

AS 8 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

AS 8.a. Provide a one to five page description and graphic presentation of the program's assessment plan and procedures.

Baccalaureate Program

The Baccalaureate Program uses a number of measures to determine the extent to which its Program Objectives are being achieved. Some of the measures focus on students' experiences, knowledge and skill performances during the educational program, while others focus on their post-graduation experience, knowledge and skills.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation strategy used by the program combines both a process and impact approach. The process evaluation examines three issues: (1) curriculum implementation and integrity, and stated learning outcomes, (2) the effectiveness of faculty in teaching the curriculum, and (3) the reaction of students to the curriculum. Please see Table 1.

The process review relies on the results of student field and classroom evaluations. The field and classroom evaluations provide feedback on the perceived quality of courses and instructors. These evaluations provide opportunities for students to rate courses on whether stated objectives are met. The ratings feedback is used to gauge whether instructors are addressing foundation content. These evaluations give us feedback on consumer satisfaction with curriculum, and also provide us with evidence on the student acquisition of learning.

Other process evaluations (also in Table 1) include a literature review completed by seniors, a grant proposal also written by seniors, a biopsychosocial assessment paper completed on a client and a development paper that focuses on program development in the community. These exercises allow for the assessment of student learning in knowledge, skills, and professional values, which measures Program Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11.

The impact evaluation examines both the program effect on student career trajectories and the impact of the program in the larger community. This part of the evaluation relies on the alumni and employer surveys. The Employer Survey provides data from employers on their perception of whether our graduates are meeting the practice community needs. The survey is directed to all agencies providing undergraduate and graduate field practicum sites. The Alumni survey provides employment and salary information, data on professional attainments, professional activities (such as leadership, engagement in policy development, research and publication), career patterns, professional memberships, continuing education, and reflections on the alumni on their educational experience at the SDSU School of Social Work. This measures Program Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

Table 1 identifies the assessment measures used for the Baccalaureate Program. The relationship of each of these measures to Program Objectives is noted below.

Table 1: Assessment Measures Used for the Baccalaureate Program

	Implementation	Consumer Satisfaction	Career Trajectories	Community Impact
Process	1. Senior Literature review 2. Senior grant proposal	Course evaluations		
	3. Field Comprehensive Skills Evaluation	Alumni Survey		
	4. Field Grades 5. Biopsychosocial papers 6. Program Development Paper	Agency Survey		
Impact			Alumni Survey Senior Exit survey Subsequent enrollment in MSW program	Alumni Survey Employer Survey

AS 8.b. Provide a three to four page summary of the data collected for each program objective.

Table 2 presents the Baccalaureate Program's objectives and the corresponding measures that are used. Results from the past year are also presented.

Table 2: Relationship Between Baccalaureate Program Objectives and Outcome Measures

The BSW program will prepare students who:

Objective	Measure	Findings
1. Perform effectively in entry-level social work practice, using a liberal arts perspective, critical thinking skills, and evidence-guided focus.	Comprehensive Skills Evaluation Core Competency 2 Employer survey (items 1, 21) Senior exit survey (item 16)	Results are described above.
2. Use the generalist practice model in direct services with client systems of all sizes.	Comprehensive Skills Evaluation Core Competency 2, 3 Employer survey (items 4,6,11,13, 14,16,17,19,20,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30) Senior exit survey (items 15A, 15B, 15C, 15E, 15H, 15I)	Results are described above.
3. Understand the biopsychosocial factors that affect human growth and development, and use theoretical frameworks to understand the person-in-environment as well as the interactions between individuals and their social systems.	Comprehensive Skills Evaluation Core Competency 2 Biopsychosocial Assessment Employer survey (item 5) Senior exit survey (item 15A)	Results are described above.
4. Demonstrate awareness of and sensitivity to oppression and discrimination, particularly within the context of professional practice with diverse populations in the Southern California border region.	Comprehensive Skills Evaluation Core Competency 2, 3 Employer survey (items 3,8,10)	Results are described above.
5. Practice without discrimination and with respect, knowledge, and skills related to clients' age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation.	Comprehensive Skills Evaluation Core Competency 1, 2, 3 Employer survey (items 8,10) Senior exit survey (items 15K, 15O)	Results are described above.
6. Intervene in agencies, neighborhoods, and communities to advance social and economic justice.	Comprehensive Skills Evaluation Core Competency 2,3 Program Development assignment Grant proposal assignment Employer survey (items 19,23) Senior exit survey (items 15I, 15J)	Results are described above.
7. Identify evidence of effective practice, evaluate the findings and the application of such evidence to their own work.	Comprehensive Skills Evaluation Core Competency 1, 3, 5 Literature review paper Employer survey (items 21,22) Senior exit survey (item 15M)	Results are described above.
8. Understand history of social work, its uniqueness, and the current state of the profession.	Comprehensive Skills Evaluation	Results are described above.
9. Analyze social policies and their impacts, and develop strategies to	Comprehensive Skills Evaluation Employer survey (item 12)	Results are described

implement positive change.		above.
10. Recognize and address ethical dilemmas in accordance with social work values and the NASW Code of Ethics and utilize these values and ethics in their own practice.	Comprehensive Skills Evaluation Core Competency 1, 2 Biopsychosocial assessment paper Employer survey (item 2)	Results are described above.
11. Communicate effectively, using written, oral, and nonverbal skills.	Comprehensive Skills Assessment Core Competency 4 Literature review paper Grant proposal paper Program Development assignment Employer survey (items 15,18) Senior exit survey (item 15G)	Results are described above.
12. Value and use supervision in an appropriate manner.	Comprehensive Skills Assessment Core Competency 1,5, 6 Employer survey (item 7)	Results are described above.
13. Function effectively as professionals within the structure of an organization and service delivery system and are able to seek organizational change when necessary.	Comprehensive Skills Assessment Core Competency 5, 6 Employer survey (items 7,12)	Results are described above.

1. Course and Field evaluations:

The field and classroom evaluations provide feedback on the perceived quality of courses and instructors. These evaluations provide opportunities for students to rate courses on whether stated objectives are met. The ratings feedback is used to gauge whether instructors are addressing the BSW content. These evaluations also give us feedback on consumer satisfaction with curriculum, and provide us with evidence on the student acquisition of learning.

The items related to course effectiveness are:

- The course has continuity and coherence.
- The objectives of the course were made clear.
- Assignments were consistent with objectives of the course.
- Examination, term papers, and assignments were fair, useful and well designed.
- The course contributed to your ability to reason critically.
- Reaction to the course as a whole.

These evaluations measure Objectives: 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Evaluations were obtained for 35 undergraduate course sections for 2006-2007.

For this group of items, the average evaluation scores on a five-point scale were:

Table 1: Mean scores of course evaluations

<u>COURSES</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>RANGE</u>
Premajor classes (4 sections)	4.0	3.61 – 4.15
SW 350 (10 sections)	3.97	3.06 – 4.38
Major classes (13 sections)	3.49	2.32 – 4.86
SW Practice classes (8 sections)	4.38	3.49 – 4.86

Overall, these scores indicate that students are fairly to highly satisfied with their classes. It should be noted that several courses in the premajor, SW 350, and SW 360

Table 2: Mean Scores for Student Evaluations of Field Internship (F'06, S'07)

<u>Who Was Evaluated</u>	<u>MEAN Fall 2006</u>	<u>MEAN Spring 2007</u>
For Field Liaisons	4.16 (Fall)	4.56 (Spring)
For Field Instructors	4.19 (Fall)	4.84 (Spring)
For Agency	4.86 (Fall)	4.57 (Spring)
Overall Field Learning Experience	4.36 (Fall)	4.17 (Spring)

Qualitative comments were also reviewed. Overall students felt highly satisfied with their field experience. Some concerns that were expressed indicated a limited time with field instructor, wanting more concurrence with curriculum in field or wanting more challenging assignments.

2. Major Assignments:

2a. Literature Review paper. The literature review paper is designed to increase students' academic writing skills as well as their knowledge of evidenced-based practice in an area of their practice interest. The data are gathered by Melinda Hohman, Undergraduate Program Coordinator.

This assignment measures the following Program Objectives: 1, 3, 4, 7, and 11.

2b. Grant Proposal Writing assignment

This purpose of this assignment is to also to increase professional writing skills and to integrate knowledge of evidenced-based practices and gaps in current services in their agencies. The data are gathered by Melinda Hohman, Undergraduate Program Coordinator.

This assignment measures the following Program Objectives: 1, 6, 7, and 11.

2c. Biopsychosocial Assessment and Case Management Plan paper

This project is designed to enable students to demonstrate their abilities to assess clients from a generalist perspective, evidence based practice and develop appropriate intervention plans. This paper is graded P/F and the data are gathered by Melinda Hohman, Undergraduate Program Coordinator.

This assignment measures the following Program Objectives: 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11.

2d. Program Development assignment

This assignment is designed to enable students to demonstrate that they understand how to involve the community in an intervention process. This involves engaging residents and stakeholders in the program design. This assignment is graded P/F. The data are gathered by Melinda Hohman, Undergraduate Program Coordinator.

This assignment measures the following Program Objectives: 2, 6, 7, 9, and 11.

Most recent results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Mean Grade Scores on Major Assignments

<u>ASSIGNMENT</u>	<u>MEAN</u>
Literature Review (F '06)	3.0
Grant Proposal (S '06)	3.02
Biopsychosocial & Agency Assessment Paper	50 passed Spring 2007 (100%)

Students appear to be more skilled in writing an assessment and intervention plan about a client (biopsychosocial) than in integrating social work research with practice (literature review paper and grant proposal), although they still did fairly well on the assignments. As the School's faculty work on infusing evidence-based practice across the curriculum, in all courses and assignments, this should become a bit easier for students to complete these assignments. Faculty have expressed that some students still have problems with writing skills particularly as related to more technical aspects of research.

3. Comprehensive Skills Evaluations

This is an evaluation of student skills made by field instructors to give an overview of the student's ability to practice skills, values and knowledge in the real life work environment on 6 Core Areas related to Program Objectives. These skills in an agency include interventions with clients and interactions with co-workers and supervisory staff. The data from these evaluations are gathered by Linda Newell, Associate Field Director and Melinda Hohman, Undergraduate Program Coordinator.

Field instructors complete comprehensive skills evaluations of their student interns. Students are rated by Field Instructors on 81 items that comprise 6 core behavioral competencies that reflect student learning. These are rated on a scale of 1 to 4. A score of 4= Exceeds minimum competencies, 3=Meets or exceeds minimum competencies; 2= Does not fully meet competencies—attention and improvement needed; 1=Does not meet minimum competencies. Field instructors may also write in a narrative description if needed. The data from the narrative were not collected for this study. If a student receives a score of 1 in any area, he/she is placed on a performance contract. If the conditions of the performance contract are not met, the student receives a grade of no credit in field. Comprehensive Skills Evaluations are read and signed off by the student and the Field Faculty Liaison.

The 6 Core Areas of competency are

Core Area 1, the awareness of self. This includes items such as, "Identifies personal and cultural values and prejudices" and "Demonstrates conscious use of self by being purposeful, selective, and responsive to appropriateness of client need when sharing personal information."

Core area 2 is the application of social work knowledge, values, and ethics. Items in the area include, “Demonstrates the ability to respect and facilitate the client’s right of self-determination” and “Begins to identify and can discuss conflicting individual values which may result in ethical dilemmas.”

Core 3 is the application of generalist practice skills to enhance the well-being of people. Sample items in this core include, “Demonstrates the ability to identify and articulate the client’s presenting problems” and “Demonstrates the ability to conduct an ethnically and culturally sensitive assessment and to develop an appropriate intervention plan.”

Core Area 4 is professional communication skills. Items measuring this area include “Demonstrates the ability to present orally in a clear, concise and focused manner in supervision, in case conference, and to other staff and/or professionals” and “With guidance, writes concise case assessments, case plans, case records, and other reports in accordance with agency policy and obtains supervisor’s signature.”

Core Area 5 covers commitment and participation in learning. Key items in this area are, “Demonstrates the ability to identify growth in knowledge and skill level” and “Carries out duties as assigned and demonstrates flexibility as requested by supervisor.”

Core Area 6 is the area regarding knowledge of and compliance with agency policy. Sample items in this area include, “Can identify agency policies and procedures and their relationship to the NASW Code of Ethics” and “Accurately defines the services and resources provided by the agency to its clients and demonstrates understanding of the mission, scope, and limitations of the agency.”

This assessment measures the following Program Objectives: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 13.

During the academic year of 2006-2007, 50 students entered the field internship. No students were placed on performance contracts and 1 withdrew from the internship. No students failed.

Table 4: Mean scores of comprehensive skills evaluations of seniors in field internships (F '06) (n=50)

<u>Core Competency Area score</u>	<u>MEAN (F'06)</u>	<u>MEAN (Sp'07)</u>	<u>t-</u>
1. Awareness of self	3.25	3.58	.38***
2. Application of knowledge, values, ethics	3.24	3.51	.34***
3. Application of skills	3.17	3.45	.29***
4. Professional communication skills	3.34	3.60	.37**
5. Commitment to learning		3.40	3.65
.32**			

6. Compliance with agency policy	3.25	3.51	
			.37**
7. Overall Mean for all 6	3.28	3.56	.30***

p < .01, * p<.000

Based up a t-test means comparison, it was found that the students showed a significant improvement in their comprehensive skills in all 6 Core Areas when evaluated by their field instructors in their field internships.

Student evaluation of their field experience: Students evaluate their field liaison, field instructor, and agency using an on-line system. The following mean scores were reported, based on a five-point scale:

4. The Alumni Survey

This survey is required by our accrediting body to be conducted every three years. Our survey is sent via email to former students. The survey includes questions regarding demographic information, employment status, if job is in the social work field, type of social work position, income, satisfaction with various aspects of the program (range 1-10), skill ability, questions regarding EBP, professional growth activities and if they went on to receive their a subsequent master's degree.

This assessment measures the following Program Objectives: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.

An alumni survey was conducted in the Spring 2006. Surveys were emailed to – graduates of the BA program. One hundred and one replied. Only data regarding satisfaction with the program, subsequent graduate school enrollment, and professional development are reported here.

Using a 10 point rating scale, respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the program and various aspects of the program. Former students tended to be mostly satisfied with the overall program and the curriculum, and less so with the supportive services.

Table 5: Satisfaction with the BA program

	N	Mean	S.D.
Overall, how well did the program meet the degree aim	71	7.01	1.89
Satisfaction with Faculty	95	6.95	2.15
Satisfaction with Coursework	94	6.96	2.05
Satisfaction with Curriculum	95	7.02	1.96

Satisfaction with Administration	92	6.27	2.30
Satisfaction with Office Staff	91	6.69	2.24
Satisfaction with Field Office	92	6.84	2.34
Satisfaction with Advising	92	6.78	2.39

Table 6: Pursuit of Master's Degree and Professional Development

<u>Type of Development</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Percent</u>
In graduate school now	21	21
Obtained a master's degree	19	19
Have taken additional training	57	56
Have attended a conference	49	49
Member, NASW	19	19
Active in a community group	21	21
Been a Field Instructor	10	10

5. Employer Survey

The Employer Survey is conducted every four years and provides perspective employers with the opportunity to assess the degree to which students are meeting the practice community's needs. The survey is directed to all agencies providing undergraduate and graduate field practicum sites. Agency management staff and supervisors of recent field students provide data on the knowledge, values and skills that social work practitioners in the agency should possess. In addition, the supervisors rate the current level of proficiency of the students they are supervising in these knowledge and skills area, which covers all of our Program Objectives. The most recent survey was sent to 22 undergraduate professionals in the community who were serving as a field instructor. The professionals were asked to rate on a scale of A to F the capacity of a student they were currently or had recently supervised in a field practicum. Ratings were sought on a number of areas addressed by the curriculum that relate to work that graduating social workers are expected to be able to perform. When a field instructor supervised more than one student, we asked them to rate the capabilities of the least capable student.

This assessment measures the following Program Objectives: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.

We received responses from 64 respondents of the original 114, which is a 56% response rate. Twenty two were field instructors for undergraduate student field placements. The respondents were primarily white (79%), female (74%) and experienced. All of the respondents had at least 5 years of social work experience, 50% report more than 15 years of experience. Eighty-two percent report they are involved in the hiring process either as decision-makers or persons who make

recommendations to a decision-maker. Forty-eight percent of the respondents work for public non-profit organizations.

The responses for several curriculum areas indicate that the respondents are fairly well satisfied with the preparation of graduating undergraduates in social work. Potential employers were asked to rate students using a traditional grading system. The average grade given to students for the first eight areas listed in the table below are all 3.0 or above. Respondents awarded average grades between B and B- (2.9 – 2.7) for fifteen of the remaining 22 areas identified, and between B- and C+ for the remaining seven areas. The number of graduating students given a grade of C- or below was not higher than 4 of 22 for any item assessed and was zero or one for eleven of the 30 areas listed.

6. Senior Exit Survey

This survey was implemented in 2007 and is given to all seniors in their Practice class. Students are asked questions regarding future plans, how well various aspects of the program contributed to their social work education, barriers to academic progress, and a self-assessment of their preparation to implement various tasks that social workers might encounter. There is also a place for open-ended responses for feedback regarding the program.

This survey assesses the following Program Objectives: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

(Information is being analyzed and will be provided before submitting)

AS 8.c. Provide a two page narrative indicating how the analysis of data is used to affirm or improve the program.

Data are presented to the undergraduate faculty regarding the various areas and we use this information to adjust the program process and/or curriculum. All proposed changes are presented to the Curriculum Committee for consideration. In the past few years, the changes made to the Undergraduate program as a result of this process include:

- Reorganization and consolidation of content provided through three pre-major courses (SWORK 110, 120 and 130) into two courses and increasing the undergraduate elective requirements from six units to nine units.
- Adding a new elective course at the Undergraduate level on Child Welfare Practice (SWORK 400).
- Revamping the content of a course on Family Issues in Social Work Practice (SWORK 410).
- Revamping the content of all courses to incorporate an evidence-based practice approach to teaching our social work curriculum
- Adding a structured small group lab component to the field practicum courses to provide students an opportunity to demonstrate social work practice skills.

AS 8 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT