

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO
ASSESSMENT SUMMARY UPDATE

PROGRAM: M.S.W. Social Work

Year of Review	Student Learning Outcomes	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Briefly report the results of the assessment activity	Based on results/evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvement?	Based on results / evidence, what action was taken regarding the assessment process?	Describe the plans you have to reassess this goal and/or follow up action needed
2011-12	All 41 SLOs mandated by the Council on Social Work Education were assessed	Student and field instructor assessment of student performance comprises one assessment set of measures. In addition, several embedded course assignments are assessed and Comprehensive Exam data are assessed.	This year we report mean scores on all measures and the percentage of students who met our benchmarks for each measure. We set the benchmark for the foundation or first year of the program at 70%, as students are only half way through the program and still developing skills, knowledge and values. The benchmark was raised from 50% in 2010-11 to 70% in 2011-2012. The benchmark was raised to accommodate possible score inflation. The benchmark for the Concentration or second year of the program is 70%. In the Foundation year, students did not meet benchmarks on 51 of 82 items (41 scored by themselves and 41 scored by field instructors). In the Concentration year, students did meet benchmarks on 6 of 82 items. In addition, the Three year students did meet the benchmark with 1 out of 82 items. In terms of the Comprehensive Exam, students met the benchmark of at least 70% scoring a "4" or above on all of the 7 SLOs measured.	In general students are doing well on the SLOs. The foundation year students did not reach the 70% benchmark (it was 37%) with students not meeting our benchmarks on the vast majority of items. We are rethinking this percentage. There was a Field Training that addressed how to score these forms and we think that possible represented some of the lower scores. We did see several consistent areas where scores are falling below our expectations. These areas include practice skills, social welfare policy, collaboration, and research. We have begun curriculum committee discussions about where this material is or should be covered in the curriculum, and how we can better teach the material. Because the specific competencies are connected to specific course competencies, we are able to target areas of the curriculum to enhance student performance in the next assessment cycle. We are not yet done discussing the matter, but early	We plan to address the issue noted above of students not having the opportunity to practice policy and research skills in the field by enhancing our training of field instructors to further encourage them to allow students to have the opportunity to apply material on research and policy in their field placements. We created handouts that gave agencies clear examples of how they can incorporate policy practice and research into the field experience. As noted above, faculty are address some material in the courses through out curriculum committees and during our monthly brown bags to discuss where and how our courses can enhance to cover the material that is may be missing from our curriculum.	We will continue to finalize our matrix and our plans for embedded measures, hoping to have them all up and running by Fall 2013. Other than that, we have no plans to change our measures.
2012-13	41 SLOs mandated by the Council on Social Work Education	We assessed all 41 outcomes using a student self-assessment of their skills, attitudes and knowledge as demonstrated in their field practicum, a field instructor assessment of students in their field practicum, and assignments embedded in various courses and the Comprehensive Exam. To help us better understand the results of these assessments, we also conduct focus groups with graduating MSW students.	The field evaluation was completed by all students (47) in the final year of the MSW program and all field instructors (66) at the end of the spring semester. Students met the benchmark on 38 of the 41 items in their self-report and 39 of the 41 items as rated by their field instructors. On the embedded assignments students met the benchmark on all but one of the SLOs measured, where we had data. We were missing data on 11 of the 41 SLOs.	We have been discussing and collecting additional information about lower scores on policy and research related SLOs for several years. We believe the primary reason for lower scores in these areas is limited opportunities to demonstrate these skills in the field. We have met with field instructors and added training in these areas. The scores have improved every year, and we will continue to address the issue with field instructors and with students.	This was the first year we implemented the embedded assignment part of the assessment. We had some misunderstandings and miscommunications about the process. We believe we have corrected these and that we will be able to collect data on all 41 measures next year.	We will assess all 41 SLOs again next year and continue to discuss policy and research concerns with faculty, students, and field instructors.

Year of Review	Student Learning Outcomes	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Briefly report the results of the assessment activity	Based on results/evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvement?	Based on results / evidence, what action was taken regarding the assessment process?	Describe the plans you have to reassess this goal and/or follow up action needed
2013-14	Ten student learning outcomes and 41 practice behaviors as required by the Council On Social Work Education.	We assessed all 10 student learning outcomes using a student self-assessment of their skills, attitudes and knowledge as demonstrated in their field practicum, a field instructor assessment of students in their field practicum, assignments embedded in various courses and the Comprehensive Exam. We took the scores of practice behaviors related to each SLO gathered from all the instruments and averaged them to get a score on each SLO. To help us better understand the results of these assessments, we also conducted focus groups with graduating MSW students.	Students met the benchmark of at least 80% achieving a 4 or above on a 5 point scale on all 10 student learning outcomes.	Although students met the benchmarks on all SLOs, students scored lower than we would have liked on some specific practice behaviors. We continue to believe much of the challenge in these areas has to do with the opportunities students have to use these behaviors in their field practicum. We have changed our Field Instructor orientation to focus more these behaviors. We have also made changes in our curriculum to add material in our courses or change when content is taught.	We continue to refine our assessment process. We have changed some of the embedded assignments that we use and we have recently added additional practice behaviors to measure skills, knowledge, and attitudes at the Advanced/Concentration level. We have also made changes in our field evaluation form, based on feedback from Agency Field Instructors.	We will assess all ten SLOs again this coming year. We will also continue to discuss curricular and field changes as a faculty.
2014-15	Ten student learning outcomes and 41 practice behaviors as required by the Council On Social Work Education.	We assessed all 10 student learning outcomes using a student self-assessment of their skills, attitudes and knowledge as demonstrated in their field practicum, a field instructor assessment of students in their field practicum, assignments embedded in various courses and the Comprehensive Exam. We took the scores of practice behaviors related to each SLO gathered from all the instruments and averaged them to get a score on each SLO. To help us better understand the results of these assessments, we also conducted focus groups with graduating MSW students.	Students met the benchmark of at least 80% achieving a 4 or above on a 5 point scale on all 10 student learning outcomes.	Although students met the benchmarks on all SLOs, students scored lower than we would have liked on some specific practice behaviors. We continue to believe much of the challenge in these areas has to do with the opportunities students have to use these behaviors in their field practicum. We have changed our Field Instructor orientation to focus more these behaviors. We have also made changes in our curriculum to add material in our courses or change when content is taught.	We continue to refine our assessment process. We have changed some of the embedded assignments that we use and we have recently added additional practice behaviors to measure skills, knowledge, and attitudes at the Advanced/Concentration level. We have also made changes in our field evaluation form, based on feedback from Agency Field Instructors.	We will assess all ten SLOs again this coming year. We will also continue to discuss curricular and field changes as a faculty.
2015-16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use critical thinking skills to address complex ethical situations and respond appropriately based on the NASW Code of Ethics. 2. Demonstrate the ability for effective written communication. 3. Demonstrate the ability for effective verbal communication. 4. Systematically collect, analyze and report data that informs practice decisions. 	We measured the four SLOs using an exit survey of graduating MSW students and embedded assignments. Both of these measures utilizes a five-point scale to rate how well students master the student learning outcomes.	Students met the banchmark on all of the SLOs. We set a benchmark of at least 80% of students receiving an average score of 4 or above on the 5 points scale. The percentage of students meeting the benchmark on the four SLOs ranged from 81% to 91%.	We discussed the results at our first faculty meeting of the fall semester. As in past years we continue to focus on the SLOs with the lowest percentage of students meeting the benchmark. That SLO is related to our research curriculum and after a faculty discussion the matter was sent to our Research Curriculum Committee to create a proposal that the faculty will discuss and address this spring.	We feel that the process is going well, and no changes are being proposed.	We will assess different SLOs next year and rotate back to these SLOs in three years after all the others have been assessed.

Year of Review	Student Learning Outcomes	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Briefly report the results of the assessment activity	Based on results/evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvement?	Based on results / evidence, what action was taken regarding the assessment process?	Describe the plans you have to reassess this goal and/or follow up action needed
2016-17	Demonstrate the ability for effective written communication.	In consultation with social work faculty, it was decided that the best place to assess student writing in our MSW program would be the comprehensive exam students write during the spring semester of their concentration year. The comprehensive exam focuses on all four essential components (Content, Organization, Sources & Evidence, and Style & Grammar) to assess writing.	On an average, two students scored 2 (meets expectations), 7 students scored 2.5 along with 7 scoring 3 (exceeds expectations) in the <u>content</u> category of their comprehensive exam. All students scored 2.5 and above in the <u>organization</u> category of their comprehensive exam. Only two students scored 2 (meets expectations) in the <u>sources & evidence</u> area of their comprehensive exam. Overall students performed well in this category. Only two students scored 2 (meets expectations) in the <u>grammar & style</u> area of their comprehensive exam. Overall students performed well in this category.	The results indicated that most of the student scored in the Exceeds Expectations categories. This feedback reinforces the strong curriculum that supports student writing in the MSW program.	Although none of the students were scored in the below expectations categories, the discussion with the faculty will allow for processing of any curriculum changes/shifts that need to be made. No program shifts but a review and update of the comprehensive exam guidelines, timeline, and rubric with faculty reviewers' feedback will be incorporated for future comprehensive exams.	None at this time.
In AY 2016-2017, we had a total of 28 students who wrote the comprehensive exam. Out of which, the assessment coordinator randomly selected 17 exams (95 % Confidence Level with, 15% Confidence interval). Two Social Work Faculty members graded these student papers independently using the BSS Graduate Writing Rubric.						