**Annual Assessment Report for 2020-2021 AY**

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2020-2021 AY will be due September 30th 2021 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Douglas Fraleigh (douglasf@csufresno.edu).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. For purposes of this report, you should only report on two or three student learning outcomes (department’s choice) even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_Social Work Education\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Degree \_\_MSW\_\_\_

Assessment Coordinator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Randy Nedegaard\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. *Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.*

SLO 2.1. Engage diversity and difference in practice (SWRK 227 – Advanced Multisystem Assessment of a Couple using a Vignette Case Study).

SLO 3.1 Advance human rights and social and economic justice (SWRK 246 – Organizational Plan)

1. *What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?* ***Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.***

**SLO 2.1–Advanced Multisystem Assessment of a Couple using a Vignette Case Study (SWRK 277).** In this assignment, all students write a paper using APA style that directly responds to ten questions on a vignette case study. Their responses must demonstrate competency on multisystem assessment to include assessment of a couple’s developmental stages, application of theoretical frameworks major couple’s theories to include Gottman, Solution-focused, and a third theory of the student’s choice. Cultural diversity issues are identified along with crisis issues, countertransference and the student’s awareness of their potential reactions to the couple, macro level issues impacting the couple in the vignette, ethical considerations related to the vignette and how to evaluate progress when working with this couple. All of these assignments are evaluated according to a rubric. For each outcome evaluated on the rubric, a score of 3.0 on a scale of 4.0 will define having met the learning outcome. The department expects that 90% of students must score a minimum of 3.0 on a scale of 0-4.0

**SLO 3.1. Advance human rights and social and economic justice (SWRK 246 – Organizational Plan).** In this assignment, all students write an organizational plan, They clearly delineate a comprehensive assessment that includes an assessment that includes a description of how an identified problem affects the organization, the staff and the clientele. This assessment is tied into the theoretical evidence-based practice literature. A theory of action is clearly specified for the program with an identified budget that includes at least two new funding sources. Various activities are clearly specified an have logical links to the goals and objectives that are proposed, along with a plan containing evaluation criteria and feasible evaluation methods

For each outcome evaluated on the rubric, a score of 3.0 on a scale of 4.0 will define having met the learning outcome. The department expects that 85% of students must score a minimum of 3.0 on a scale of 0-4.0

1. *What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient. Also indicate your benchmark (e.g. 80% of students will be designated as proficient or higher) and indicate the number of students who met that benchmark.*

**SLO 2.1–Advanced Multisystem Assessment of a Couple using a Vignette Case Study (SWRK 277).** Of the total of 54 students who were assessed on this standard assignment, 70% (38) received a 4.0 (exceeds expected outcomes) and 24% (13) received 3.0 (meets expected outcomes). Just 6% (2) students received a 2.0 (emerging ability to meet outcomes). Overall, 94% (52) of the students met the program benchmark of 3.0 or higher.

Students scored quite well on this assignment. It is a culmination of the major concepts discussed throughout the semester where we ask students to apply what they have learned to a real-life vignette. The relative strengths include students’ awareness of couple’s intervention theory and techniques in addressing a challenging issue in working with a couple, as well as their own self-awareness.

**SLO 3.1–Advance human rights and social and economic justice (SWRK 246 – Organizational Plan).**

Of the total of 54 students who were assessed on this standard assignment, 54% (29) received a 4.0 (exceeds expected outcomes) and 26% (14) received 3.0 (meets expected outcomes). However, 20% (11) students received a 2.0 (emerging ability to meet outcomes). Overall, 80% (43) of the students met the program benchmark of 3.0 or higher.

Students scored lower on this assignment than expected. We are confident the assignment is measuring students’ understanding of advancing human rights as well as social and economic justice, however, all of the students who scored a 2.0 came from one course that was taught by a part-time instructor. The average score of that class was 2.5. A discussion with this instructor indicates some confusion about the measure, especially since we recently shifted from a grade focus to a competency focus.

1. *What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?*

The findings suggest that overall our students exceeded the benchmark for SLO 2.1 but SLO 3.1 needs further assessment. Yet, this is reminiscent of the benchmark for SLO 2.2 that was measured in the same course SWRK 246 with a second common assignment (Organizational Assessment) that was not quite met in 2016-17. That issue was brought to the Practice Sequence in 2019 and faculty discussed some ideas about how to better support student learning in the area of organizational assessment. After some brainstorming, it was thought that this finding was most likely instructor based and it appears this same instructor is involved with this most recent finding. A discussion about expectations with regard to our assessment measure will take place with this instructor to attempt to help ensure that her expectation of meeting outcomes is similar with those of other faculty assessing our students and minimize a potential problem with inter-rater reliability.

As a reminder, at the end of AY 2019-2020, the Department of Social Work Education (DSWE) is finished the process of reviewing all of the SLOs in our efforts to align them with the national accreditation by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE)’s updated competencies.

1. *If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in your 2018-19 assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question.*

N/A There were no recommended changes in our previous report

1. *What assessment activities will you be conducting during AY 2021-22?*

1.1. Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly: Demonstrate professional use of self in specific multi systems level interventions (SWRK 283 – Professional Use of Self).

1.4. Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research: Student Learning Outcome: Use advanced practice experiences to inform research at multi system levels (SWRK 298/299 – Research Completion).

1. *Identify and discuss any major issues identified during your last Program Review and in what ways these issues have or have not been addressed.*

Our program review took place in 2019. In this program review, six items were identified as requiring action on the part of the Department of Social Work Education.  The progress status on each of the items are indicated under “PROGRAM RESPONSE.”

1. FACULTY: A critical need in additional tenure track faculty. This is a very large graduate program with too few full-time faculty for committee work, such as curriculum revisions and admissions, as well as program stability. While they presented evidence of high-quality part-time faculty, there is too much reliance on part-time faculty. RECOMMENDATION: Program needs searches for additional faculty and searches should be at the assistant/associate or even open rank.

**PROGRAM RESPONSE:**

1. Two full-time tenure-track faculty were hired by the end of Spring 2019, however we lost one full-time tenure-track faculty member to retirement (with no FERP) in Fall 2019. The department has been granted one additional tenure-track line and has created a search committee to begin the search process for an eventual hire in Spring 2022. We are hopeful this will move the program above the doctoral faculty ratios needed for our upcoming reaccreditation.

2. STUDENTS: As noted above, we appreciate the changes made to their admission policies, and the fact they now have rubrics and an admission committee. RECOMMENDATION: We suggest they carefully track changes in applications, admissions, retention, and graduation following these changes in admission policies and procedures. Are more Fresno State students admitted? Is there more ethnic diversity? Are there changes in retention and graduation rates?

**PROGRAM RESPONSE:**

a. The program moved to online applications two years ago which prohibits us to ask our students about ethnic diversity. Thus, cannot assess if there is more ethnic diversity at the program level. There has been an increase in Fresno State students (social work students and graduates where this issue originated from) admitted in the last two years by 22%. Finally, the retention and graduation rates have remained basically the same in the past two years. Retention and graduation have been impacted by Covid-19 in the past two years, but our faculty has done an outstanding job in supporting our students and aiding them in staying in school and completing.

3. The self-study noted student involvement in program organization, but interviews indicated this is currently limited. RECOMMENDATION: Continue to find ways to increase students' involvement in the program committees and organizations.

**PROGRAM RESPONSE:**

a. Student involvement in our many clubs has increased in the past year, but was heavily impacted by Covid-19 when most club activity was shut down by the pandemic. That said, our clubs have been doing some amazing things, to include community gardens over the summer as well as organizing and participating in two recent campus-wide events: Bulldogs Drumming Together and Bulldogs Joyful Together event that included many of our students participating in a flash-mob.

4. CURRICULUM: We recognize it is challenging to schedule courses; online or hybrid courses could enhance scheduling to the benefit of faculty and students. SUGGESTION: Explore courses where online or blended teaching could enhance scheduling to the benefit of faculty and students. Encourage faculty to take advantage of training opportunities for online teaching.

**PROGRAM RESPONSE:**

a. Partially as a result of the pandemic, almost all of our faculty have now completed the Introduction to Teaching Online using QLT course that qualifies them to teach online courses within the CSU system. We still only have two courses that are officially approved to teach online, but will consider others as time moves forward.

5. STAFFING: Concerns were raised over stability of support staff. The department might work with the Dean's Office to enhance the position.

**PROGRAM RESPONSE:**

a. At the present time, the support staff have been stable and we haven’t had any turnover for the past two years. We do anticipate one support staff leaving as she is completing her Master’s degree in December and she is likely going to seek employment connected to her new degree.

6. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT: Clearly social work is heavily invested in the local community. Graduate students do field placements and internships with local agencies. SUGGESTION: Consider developing a community-based Advisory Board. Such a board can augment the relations between field-based placements and the university and provide support for program development.

**PROGRAM RESPONSE:**

1. With the advent of Covid-19, etc., the DSWE has not been able to create a community-based Advisory Board. The department remains connected to the community in a wide variety of ways.