

California State University, Stanislaus  
**Social Work (MSW)**  
**Assessment Report 2008-09 and Assessment Plan 2009-10**

Program Assessment and Continuous Improvement

*AS 8.0 The program has an assessment plan and procedures for evaluating outcomes for each program objective. The plan specifies the measurement procedures and methods used to evaluate the outcome of each program objective.*

Collectively, social work educators have used a panoply of methods to assess educational outcomes. Hull, Mather, Christopherson, and Young (1994) organize these methods into three overarching categories: student focused, institution focused, and process focused. According to Holden, Barker, Heenaghan, and Rosenberg (1999) for student focused measures, educators tend to use a combination of indicators, including homework, tests, quizzes, papers, presentations, and class participation as a means of assessing student outcome. They further indicate that educators tend to rely on student course evaluations as a barometer for gauging students' views of the instructional methodology and course content. Nevertheless, concerns regarding the quality (reliability and validity) and utility of this student-focused evaluative strategy have been raised (d'Apollonia & Abrami, 1997; Greenwald, 1997; Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997; Jirovec, Ramanathan, & Alvarez, 1998; Pike, 1998). For example, d'Apollonia and Abrami found a correlation of only .33 between students' ratings of general instruction and students' learning.

Buchan (1991) has convincingly argued for "multidimensional assessments" of social work educational outcomes, relying on methods that are consistent with sound research principles and practices. This recommendation is consistent with the assessment strategies that have historically been a part of the Master of Social Work Program at California State University, Stanislaus. That is, both qualitative and quantitative program evaluation data have been regularly collected on a variety of levels within the Master of Social Work Program, including: within individual classes, through integrative assignments, from capstone indicators (number of students completing a Master's Thesis), from focus group discussions/forums with students and faculty, and through surveys of students and instructors. However, during the self-study process, the collective faculty acknowledged that the traditional evaluative process used to *systematically evaluate the Program* was somewhat disjointed and in need of greater synthesis and focus. Additionally, similar to all programs/departments, we recognized the fact that there is a clear need for the development of measurement devices (quality instrumentation) designed to more directly address (measure) students' acquisition of knowledge related to the Program's core learning objectives. This instrumentation is needed as a centerpiece for organizing other evaluation activities in a coordinated fashion to rigorously and holistically examine student learning outcomes. Finally, it became evident that while we had a variety of measures/activities associated with our program assessment, the emphasis of these measures was not squarely focused on the program objectives.

As a result of our acknowledged program assessment shortcomings, we established a consensus agreeing that the systematic use of evaluative data to guide program planning and curriculum design (the completion of the evaluation feedback loop) has historically not been fully realized. Given this reality, The Master of Social Work Program began implementing its **new** Program Assessment Model (see matrix below) in the spring of 2008. The new assessment model was developed in accordance with Council of Social Work Education accreditation mandates, which require us to assess the degree to which students have achieved foundation and advanced program objectives (n=16). Our assessment model includes a combination of both direct and indirect measures of student learning related to program objectives, is manageable, and is capable of producing quality data that can guide programmatic decision making.

In the spring of 2008, we began gathering data pertaining to our foundation and advanced program objectives from four data collection sources: Exit Surveys, Field Instructor Evaluations, University IDEA Course Evaluations, and a Master's Thesis Rating Rubric. In the fall of 2008 and the spring of 2009, our program assessment model was fully implemented, as we gathered additional data pertaining to the program objectives via the use of an Alumni Survey and Embedded Course Assignments.

It is worth noting that we are pleased with the quantity and quality of data that were gathered from the various data collection tools. Field instructors completed final evaluations on **all** students enrolled in the Master of Social Work Program. These assessments provide data regarding field supervisors' views pertaining to students' mastery of program objectives. University IDEA course evaluations were completed by all faculty members as appropriate, and over 500 master's thesis rating rubrics were completed by audience members at the thesis defenses. Student exit data were compiled from graduating students via our Exit Survey. This survey asks for students' feedback on the 13 foundation objectives and the 3 advanced objectives. We received a total of 23 completed exit surveys from our graduating cohort of 42 students, for a 55% response rate.

Below is a full description of each measurement tool utilized in assessing program objectives, the rationale for the tool, the procedures related to data collection, the time line for data collection and reporting (feedback loop), and the desired outcome for each measure. This is followed by a matrix which directly connects each program objective to the specific program objective measures. It is worth noting that each program objective has no fewer than three measures designed to assess the degree to which students have achieved the desired outcome.

**Program Assessment Measures:**  
**Master of Social Work Program, CSU Stanislaus**

**Outcome Measure #1: Exit Surveys**

**Purpose:** Exit surveys are constructed in order to assess the degree to which students believe that the foundation and advanced program objectives were accomplished.

**Process/Procedures:** Exit surveys are administered in the Advanced Practice or Capstone classes in the student's final semester of study. The survey is administered by the faculty member in the final class session. Using a Likert type scale (ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree), students are asked to rate the degree to which they believe that the program accomplished desired objectives.

**Desired Outcome:** For each program objective, 80% of the surveyed students will "agree or strongly agree" that the program achieved the objective.

**Time line:** Annually

**Feedback Loop:** A reported is disseminated, reviewed and discussed at the January Faculty Retreat for interpretation and decision by full faculty.

**Person(s) Responsible:** Research and Evaluation Committee reviews, analyzes data, and prepares report to present to the full faculty.

**Outcome Measure #2: Alumni Surveys**

**Purpose:** The purpose of the Alumni Survey is multidimensional. First, similar to the Exit Survey, this survey is constructed in order to assess former students' perceptions regarding the degree to which each foundation and advanced program objective was accomplishment. In addition, the Alumni Survey generates data regarding students' overall satisfaction with the program and recommendations for change. Finally, the survey generates information regarding post-graduation employment.

**Process/Procedures:** Alumni Surveys are mailed by the administrative staff of the MSW program. The returned surveys are forwarded to the Chair of the Research and Evaluation Committee. The Research and Evaluation Committee assumes the responsibility of analyzing the data generated from the surveys.

**Desired Outcome:** For each program objective, 80% of the surveyed students will "agree or strongly agree" that the program achieved the objective.

**Outcome Measure #2: Alumni Surveys (cont)**

**Time line:** Bi-Annually

**Feedback Loop:** A reported is disseminated, reviewed and discussed at the January Faculty Retreat for interpretation and decision by full faculty.

**Person(s) Responsible:** Research and Evaluation Committee reviews, analyzes data, and prepares report to present to the full faculty.

### **Outcome Measure #3: Field Instructor Evaluations of Student Performance**

**Purpose:** Field instructor evaluations provide feedback on students' performance in several areas related to program objectives. The primary purpose of the form is to determine whether the student will receive credit for the Practicum course.

**Procedure/Process:** Field instructor evaluations are completed two times each academic year: mid-year and a final evaluation at the completion of the Practicum. The faculty liaison meets with the field instructor and student to review both the mid-year and final evaluation. Only final evaluation data are used for program assessment purposes. Field instructors specify the student's accomplishment of the program objectives by indicating "satisfactory", "needs improvement", or "no opportunity" related to each program objective.

**Desired Outcome:** For each objective, 90% of the students will receive ratings of "good, very good, or excellent," thus indicating that the objective was accomplished.

**Time line:** The field evaluations are administered at the middle and end of a student's Practicum. Completed evaluation forms are filed in the students' field files.

**Feedback Loop:** A report is disseminated, reviewed and discussed at the January Faculty Retreat for interpretation and decision by full faculty.

**Person(s) Responsible:** Research and Evaluation Committee reviews, analyzes data, and prepares report to present to the full faculty.

### **Outcome Measure #4: IDEA Course Evaluations**

**Purpose:** This University-wide evaluation tool is used by the campus community as a systematic tool for students to evaluate their learning experience. Evaluative items from the IDEA form that match specific MSW program objectives have been identified and are used as a tool to determine the degree to which students believe the course contributed to the accomplishment of the program objective.

**Procedure/Process:** IDEA course evaluations are completed at the end of each semester in which the class is offered. By contract, faculty members must evaluate at least two courses per academic year using the IDEA form.

**Desired Outcome:** Students' average rating of each selected IDEA evaluative item will be 3.75 or higher. (Each item rates the degree to which the learning objective was achieved using a 5 points scale, with 1=no apparent progress and 5=exceptional progress.)

**Time line:** Every three years a multiyear summary report is requested from the University.

**Feedback Loop:** A report is disseminated, reviewed and discussed at the January Faculty Retreat for interpretation and decision by full faculty.

**Person(s) Responsible:** Research and Evaluation Committee reviews, analyzes data, and prepares report to present to the full faculty.

**Outcome Measure(s) #5: Embedded Measures/Final Assignment Rubric**

**Purpose:** The purpose of the embedded measures is to assess the degree to which students' final assignments in the advanced practice classes (SW 5032 and SW 5034) show evidence of mastery of advanced program objectives 14 and 15.

**Procedure/Process:** At the end of each course, faculty members teaching the practice classes use the Final Assignment Rubric (5032, 5034) to assess the degree to which the students' final assignments in the specific course show evidence of the mastery of program objectives 14 or 15.

**Desired Outcome:** 80% of the students will receive a 2 (satisfactory) or higher on each of the grading rubric items.

**Time line: Annually**--Upon completion of the course(s).

**Feedback Loop:** A reported is disseminated, reviewed and discussed at the January Faculty Retreat for interpretation and decision by full faculty.

**Person(s) Responsible:** Research and Evaluation Committee reviews, analyzes data, and prepares report to present to the full faculty.

**Outcome Measures #6: Thesis Defense Presentation Rubric**

**Purpose:** This tool is used to assess the degree to which the student's presentation of his or her master's thesis or project demonstrates mastery of program objective #16.

**Outcome Measures #6: Thesis Defense Presentation Rubric (cont)**

**Procedure/Process:** A rating rubric is given to each member of the audience. The rubric contains a series of Likert-type questions that probe students' mastery of the specified program objective.

**Desired Outcome:** 80% of the students will receive a 2 (satisfactory) or higher on each of the rating rubric items pertaining to program objective 16.

**Time line:** Each year during thesis defense week.

**Feedback Loop:** A reported is disseminated, reviewed and discussed at the January Faculty Retreat for interpretation and decision by full faculty.

**Person(s) Responsible:** Research and Evaluation Committee reviews, analyzes data, and prepares report to present to the full faculty.

Program Assessment Matrix  
**Foundation Objectives**

<u>Program Objective</u>	<u>Assessment Measure/Indicator</u>
1. Apply critical thinking skills to professional social work practice.	1. Item "1" from Exit Survey 2. Item "1" from Alumni Survey 3. Item "2" from Field Instructor final foundation evaluation. 4. Items "3" and "11" from IDEA course evaluations.
2. Understand and are guided by the values and ethics of the profession.	1. Item "2" from Exit Survey 2. Item "2" from Alumni Survey 3. Item "1" from Field Instructor final foundation evaluation.
3. Demonstrate the ability to practice without discrimination and with respect, knowledge, and skills related to diverse client populations.	1. Item "3" from Exit Survey 2. Item "3" from Alumni Survey 3. Item "3" from Field Instructor final foundation evaluation. 4. Items "4" from IDEA course evaluations
<u>Program Objective</u>	<u>Assessment Measure/Indicator</u>
4. Advocate for social justice by understanding and working to expose paradigms of oppression and discrimination and those mechanisms and structures that serve those paradigms.	1. Item "4" from Exit Survey 2. Item "4" from Alumni Survey 3. Item "12" from Field Instructor final foundation evaluation.

<p>5. Understand the history of social work profession and utilize this knowledge as a context for understanding and addressing current practice issues.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "5" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "5" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Item "1" from IDEA course evaluations.</li> </ol>
<p>6. Engage clients to assess and intervene at all system levels using a generalist perspective that incorporates client strengths.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "6" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "6" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Item "4" from Field Instructor final foundation evaluation.</li> </ol>
<p>7. Apply theoretical frameworks supported by research to understand individual development and behavior across the life span, between individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "7" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "7" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Item "2" from IDEA course evaluations.</li> </ol>
<p>8. Analyze, formulate, and influence social policies and understand the integral relationship between policy and practice.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "8" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "8" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Item "9" from Field Instructor final foundation evaluation.</li> </ol>

<u>Program Objective</u>	<u>Assessment Measure/Indicator</u>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------

<p>9. Use research to inform and continually update practice.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "9" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "9" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Item "10" from Field Instructor final foundation evaluation.</li> <li>4. Items "9" and "12" from IDEA course evaluations.</li> </ol>
<p>10. Use supervision, consultation, and continuing education to strengthen practice.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "10" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "10" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Item "11" from Field Instructor final foundation evaluation.</li> </ol>
<p>11. Understand and operate within organizational structures and service delivery systems and seek necessary change.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "11" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "11" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Item "6" from Field Instructor final foundation evaluation.</li> </ol>
<p>12. Use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and communities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "12" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "12" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Item "7" from Field Instructor final foundation evaluation.</li> <li>4. Items "5" and "8" from IDEA course evaluations.</li> </ol>
<p>13. Carry out critical self-analysis and self evaluation.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "13" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "13" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Item "10" from IDEA course evaluations.</li> </ol>

### Advanced Objectives

<u>Program Objective</u>	<u>Assessment Measure/Indicator</u>
14. Engage in autonomous practice that is highly differentiated, discriminating, ethical, and self-critical using the integrative practice approach.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "14" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "14" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Item "2" from Advanced Field Instructor final evaluation.</li> <li>4. Embedded Measure 5032</li> </ol>
15. Apply and promote paradigms of social and economic justice and liberation to continually advance the larger social work profession and refine the quality of their own practice.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "15" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "15" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Embedded Measure 5034.</li> </ol>
16. Demonstrate a spirit of inquiry that is characterized by curiosity and a motivation to learn about others whose lives are different from one's own and the strengths utilized by those individuals and groups.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Item "16" from Exit Survey</li> <li>2. Item "16" from Alumni Survey</li> <li>3. Master's thesis rubric</li> </ol>

*AS 8.1 The program implements its plan to evaluate the outcomes of each objective and shows evidence that the analysis is used to affirm and improve the educational program.*

The implementation of the evaluation of program objectives is holistically overseen by the Master of Social Work Program's Research & Evaluation Committee. Below are the results of the most current assessment of program objectives. After analyzing the data, the members of the Research & Evaluation Committee prepared this information for review of the full faculty. (See Table 8.1, page 193). Additionally, this information is presented in report form to the University's Program Assessment Council (PAC) and to our Master of Social Work Program Community Advisory board.

### **Program Objective 1: Apply critical thinking skills to professional social work practice.**

This objective was assessed using five different measures. The analysis of the first item on the Exit Survey, which is an indicator of progress on this objective, revealed that of the 68 students who completed the survey for the academic years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, 95% agreed or strongly agreed that the objective was accomplished. Similar results were echoed from the Alumni Survey. A significant number of students, 91% (out of 127 students), agreed or strongly agreed that the Master of Social Work Program prepared them to apply critical thinking skills to professional social work practice. Question 3 from the University's IDEA course evaluation shows that 94% of the students from 117 courses ranked the accomplishment of this objective at a 3.75 or higher (on a scale of 1-5). On question 11 from the IDEA evaluation forms which asks about "Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of views", 90% of the students (out of 100 courses) ranked 3.75 or higher. Field Instructor evaluations of students' performance (SW 5040 evaluation, item 2) were also used as an indicator of progress on this program objective. Results indicate that 95% of students received a ranking of satisfactory, which is the highest ranking possible on this measure, on the accomplishment of this objective. Therefore, it is evident from all these measures that the Department's desired outcome level on this program objective was met.

### **Program Objective 2: Understand and are guided by the values and ethics of the profession**

This objective was assessed using three different measures. The results associated with the second item on the Exit Survey revealed that 94% percent of the students agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was accomplished, with 69% of the students strongly agreeing. Similar results were echoed from the Alumni Survey. A significant number of students, 91% (out of 127 students), agreed or strongly agreed that the Master of Social Work Program prepared them to understand and be guided by the values and ethics of social work practice. Only three students disagreed (2%). Field Instructor evaluations of students' performance (SW 5040 evaluation, item 1) were also used as an indicator of progress on this Program objective. Results indicate that 95% of students received a ranking of satisfactory, which is the highest ranking possible on this measure, on the accomplishment of this objective. Therefore, it is evident from all three measures that the Department's desired outcome level on this program objective was met.

### **Program Objective 3: Demonstrate the ability to practice without discrimination and with respect, knowledge, and skills related to diverse client populations.**

This objective was assessed using four different measures. The data connected to the third item on the Exit Survey, which is an indicator of progress on this objective, revealed that 97% of the 68 students agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was accomplished, with 79% of the students strongly agreeing. The alumni survey results were a little different. A significant number of students, 91% (out of 127 students), agreed or strongly agreed that the Master of Social Work Program prepared them to practice without discrimination and with respect, knowledge, and skills related to diverse client populations, though five percent of

students disagreed or strongly disagreed. Question 4 from the IDEA evaluations which asks about, “developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field, shows that 95% of the students from 104 courses ranked the accomplishment of this objective at a 3.75 or higher (on a scale of 1-5). Field Instructor evaluations of students’ performance (SW 5040 evaluation, item 3) were also used as an indicator of progress on this Program objective. Results indicate that 95% of students received a ranking of satisfactory, which is the highest ranking possible on this measure, on the accomplishment of this objective. Therefore, it is evident from all four measures that the Department’s desired outcome level on this program objective was met.

**Program Objective 4: Advocate for social justice by understanding and working to expose paradigms of oppression and discrimination and those mechanism and structures that serve those paradigms.**

This objective was assessed using three different measures. The analysis of the fourth item on the exit survey, which is an indicator of this objective, revealed that 95% of the students agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was accomplished, with 57% of the students strongly agreeing and 35% agreeing. For alumni, however, this rating dropped somewhat. Results of the Alumni Survey indicated that 87% (out of 127) of alums agreed or strongly agreed that this objective had been met. Nine percent were neutral on this item, and 4% (n=5) disagreed or strongly disagreed. Field Instructor evaluations of students’ performance (SW 5040 evaluation, item 12) were also used as an indicator of progress on this program objective. Results indicate that 92% of students received a ranking of satisfactory, which is the highest ranking possible on this measure, on the accomplishment of this objective. Therefore, it is evident from all three measures that in total, the Department’s desired outcome level was met.

**Program Objective 5: Understand the history of social work and profession and utilize this knowledge as a context for understanding and addressing current practice issues.**

This objective was assessed using three different measures. The analysis of fifth item on the Exit Survey, which is an indicator of this objective, revealed that 85% of the students agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was accomplished. On the alumni surveys, 83% (out of 127 students), agreed or strongly agreed that the Master of Social Work Program prepared them to understand the history of social work and profession and utilize this knowledge for understanding and addressing current practice issues, whereas five percent (n=6) disagreed or strongly disagreed. On question 1 from the IDEA evaluation forms which asks about “Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classification, methods, trends)”, 95% of the students (out of 103 courses) ranked 3.75 or higher. Therefore, it is evident from all measures that the Department’s desired outcome level was met.

**Program Objective 6: Engage clients to assess and intervene at all system levels using a generalist perspective that incorporates client strengths.**

This objective was assessed using three different measures. The analysis of Item 6 on the exit survey, which reflects this objective, revealed that 97% of the students agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was accomplished, with 49% of the students strongly agreeing and 48% agreeing. Similar results were echoed from the Alumni Survey. A significant number of students, 93% (out of 127 students), agreed or strongly agreed that the Master of Social Work Program prepared them to engage clients and intervene at all system levels while incorporating client strengths. Field Instructor evaluations of students' performance (SW 5040 evaluation, item 4) were also used as an indicator of progress on this Program objective. Results indicate that 95% of students received a ranking of satisfactory, which is the highest ranking possible on this measure, on the accomplishment of this objective. Therefore, it is evident from all measures that the Department's desired outcome level on this program objective was met.

**Program Objective 7: Apply theoretical frameworks supported by research to understand individual development and behavior across the life span, between individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.**

This objective was assessed using three different measures. The analysis of Item 7 on the Exit Survey, which is an indicator of progress on this objective, revealed that 86% of the students agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was accomplished. Results from the Alumni Survey on item 7, an indicator of progress on this objective, scored a bit lower. On the Alumni Survey, 81% of the respondents (out of 127 students) agreed or strongly agreed that the Master of Social Work Program prepared them to apply theoretical frameworks supported by research to understand individual development and behavior. Eleven percent (n=11) were neutral in their response and 8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. On question 2 from the IDEA evaluation forms which asks about "learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories", 89% of the students (out of 109 courses) ranked 3.75 or higher. Therefore, it is evident from all measures that the Department's desired outcome level on this program objective was met.

**Program Objective 8: Analyze, formulate, and influence social policies and understand the integral relationship between policy and practice.**

This objective was assessed using three different measures. The 8th item on the Exit Survey, which reflects this objective, demonstrates that 79%% of the students agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was accomplished. The results on the Alumni Survey scored lower than the Department's desired outcome level, with 76% of the respondents (out of 127 students) agreeing or strongly agreeing that the Master of Social Work Program prepared them to analyze, formulate, and influence social policies and understand the integral relationship between policy and practice. Field instructor evaluations of students' performance (SW 5040 evaluation, item 9) were also used as an indicator of progress on this Program objective. Results indicate that 92% of students received a ranking of satisfactory, which is the highest ranking

possible on this measure, on the accomplishment of this objective. Therefore, it is evident for nearly all of the measures, the Department's desired outcome level on this program objective was met.

**Program Objective 9: Use research to inform and continually update practice.**

This objective was assessed using five different measures. Item 9 on both the Exit and Alumni Surveys asked students and graduates to directly indicate the extent to which the Master of Social Work Program prepared them to use research to inform and continually update their practice. Results from the Exit Survey indicated that 83% of the students agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was accomplished. For alumni, however, the extent of agreement dropped somewhat. Results of the Alumni Survey indicated that 67.7% (out of a total of 127 participants) of alums agreed or strongly agreed that this objective had been met. Nearly a quarter (22.8%, n=29) were neutral on this item and 9.4% (n=12) disagreed. SW 5040 Field Instructor Final Foundation Evaluation of Students' Performance (Item 10) was also used as an indicator of progress on this program objective. Field instructors were asked to report on students' ability to examine their own practice and use research to inform and update practice. Results indicated high success in this area, with 94.7% satisfactory ratings. Finally, this program objective was assessed using two measures from University IDEA Course Evaluations. Question 9 from IDEA evaluations asked students to rate their progress on learning how to find and use resources for answering questions and solving problems. Results showed that 85% of the students from a total of 70 classes ranked progress on this objective at a 3.75 or higher on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest rating. Similarly, 90% of students from 59 classes ranked accomplishment at 3.75 or higher for question 12 on IDEA evaluations which asked students to rate progress on acquiring interest in learning more by asking questions and seeking answers. In total, all measures of Program Objective #9 met the Department's desired outcome level with the exception of the Alumni Survey, where slightly less than the desired level of 80% agreement was achieved.

**Program Objective 10: Use supervision, consultation, and continuing education to strengthen practice.**

Program Objective 10 was assessed using three specific measures. Item 10 on the Exit Survey was used to ask students finishing the program to directly report on the extent to which they believed this objective had been met. Students reported very high success on this objective, with 89% agreeing or strongly agreeing that this objective was accomplished. Success on this objective appeared to remain over time as well, as 89.8% of alums also agreed or strongly agreed that the objective had been met (Alumni Survey, Item 10). SW 5040 Field Instructor Final Evaluations of Student Progress (Item 11) were also used as an indicator of progress on this objective. Field instructors were asked to rate students' ability to self-reflect and use consultation and supervision. Results indicate that 94.7% of students received satisfactory ratings from their field instructors. Data indicate that all measures of Program Objective #10 exceeded the Department's desired outcome level.

**Program Objective 11: Understand and operate within organizational structures and service delivery systems and seek necessary change.**

Program Objective 11 was assessed using three measures. Exit Survey Item #11 asked students to directly rate the degree to which they believed the program objective had been met. Results indicated that 84% of the students completing the Exit Survey agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was met. Additionally, 80.3% of the 127 respondents to the Alumni Survey also agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was met. Field Instructor SW 5040 Foundation Field Evaluation item 6, which asked whether students demonstrated an understanding of the social service organizational structure and could identify where change might be indicated, was also used as an indicator of progress on Program Objective #11. Field instructor ratings indicated that 89.5% of students performed satisfactorily on this item. In total, all Program measures for Program Objective #11 reached the desired outcome level of the Program.

**Program Objective 12: Use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and communities.**

This objective was assessed using five specific indicators. These included one item each from the Exit and Alumni Surveys, one item from SW 5040 Field Instructor Evaluations of students' performance, and two items from University IDEA Course Evaluations. Both Exit and Alumni Surveys asked graduates to directly assess whether they believed the program objective had been met. Exit Survey results indicated that 94% of students agreed or strongly agreed that it had. Of these, the large majority (71.4%) strongly agreed. Only a single individual was neutral on this item and no-one disagreed. Alumni were also in agreement that this program objective had been met. Of the 127 total alum responding, 111 (87.4%) agreed or strongly agreed with this item. Field Instructors also appeared to agree that this program objective was being met. Their ratings of SW 5040 Foundation field students revealed that 94.7% of the students had performed satisfactorily. Finally, IDEA evaluation scores for two items were used as indicators of this objective. IDEA Item 5 asked students to rate how effective their course had been in helping them acquire skills in working with others as members of a team. Scores from 50 classes revealed a mean score of 4.1 on a 1-5 scale, with 70% scoring the item at a 3.75 or above. IDEA item 8 asked students about developing skills in expressing themselves orally or in writing and was also used as a measure of their communication skills. With an n=85 classes, 90% of students rated progress on this item at 3.75 or above. Overall, 4 of the 5 measures exceeded the desired outcome level. A single item (Item 5 from IDEA Evaluations) failed to meet the desired outcome of 80% rating above a 3.75. This is not particularly surprising, however, as divergent views are often in evidence among students about teamwork or group work assignments which are likely the class experiences students were reflecting on when scoring this item.

### **Program Objective 13: Carry out critical self-analysis and self evaluation.**

Program Objective 13 was assessed via three indicators. Item 13 from the Exit Survey asked graduating students directly about their views on whether they believed this objective had been met. Importantly, 92% of the students completing this survey agreed or strongly agreed that the Program had prepared them to carry out self-analysis and self evaluation. Similarly, alumni agreed. Of the 127 alumni completing the Alumni Survey, 109 (89.8%) agreed or strongly agreed that this objective had been met. Students still in the program were also asked their views via their completion of IDEA course evaluations. Item 10 from IDEA evaluations, which asked students if the course assisted them with developing a clearer understanding of and commitment to personal values, had a mean score of 4.3 on a 1-5 scale, with 87% of the students rating this item at a 3.75 or above. Scores were available from a total of 56 classes for IDEA Item 10. In total, all Program measures for Program Objective #12 reached the desired outcome level of the Program.

### **Program Objective #14: Engage in autonomous practice that is highly differentiated, discriminating, ethical, and self-critical using the integrative practice approach.**

Program Objective 14 is one of three Advanced Program Objectives. This objective was assessed using three items from general program assessment tools and a fourth embedded measure (SW 5032 Final Assignment Rubric) containing three additional items. Items on general tools included Item 14 from the Exit Survey, Item 14 from the Alumni Survey, and Item 2 from the Field Instructor Final Advanced (SW 5041) Evaluation of Students. Results from the Exit Survey showed that 90.5% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was met. In contrast, 72.5% of those completing the Alumni Survey agreed or strongly agreed and 9.5% disagreed with this item. When Field Instructors rated students on their ability to complete an assessment using an integrative practice framework, 97.5% of students were rated as satisfactory. In addition to these measures, a specific tool was created to evaluate progress on Program Objective #14 using an embedded measure of students' performance in the Advanced Integrative Practice (SW 5032) course. This tool measured each of three identified components of Program Objective #14. Course instructors completed ratings for each student in this advanced course (n=51) based on the students' final course assignment. Ratings for all students from all sections (and by various instructors) were aggregated to obtain final results. For the first component, engaging in differentiated, discriminating, ethical and self-critical autonomous practice, aggregate scores indicated a mean score of 2.13 on a 1-3 scale, with 80% of students receiving satisfactory or above ratings. For the second component, describing practice in terms of an integrative practice framework, aggregate scores indicated a mean score of 2.27, again with 80% of students scoring satisfactory or above. Finally, on the third component, engaging in critical reflection/self evaluation about the integrative practice approach, 84% of students scored satisfactory or above with a mean score of 2.37. In total, results from 5 of the 6 unique measures met or exceeded the Program's desired outcome level for success. Only the Alumni Survey item did not meet the desired level of 80% agreement.

**Program Objective #15: Apply and promote paradigms of social and economic justice and liberation to continually advance the larger social work profession and refine the quality of their own practice.**

Program Objective 15, the second Advanced Objective, was assessed using items from the Exit and Alumni Surveys and an embedded measure of progress in the SW 5034 Advanced Social Work Practice with Communities and Organizations. Item 15 on the Exit Survey and item 15 on the Alumni Survey asked each sample to directly rate the extent to which they believed the Program had met this objective. Results of the Exit Survey showed that 90.5% of students agreed or strongly agreed that this objective had been met. Results from the Alumni Survey showed that 73.2% agreed or strongly agreed that this objective had been met. An additional 18.1% were neutral on this item and only 8.7% (11 of the 127 participants) disagreed that this objective was met. In terms of the embedded measure, a Final Assignment Rubric was created for the SW 5034 course. Program Objective #15 was divided into 3 core components, and each component was rated separately on a scale of 1-3 by course instructors for all students in their classes (n=48). All ratings from all courses were aggregated to determine final results. For the first component, applying and promoting paradigms of social and economic justice and liberation, the mean score was 2.75, and 100% of students received satisfactory or above scores. For the second component, advancing the larger social work profession, the mean score was 2.69, and 100% of students were rated satisfactory or above. The final component of this objective assessed students' ability to refine the quality of their own practice. The mean score was 2.69 on this item, with 100% of students receiving a score of satisfactory or above.

**Program Objective #16: Demonstrate a spirit of inquiry that is characterized by curiosity and a motivation to learn about others whose lives are different from one's own and the strengths utilized by those individuals.**

This final Advanced Program Objective was assessed via one item each from the Exit and Alumni Surveys and an embedded measure for the SW 5990/5960 Thesis Defense presentations. Results showed that 100% of the graduating students completing the Exit Survey agreed or strongly agreed that this objective was met. Additionally, 89.7% of the 127 alumni completing the Alumni Survey agreed or strongly agreed this objective was met. Data for an embedded measure of Program Objective #16 was obtained from results of an evaluation of the thesis defense presentations made by all graduating students. All audience members at Thesis Defense presentations for 2008 and 2009 were invited to complete an Oral Presentation/Thesis Defense Feedback Form for each presentation they attended. Audience members were made up of faculty, students, administrators, agency representatives, friends, family, and occasional other interested parties. A total of 1123 feedback forms were completed. Four items on this instrument (Items 6-9) were used to assess progress on Program Objective #16. These four items represented four component parts of Program Objective #16. The first component (Item 6), asked participants to rate the extent to the study demonstrated an interest in the viewpoints of others. With a mean score of 2.67 on a scale of 1-3, results indicated that participants felt the students met this objective. Specifically, 98.2% (n=1,097) of the audience members responded that they agreed or strongly agreed that the presentations

provided evidence of an interest in the viewpoints of others. Item 7 asked participants to rate the extent to which the study demonstrated a desire to learn about the experiences or perspectives of others. With a mean score of 2.70, and 98.4% (n=1,105) of participants agreeing or strongly agreeing, results indicated success on this item. On Item 8 (the study described the strengths of the research participants or of the target population) 82.5% (n=913) of the Thesis Defense audience participants agreed or strongly agreed. Results revealed a mean score of 2.30 on the 1-3 scale. And finally, on Item 9, which asked the audience to rate the extent to which the study described the similarities and differences between study results and previous work in the field, results revealed a mean score of 2.32, with 85.8% (n=940) of participants agreeing or strongly agreeing that the study did so. Cumulatively, in all 6 unique measures of Program Objective #16, results exceeded the Program's desired outcome level, demonstrating success on this Program Objective.

### Program Improvement

This assessment of the program objectives holistically offers credible evidence to suggest that students are accomplishing the program objectives in accordance with the Program's desired outcomes. These findings have been shared with various program constituents for review and feedback. Holistically, the consensus is that while it appears that the students are achieving the program objectives, we will need to continue gathering data in accordance with the new Program Assessment Plan in order to fully understand the degree to which students have achieved desired goals and in order to make informed decisions regarding the Program's curriculum and Program planning. This notwithstanding, we did identify a limitation to the tool that is being used by field instructors to assess student learning. As such, we are working to modify the tool to bring it in line with the other measurement tools that are used for assessing program objectives.

Finally, we fully realize that the tools we are using to assess students' accomplishment of program objectives are only one aspect of our examination of the program as a whole. Over the past three years (during the self study process) we have used a structure that has allowed the faculty to examine how our curriculum is organized as a coherent and integrated whole around the program goals and objectives. In accordance with this CSWE mandate, over the course of the past three years we worked to trace each program objective through the curriculum, identify linkages to various course objectives, and show how course units and assignments implement each program objective. We accomplished this task by breaking each of our 16 program objectives into its requisite elements. This process was guided by six questions targeting each program objective:

- What do we mean by the program objective?
- How do we teach it?
- Where does it go in the curriculum?
- How do we organize it?
- How will it be featured in various courses?
- What assignments will be use to help students learn it?

As the entire curriculum (foundation and advanced) was articulated in this logic model, we were ultimately able to lay out the entire curriculum and trace the curriculum components to the program objectives. We were also able to construct our program assessment model that is capable of producing credible information about students' accomplishment of program objectives. The program assessment model includes both direct and indirect measures of student learning.

Over the course of this curriculum examination and based on our classroom experiences, we have noted areas of potential concern. One specific area which needs ongoing attention is the degree to which our students and faculty pursue the teaching and learning of social justice both in the classroom and the field experience. We have found that students, faculty, and field instructors are struggling with (have had disagreements regarding) the roles and responsibilities of teachers and students in creating a learning environment that promotes social justice and how we pursue social justice both in and out of the classroom setting. These conversations are on-going, and our program assessment plan and our ongoing examination of the curriculum will assist us in addressing concerns and strengthening our approaches to teaching and learning.

**Table 8. 1 Program Assessment Matrix – 2008**  
**Foundation Objectives**

<u>Program Objective</u>	<u>Assessment Measure / Indicator</u>	<u>Indicator Definition</u>	<u>Finding/Desired Outcome Met</u>
1. Apply critical thinking skills to professional social work practice.	Item "1" from Exit Survey	Apply critical thinking skills to your professional social work practice.	N=23, 100% agree or strongly agree, 95.7% (n=22) of those strongly agree, M=4.96
	Item "1" from Alumni Survey	Apply critical thinking skills to your professional social work practice.	N=127, 90.5% (n=115) agree or strongly agree, M=4.33
	Item "2" from Field Instructor Final Foundation (SW 5040) Evaluation of Student	Apply critical thinking skills within the context of practice.	N=38, 94.7% (n=36) satisfactory
	Item "3" from IDEA course evaluations	Learning to apply course materials to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions.	N=117 classes, M=4.4, 94% at 3.75 or above
	Item "11" from IDEA course evaluations	Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view.	N=100, M=4.3, 90% at 3.75 above
2. Understand and are guided by the values and ethics of the profession.	Item "2" from Exit Survey	Understand and be guided by the values and ethics of the profession.	N=23, 95.7% (n=22) agree or strongly agree, M=4.74
	Item "2" from Alumni Survey	Understand and be guided by the values and ethics of the profession.	N=127, 91.4% (n=116) agree or strongly agree, M=4.47
	Item "1" from Field Instructor Final Foundation (SW 5040) Evaluation of Student	Demonstrate an understanding and adherence to social work values and ethics, and is aware of his or her biases.	N=38, 94.7% (n=36) satisfactory

<u>Program Objective</u>	<u>Assessment Measure / Indicator</u>	<u>Indicator Definition</u>	<u>Finding/Desired Outcome Met</u>
3. Demonstrate the ability to practice without discrimination and with respect, knowledge, and skills related to diverse client populations.	Item "3" from Exit Survey	Demonstrate your ability to practice without discrimination and with respect, knowledge, and skills related to diverse client populations.	N=23, 100% agree or strongly agree, 82.6% (n=19) of those strongly agree, M=4.83
	Item "3" from Alumni Survey	Demonstrate your ability to practice without discrimination and with respect, knowledge, and skills related to diverse client populations.	N=127, 90.5% (n=114) agree or strongly agree, M=4.37
	Item "3" from Field Instructor Final Foundation (SW 5040) Evaluation of Student	Demonstrate the ability to practice without discrimination and with sensitivity and respect, for multicultural issues, race, gender, sexual orientation, religious orientation, and disability.	N=38, 94.7% (n=36) satisfactory
	Item "4" from IDEA course evaluations	Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course.	N=38, 94.7% (n=36) satisfactory
4. Advocate for social justice by understanding and working to expose paradigms of oppression and discrimination and those mechanisms and structures that serve those	Item "4" from Exit Survey	Advocate for social justice by understanding and working to expose paradigms of oppression and discrimination and those mechanisms and structures that serve those paradigms.	N=23, 100% agree or strongly agree, M=4.65
	Item "4" from Alumni Survey	Advocate for social justice by understanding and working to expose paradigms of oppression and discrimination and those mechanisms and structures that serve those paradigms.	N=127, 87.3% (n=110) agree or strongly agree, M=4.35
	Item "12" from Field Instructor Final	Understands and recognizes issues of oppression, social justice, and discrimination.	N=38, 92.1% (n=35) satisfactory

paradigms.	Foundation (SW 5040) Evaluation of Student		
<u>Program Objective</u>	<u>Assessment Measure / Indicator</u>	<u>Indicator Definition</u>	<u>Finding/Desired Outcome Met</u>
<p>5. Understand the history of social work profession and utilize this knowledge as a context for understanding and addressing current practice issues.</p>	<p>Item “5” from Exit Survey</p> <p>Item “5” from Alumni Survey</p> <p>Item “1” from IDEA course evaluations</p>	<p>Understand the history of social work profession and utilize this knowledge as a context for understanding and addressing current practice issues.</p> <p>Understand the history of social work profession and utilize this knowledge as a context for understanding and addressing current practice issues.</p> <p>Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends).</p>	<p>N=23, 90.9% (n=20) agree or strongly agree, M=4.14</p> <p>N=127, 82.7% (n=115) agree or strongly agree, M=4.05</p> <p>N=103 classes, M=4.4, 95% at 3.75 or above</p>
<p>6. Engage clients to assess and intervene at all system levels using a generalist perspective that incorporates client strengths.</p>	<p>Item “6” from Exit Survey</p> <p>Item “6” from Alumni Survey</p> <p>Item “4” from Field Instructor Final Foundation (SW 5040) Evaluation of Student</p>	<p>Engage clients to assess and intervene at all system levels using a generalist perspective that incorporates client strengths.</p> <p>Engage clients to assess and intervene at all system levels using a generalist perspective that incorporates client strengths.</p> <p>Using a generalist perspective, demonstrate an ability to engage clients and develop multi-system assessments that integrate biological, social and psychological factors, incorporates client’s strengths, and is sensitive to social justice concerns.</p>	<p>N=23, 100% agree or strongly agree, 95.7%, M=4.55</p> <p>N=127, 92.9% (n=118) agree or strongly agree, M=4.34</p> <p>N=38, 94.7% (n=36) satisfactory</p>

<u>Program Objective</u>	<u>Assessment Measure / Indicator</u>	<u>Indicator Definition</u>	<u>Finding/Desired Outcome Met</u>
<p>7. Apply theoretical frameworks supported by research to understand individual development and behavior across the life span, between <u>#7 continued</u> individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</p>	<p>Item "7" from Exit Survey</p>	<p>Apply theoretical frameworks supported by research to understand individual development and behavior across the life span, between individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</p>	<p>N=23, 91.3% (n=21) agree or strongly agree, M=4.30</p>
	<p>Item "7" from Alumni Survey</p>	<p>Apply theoretical frameworks supported by research to understand individual development and behavior across the life span, between individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</p>	<p>N=127, 81.1% (n=103) agree or strongly agree, M=4.02</p>
<p>8. Analyze, formulate, and influence social policies and understand the integral</p>	<p>Item "2" from IDEA course evaluations</p>	<p>Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories.</p>	<p>N=109 classes, M=4.3, 89% at 3.75 or higher</p>
	<p>Item "8" from Exit Survey</p>	<p>Analyze, formulate, and influence social policies and understand the integral relationship between policy and practice.</p>	<p>N=23, 87.0% (n=20) agree or strongly agree, M=4.30</p>
	<p>Item "8" from Alumni Survey</p>	<p>Analyze, formulate, and influence social policies and understand the integral relationship</p>	<p>N=127, 76.4% (n=97) agree or strongly agree, M=3.95</p>

relationship between policy and practice.	Item "9" from Field Instructor Final Foundation (SW 5040) Evaluation of Student	between policy and practice.  Demonstrate an ability to analyze policy, policy development, and understand its relationship to practice.	N=38, 92.1% (n=35) satisfactory
<u>Program Objective</u>	<u>Assessment Measure / Indicator</u>	<u>Indicator Definition</u>	<u>Finding/Desired Outcome Met</u>
9. Use research to inform and continually update practice.	Item "9" from Exit Survey  Item "9" from Alumni Survey  Item "10" from Field Instructor Final Foundation (SW 5040) Evaluation of Student  Item "9" from IDEA course evaluations  Item "12" from IDEA course evaluations	Use research to inform and continually update practice.  Use research to inform and continually update practice.  Demonstrate ability to examine his or her practice and uses research to inform and update practice.  Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems.  Acquiring an interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers.	N=23, 91.3% (n=21) agree or strongly agree, M=4.30  N=127, 67.7% (n=86) agree or strongly agree, M=3.84 --- 9.4% (n=12) disagree & 22.8% (n=29) neutral  N=38, 94.7% (n=36) satisfactory  N=70 classes, M=4.2, 85% at 3.75 or above  N=59 classes, M=4.3, 90% at 3.75 or above
10. Use supervision, consultation,	Item "10" from Exit Survey	Use supervision, consultation, and continuing education to strengthen practice.	N=23, 95.6% (n=22) agree or strongly agree, M=4.61

<p>and continuing education to strengthen practice.</p>	<p>Item "10" from Alumni Survey</p> <p>Item "11" from Field Instructor Final Foundation (SW 5040) Evaluation of Student</p>	<p>Use supervision, consultation, and continuing education to strengthen practice.</p> <p>Demonstrate an ability to self-reflect and use supervision, consultation, and supervision.</p>	<p>N=127, 89.8% (n=114) agree or strongly agree, M=4.30</p> <p>N=38, 94.7% (n=36) satisfactory</p>
<p><u>Program Objective</u></p>	<p><u>Assessment Measure / Indicator</u></p>	<p><u>Indicator Definition</u></p>	<p><u>Finding/Desired Outcome Met</u></p>
<p>11. Understand and operate within organizational structures and service delivery systems and seek necessary change.</p>	<p>Item "11" from Exit Survey</p> <p>Item "11" from Alumni Survey</p> <p>Item "6" from Field Instructor Final Foundation (SW 5040) Evaluation of Student</p>	<p>Understand and operate within organizational structures and service delivery systems and seek necessary change.</p> <p>Understand and operate within organizational structures and service delivery systems and seek necessary change.</p> <p>Demonstrate an understanding of the social service organizational structures and identify where organizational change may be indicated.</p>	<p>N=23, 82.6% (n=19) agree or strongly agree, M=4.52</p> <p>N=127, 80.3% (n=102) agree or strongly agree, M=4.04</p> <p>N=38, 89.5% (n=34) satisfactory</p>
<p>12. Use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and</p>	<p>Item "12" from Exit Survey</p> <p>Item "12" from Alumni Survey</p> <p>Item "7" from Field</p>	<p>Use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and communities.</p> <p>Use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and communities.</p> <p>Demonstrate the use of oral and written</p>	<p>N=23, 95.2% (n=20) agree or strongly agree, M=4.67</p> <p>N= 127, 87.4% (n=111) agree or strongly agree, M=4.21</p> <p>N=38, 94.7% (n=36) satisfactory</p>

<p>communities.</p>	<p>Instructor Final Foundation (SW 5040) Evaluation of Student</p> <p>Item “5” from IDEA course evaluations</p> <p>Item “8” from IDEA course evaluations</p>	<p>communication skills that is organized, coherent, strength-based, and is consistent with the agency setting and profession.</p> <p>Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team.</p> <p>Developing skill is expressing self orally or in writing.</p>	<p>N=50 classes, M=4.1, 70% at 3.75 or above</p> <p>N=85 classes, M=4.2, 90% at 3.75 or above</p>
<p><u>Program Objective</u></p>	<p><u>Assessment Measure / Indicator</u></p>	<p><u>Indicator Definition</u></p>	<p><u>Finding/Desired Outcome Met</u></p>
<p>13. Carry out critical self-analysis and self evaluation.</p>	<p>Item “13” from Exit Survey</p> <p>Item “13” from Alumni Survey</p> <p>Item “10” from IDEA course evaluations</p>	<p>Carry out critical self-analysis and self evaluation.</p> <p>Carry out critical self-analysis and self evaluation.</p> <p>Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values.</p>	<p>N=23, 100% (n=21) agree or strongly agree, M=4.62</p> <p>N=127, 89.8% (n=109) agree or strongly agree, M=4.23</p> <p>N=56 classes, M=4.3, 87% at 3.75% or above</p>

**Advanced Objectives**

<u>Program Objective</u>	<u>Assessment Measure / Indicator</u>	<u>Indicator Definition</u>	<u>Finding/Desired Outcome Met</u>
14. Engage in autonomous practice that is highly differentiated, discriminating, ethical, and self-critical using the integrative practice approach.	Item "14" from Exit Survey	Engage in autonomous practice that is highly differentiated, discriminating, ethical, and self-critical using the integrative practice approach.	N=23, 90.5% (n=19) agree or strongly agree, M=4.43
	Item "14" from Alumni Survey	Engage in autonomous practice that is highly differentiated, discriminating, ethical, and self-critical using the integrative practice approach.	N=127, 72.5% (n=92) agreed or strongly agree, M= 3.97 --- 9.5% (N=12) disagree or strongly disagree & 15% (n=19) neutral
	Item "2" from Field Instructor Final Advanced (SW 5041) Evaluation of Student	Demonstrate ability to complete an assessment using an integrative practice framework.	N=44, 97.5% (n=39) satisfactory

	SW 5032 Final Assignment Rubric (Embedded):	Engage in autonomous practice (highly differentiated, discriminating, ethical, and self-critical).	N=51, 80% (n=41) satisfactory or above, M=2.13 (41 is correct – need to fix on rubric report)
	Item 1	Describe practice in terms of the integrative practice framework.	N=51, 80% (n=41) satisfactory or above, M=2.27
	Item 2	Engage in critical reflection/self evaluation about the integrative practice approach.	N=51, 84% (n=43) satisfactory or above, M=2.37
	Item 3		
<u>Program Objective</u>	<u>Assessment Measure / Indicator</u>	<u>Indicator Definition</u>	<u>Finding/Desired Outcome Met</u>
15. Apply and promote paradigms of social and economic justice and liberation to continually advance the larger social work profession and refine the quality of their	Item “15” from Exit Survey	Apply and promote paradigms of social and economic justice and liberation to continually advance the larger social work profession and refine the quality of their own practice.	N=23, 90.5% (n=19) agree or strongly agree, M=4.43
	Item “15” from Alumni Survey	Apply and promote paradigms of social and economic justice and liberation to continually advance the larger social work profession and refine the quality of their own practice.	N=127, 73.2% (n=93) agree or strongly agree, M=3.87 --- 8.7% (n=11) disagree & 18.1% (n=23) neutral
	SW 5034 Final Assignment Rubric (Embedded): Item 1	Apply and promote paradigms of social and	N=48, 100% satisfactory or above,

<p>own practice.</p>	<p>Item 2</p> <p>Item 3</p>	<p>economic justice and liberation.</p> <p>Advance the larger social work profession.</p> <p>Refine the quality of their own practice.</p>	<p>M=-2.75</p> <p>N=48, 100% satisfactory or above, M=2.68</p> <p>N=48, 100% satisfactory or above, M=2.68</p>
<p><u>Program Objective</u></p>	<p><u>Assessment Measure / Indicator</u></p>	<p><u>Indicator Definition</u></p>	<p><u>Finding/Desired Outcome Met</u></p>
<p>16. Demonstrate a spirit of inquiry that is characterized by curiosity and a motivation to learn about others whose lives are different from one's own and</p>	<p>Item "16" from Exit Survey</p> <p>Item "16" from Alumni Survey</p> <p>SW 5990 Thesis Defense</p>	<p>Demonstrate a spirit of inquiry that is characterized by curiosity and a motivation to learn about others whose lives are different from one's own and the strengths utilized by those individuals and groups.</p> <p>Demonstrate a spirit of inquiry that is characterized by curiosity and a motivation to learn about others whose lives are different from one's own and the strengths utilized by those individuals and groups.</p>	<p>N=23, 100% (n=22) agree or strongly agree, M=4.91</p> <p>N=127, 89.7% (n=114) agree or strongly agree, M=4.32</p>

<p>the strengths utilized by those individuals and groups.</p>	<p>Presentation Rubric (Embedded):</p> <p>Item 6</p> <p>Item 7</p> <p>Item 8</p> <p>Item 9</p>	<p>The study demonstrates an interest in the viewpoints of others.</p> <p>The study demonstrates a desire to learn about the experiences or perspectives of others.</p> <p>The study describes the strengths of the participants or of the target population.</p> <p>The study describes the similarities and differences between results and previous work in the field.</p>	<p>N=506, 98.2% (n=497) agree or strongly agree, M=2.65</p> <p>N=506, 98.4% (n=498) agree or strongly agree, M=2.66</p> <p>N=506, 83.3% (n=421) agree or strongly agree, M=2.27</p> <p>N=506, 84.8% (n=429) agree or strongly agree, M=2.28</p>
--	--	---	---