

Department of Social Work Education

MSW Program Assessment

Academic Year 2013 - 2014

Date: May 15, 2014

Prepared by: Assessment Committee (Andrea Carlin, Debra Harris-Chair, Sal Montana, Martha Vungkhanching)

This evaluation is based on the Department of Social Work Education M.S.W. Student Outcome Assessment Plan (SOAP) which was updated during the Spring 2014 semester, as well as the Provost's Annual Report. The Master's in Social Work degree prepares students for autonomous multi-systems (i.e., individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities) social work practice, with a commitment to social justice, diversity / cultural awareness, and empowerment. There are presently 150 students in the MSW program.

Direct Measures

Graduate Field Placement Performance Evaluations (SWRK 280, 282)

These evaluations are completed by the field instructor and the student in the field placement, in consultation with the faculty liaison and field coordinator.

Graduate Field Placement Performance Evaluation (SWRK 280) – Fall 2013

There were a total of 56 field instructed practice evaluations assessed for the Fall 2013. The type of field instructed practice placements can be viewed in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Field Instructed Practice 1 (SWRK 280) Fall 2013 – Placement Type

| Placement Type | Fall 2012 | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|----------|
| | N | % |
| Administration | 2 | 3.6 |
| Adult Services | 12 | 21.4 |
| Child & Adolescent Services | 6 | 10.7 |
| Child Welfare | 17 | 30.4 |
| Juvenile Justice | 4 | 7.1 |
| Medical | 10 | 17.9 |
| Mental Health | 3 | 5.4 |
| School | 2 | 3.6 |
| Total | 56 | 100 |

A Likert Scale was used to assess the 19 performance areas with a range of answers from 1-5, using the following scale:

- 1-Unsatisfactory
- 2-Below Average
- 3-Satisfactory
- 4-Above Average
- 5-Exemplary

The possible score ranged between a high score (exemplary rating) of 95 to a low score of 19 (unsatisfactory rating). The benchmark for performance is a score of 57 or higher. The mean was 73.05, with a standard deviation of 11.38. This indicates that students performed at a high level in their field placements.

Students received supervision in these community placements for a total of 22,400 hours (56 students x 200 hours per 2 semesters).

Graduate Field Placement Performance Evaluation (SWRK 282) – Fall 2013

There were a total of 55 field instructed practice evaluations assessed for the Fall 2012. The type of field instructed practice placements can be viewed in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Field Instructed Practice 1 (SWRK 282) Fall 2013 – Placement Type

| Placement Type | Fall 2012 | |
|--|------------------|----------|
| | N | % |
| Child Welfare | 14 | 23.0 |
| Medical | 6 | 9.8 |
| Mental Health | 6 | 9.8 |
| School (PPS) | 19 | 31.1 |
| Social Services | 13 | 21.3 |
| Social Work Evaluation, Research, Training | 1 | 1.6 |
| University Services | 2 | 3.3 |
| Total | 61 | 100 |

A Likert Scale was used to assess 19 areas of performance with a range of answers from 1-5, using the following scale:

- 1-Unsatisfactory
- 2-Marginal
- 3-Satisfactory
- 4-Above Average
- 5-Exemplary

The possible score ranged between a high score (exemplary rating) of 95 to a low score of 19 (unsatisfactory rating). The benchmark for performance is a score of 57 or higher. The mean was 73.89, with a standard deviation of 11.49. This indicates that students performed at a high level in their field placements.

Students received a total of 36,600 hours (61 students x 300 hours per 2 semesters).

Standard Assignment – Assessment Assignment (SWRK 220)

There were 16 students who submitted a standard assignment. The possible scores were an A, B, C, D, and F. There were 7 (43.75%) A's; 5 (31.25%) B's; 0 (2%) C's; 4 (25%) earned D's; and 0 (0%) F. This indicates that overall, more than two thirds, students performed at a high level.

Standard Assignment – Policy Making Process (SWRK 200)

There were 56 students who submitted a standard assignment. All students earned an A.

Standard Assignment – Seminar in Thesis / Project (SWRK 292)

Of the 59 students, 41 (69.4%) earned an A; 15 (25.5%) earned a B; 1 (1.7%) earned a C; and 2 (3.4%) earned an Incomplete. This indicates that most students performed at the A & B level which is the benchmark for graduate study. This course precedes the culminating experience of the project / thesis (SWRK 298 and SWRK 299).

Alumni Survey

This was not a required measure for this semester but was completed in an effort to increase the response rate. A total of 147 surveys were sent to Alumni who graduated in 2012 and 2013 with e-mail addresses. It was not known if these e-mail addresses were current, however this list was the most current available. There were 26 questions related to the Alumni's preparation from the MSW program for the work force. These areas of preparation primarily emanated from the Council on Social Work Education's Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards. There were 15 responses which is a 10.2% response rate. The response rate was increased from .88% in 2013 to 10.2% in 2014.

There were 3 (20%) males; 11 (73%) females; and 1 (7%) other. The ethnic background of respondents was: Asian = 2 (14%); Hispanic = 5 (36%); White = 5 (36%); African American = 1 (7%); and Multi Ethnic = 1 (7%). There were a total of 2 responses that the student participated in the Title IV-E Stipend program; 3 participated in the Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program; and 2 participated in the Mental Health Stipend. The majority worked with adults and families (n=8; 54%).

Ratings ranged between 1 (indicating the student was well prepared) to 5 (indicating the student was not prepared at all). The mean rating was 2 indicating that most respondents believe they were either very prepared or prepared for the workforce based on their MSW program of study.

Four individuals commented regarding their MSW program. The themes from these responses are as follows:

| Strengths | Areas of Improvement |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| You get what you put in the program | The three year part time program takes four years. Consider eliminating the three year program. |
| | Need more content in policy, research, and clinical social work |

Employer / Supervisor Survey

An employer / supervisor survey was sent last semester and will be completed in 2 years.

End of Year Student Survey

An end of year student survey was sent to 40 graduating by having faculty hand these out in class. There were 33 responses which was a 82.5% response rate. The responses indicate the following themes:

| What I Found Useful | What I Did Not Find Useful |
|----------------------------|---|
| Internship experience | Community advocacy course & organizational course redundant |
| Classmates and professors | 3 rd semester too stressful |
| Clinical Courses | Field supervision repetitive with field |
| | Internship hours excessive |

This was a much higher response rate from Academic Year 2012-2013 which was a 7% response rate. Overall, students viewed their field instructed practice experiences as enriching their classroom learning.

PROVOST ANNUAL REPORT REQUESTED INFORMATION

1. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?

All goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes as outlined in the SOAP were assessed. The standard assignments were discussed in further detail and this is as follows:

Direct Measure – Standard Assignment (SWRK 220) – Assessment Assignment – After evaluating this assignment it was determined that students performed well on this assessment and this outcome measure will be continued.

Direct Measure – Standard Assignment (SWRK 200) – Policy Making Process – This is a new direct measure begun this year. After evaluating student’s performance it was determined that all of them completed this assignment well above the benchmark.

Direct Measure – Standard Assignment (SWRK 292) – Seminar in Thesis / Project – This measure indicates that student performed well on this assessment and this outcome measure will be continued.

2. What instruments did you use to assess them?

Direct Measures

1. Graduate Field Placement Learning Evaluations
2. Standard Assignment (SWRK 220) – Assessment Assignment - Grading Rubric
3. Standard Assignment (SWRK 200) – Policy Making Assignment – Grading Rubric
4. Standard Assignment (SWRK 292) - Grades

Indirect Measures

1. Alumni Survey
2. Student Surveys

3. What did you discover from the findings?

The 2013 - 2014 cohort of MSW students performed well in their field placements. The average level of performance met or exceeded the program benchmark. This outcome is an important indicator of the effectiveness of the program.

Performance level of MSW students in the foundation practice class assessment assignment was high for the majority of students (75%) as they met the program benchmark of obtaining A’s & B’s.

Performance levels of MSW students in the foundation policy class assignment was high for all the students (100%) met the program benchmark of obtaining A’s & B’s.

Performance levels of MSW students engaged in advanced level research was also high for the majority (94.9%) and met the program benchmark for A’2 & B’s.

Most alumni who responded to the survey report that they were prepared for the workforce. Graduating MSW majors especially learned from the internship experience, their professors and other students and the clinical courses. Exiting students expressed concern for the number of internship hours and the stress in completing the program.

It was learned that sending a request for participation from alumni who graduated during the past two years, via e-mail, increased the response rate. Also, the response rate of student comments was greatly increased when faculty administered this questionnaire during class.

4. What changes did you make as a result of these findings?

Select an alternate measure for the student learning objectives rather than use the Policy Analysis Paper in the Spring. A common assignment related to the policy making process was selected.

The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Commission on Accreditation (COA) developed the 2008 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS). The 2008 EPAS represented a major reconfiguration of educational policy and standards compared with previous iterations. The move from a content orientation to one focusing on “student learning outcome” is in keeping with the Department’s Student Outcomes Assessment Plan and its goal of improving student preparedness for the profession. Currently, a self-study is in the process by faculty to seek CSWE re-accreditation. Many common assignments and grading rubrics are in the process of being completed.