practice with all client systems through a well-developed professional use of self.	<p>Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i></p> <p>Measure 2 PIESI Evaluation: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i></p>	<p>Measure 1 (N=57): 100%</p> <p>Measure 2 N=79): 100%</p>		
2.1.10(c)	90% of students will demonstrate competency	Initiate actions to achieve organizational goals	<p>Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i></p> <p>Measure 2 Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or Far Exceeded</i> expectations</p>	<p>Measure 1 (N=52): 81%</p> <p>Measure 2 (N=68): 100%</p>	92.75%	Yes
		Implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities	<p>Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent or Highly competent</i></p> <p>Measure 2- Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or</i></p>	<p>Measure 1 (N=52): 83%</p> <p>Measure 2 (N=68): 100%</p>		

Help clients resolve problems	<i>Far Exceeded</i> expectations Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent</i> or <i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 86%
	Measure 2- Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or</i> <i>Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%
Negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent</i> or <i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 86%
	Measure 2- Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or</i> <i>Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%
Facilitate transitions and endings	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent</i> or <i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=52): 77%
	Measure 2- Foundation PIESI (2012 version): <i>Met, Exceeded, or</i> <i>Far Exceeded</i> expectations	Measure 2 (N=68): 100%

Advanced Practice Behavior

Engage, assess and <u>intervene</u> in integrated, autonomous, evidence-based and ethical practice with all client systems through a well-developed professional	Measure 1 SSEA: <i>Competent</i> or <i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 1 (N=57): 100%
	Measure 2- PIESI: <i>Competent</i> or <i>Highly competent</i>	Measure 2 (N=79): 100%

2.1.10(d)
Evaluate with
individuals,
families, groups,
organizations,
and
communities.

90% of students
 will
 demonstrate
 competency

use of self.
 Critically analyze,
 monitor, and evaluate
 interventions

Measure 1 SSEA:
 "Competent" or
 "Highly competent"

Measure 1
 (N=52): 77%

92%

Yes

Measure 2
 Foundation PIESI
 (2012 version):
 Met, Exceeded, or
 Far Exceeded
 expectations

Measure 2
 (N=68): 100%

Advanced Practice Behavior

Monitor and evaluate
 interventions at all levels
 of practice through the
 application of research
 and program evaluation
 knowledge and skills.

Measure 1 SSEA:
 Competent or
 Highly competent

Measure 1
 (N=57): 91%

Measure 2 PIESI:
 Competent or
 Highly competent

Measure 2
 (N=79): 100%

Data-Based Decision Making

In an effort to continuously improve, assessment data and outcomes are discussed by the faculty and with other constituencies on an ongoing basis. Below are examples of how this is done.

Monthly Faculty Meetings and Semi-annual Retreats. Discussion of assessment results occurs on an ongoing basis at monthly faculty meetings, the annual fall faculty retreat, and the annual spring practicum faculty retreat. During these meetings faculty members discuss assessment outcomes and propose plans to remedy any issues determined to be problematic. We also discuss ways to share with our constituencies what we are doing and what changes we are considering. Student representatives are invited to these meetings when the agenda suggests their input is needed. As needed, we gather feedback from our constituencies regarding the change process. For example, recently we discussed ways to improve the professional seminars taught in conjunction with the field practicum experiences. We learned from the student self assessment data collected over the past two years that students needed more time to process their practicum experiences in ways that help them develop program competencies. We responded by adjusting the seminars to include more time for processing experiences, connecting those experiences with practice behaviors and competencies.

MSW Advisory Board. The MSW program receives regular feedback from the community Advisory Board. Program administrators meet with the Advisory Board annually. A segment of each meeting is devoted to an update on any curriculum changes. We also discuss assessment outcome data and other program initiatives. Recently, the Advisory Board and other community partners were instrumental in helping the program transition to the 2008 EPAS. They provided feedback regarding assessment tools, learning contracts, and the curriculum.

Field Instructor Trainings. Field Instructor orientation/training occurs at the beginning of each fall semester to welcome field instructors to the new academic year and to familiarize them with the requirements of the field experience. Field instructors are provided with information about the MSW program, including pertinent program assessment results, as well as information about student requirements for the year, and the faculty liaison with whom they will be working. During a recent field instructor training we discussed how the learning contracts can be used to help students focus on practice behaviors and competencies they need to give more attention to during the field practicum experience. Field instructors provided feedback regarding the learning contracts, how the foundation learning contract could be improved to help students develop competencies that they feel less confident about. This feedback was used to redesign the foundation learning contract that will be used starting with the 2014-2015 academic year.

Student Focus Groups. Program administrators meet with students near the conclusion of each academic year to gather feedback about the program and to share and discuss program information including assessment findings. Student input gathered during these

meetings is shared with all faculty and helps inform faculty discussions about assessment outcomes and their implications for program modifications. During a recent focus group, students shared ideas for improving the curriculum in relation to program competencies which were then discussed during the spring practicum faculty retreat and incorporated into the redesigning of the professional seminars to allow more time for processing agency experiences in ways that help develop competencies.

Annual Department Newsletter. Each year the Sociology, Social Work, and Anthropology Department publishes a newsletter with information regarding assessment data, faculty hires, awards, retirements, visiting scholar presentations, workshops, and student projects and accomplishments. This allows the department to update alumni, the community, and other programs across the country regarding current events and changes that are made in connection with assessment outcomes. The newsletter is used to solicit feedback from constituents which is used to inform assessment-driven program changes.

Website Updates. Our social work webpage is another avenue we use to update our constituencies and solicit their feedback. It is updated regularly with current events, announcements, and news concerning the social work program. There is also an assessment link on the website (<http://socialwork.usu.edu/ProgEvalOutcomes.aspx>). The website provides contact information for program administrators and faculty.

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
Utah State University MASTERS OF SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM
LAST COMPLETED ON July 1, 2014

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	% STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK
		Advanced Generalist CONCENTRATION Class of 2014 FT, PT, AS Cohorts
-Identify as a Professional Social Worker	90% of Students will achieve each competency	97.92%
-Apply Ethical Principles		98.2%
-Apply Critical Thinking	Competency is assessed by students and field instructors using instruments employing a 3 –point scale where 0= not yet competent, 1=competent, 2=highly competent	94.5%
-Engage Diversity in Practice		97.7%
-Advance Human Rights/ Social and Economic Justice		94.5%
-Engage Research Informed Practice/ Practice Informed Research		92.17%
-Human Behavior Knowledge	Competencies are operationalized via 41 foundation practice behaviors and 10 advanced practice behaviors	99.5%
-Engage Policy Practice to Advance Well-Being and Deliver Services		92%
-Respond to Practice Contexts		93.16%
-Practice Engagement		95.75%
-Practice Assessment		94.2%
-Practice Intervention		92.75%
-Practice Evaluation		92%