

Final Assessment Report for BSW Program

Educational Outcomes

2011-2012 Academic Year

Florida Atlantic University

School of Social Work

Program Assessment and Continuous Improvement

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

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

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

The Assessment Plan & Procedure of FAU's BSW Program

As in previous years, FAU's BSW program has relied primarily on the field supervisor's assessment of student performance and student exit surveys to determine whether the programs have met their program objectives. These have been sufficient to ensure that the programs are effectively meeting their program goals. The exit surveys had quantitative components to evaluate the BSW program's objectives. Data for measurement are received from field supervisors (not employed by FAU), and FAU students from the School of Social Work. The measures for 2012 include the Field Instructor Evaluations (BSW) described in detail.

Quantitative Measures: Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors

1. Field Instructors' Evaluation of Student Performance

Field instructors who supervise BSW students in their field internships are required to complete evaluations of students' performance. These evaluations are offered on-line and the information is aggregated. Aggregated information is used to assess students' knowledge, skills and values and their ability for competent social work practice as either beginning generalist social workers (BSW) or for independent clinical-community practice. Each program objective is operationalized using multiple item indicators. Items are summed for each program objective. Field instructors provide important evaluative information that assists in determining whether the BSW program has provided students with the necessary knowledge, skills and values articulated in specific program objectives.

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

The program reports and analysis of its outcome data for each program objective.

EVALUATION OF THE BSW PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

B1. Adhere to the basic & historic values of the profession of social work and the ethical standards contained in the Code of Ethics of National Association of Social Workers.

Method of Measurement:

BSW Program Objective 1 was evaluated using two measures:

1. Evaluation of student performance in field site by field supervisor - Using 7 items, no individual item scores

(B1) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

Outcome Data and Analysis:

1. Seven items were used from the Field Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors. Mean score for the group of 7 items = 4.0352 (N= 44). This outcome measure asked field instructors to rate their students' ability to (21a) protect clients' confidentiality and self-determination, (21b) preserve human dignity and the clients' individuality, (21c) identify social work values and ethics in work with colleagues and clients and in other professional relationships, (21d) prevents personal values and biases from interfering with practice decisions in the best interests of the client, (21e) fully meets attendance requirements of the agency and the school of social work, the social work code of ethics, along with other regulations, (21f) understands the history of the social work profession and its current structure and issues, and (21g) recognizes and controls own verbal and non-verbal communication of biases and feelings in an interview. Again, the mean scores for these seven items = 4.01, SD = .75, Mode = 3.0 and Median= 4.0. This scale, as noted above, ranks a score of 1.0 as failing, a score of 3.0 as at an expected level, and a score of 5 at an outstanding level. This outcome data indicates that the program is well above the required score of 3.0 and meets program criteria.

B2. Demonstrate the knowledge & skills necessary for brokerage and advocacy on behalf of client systems of all sizes and with diverse populations, including populations at risk, groups that have experienced social and economic injustice, including women and children, new immigrant groups, migrant farm workers, gay, lesbian, Haitian, Latino, African & Caribbean American, & aging populations in south Florida.

Method of Measurement:

1. Evaluation of student performance in field by field supervisor - Using 5 items, no individual item scores (B2) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

Outcome Data and Analysis

1. Five items were used from the Field Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors (n=44). This outcome measure asked field instructors to rate their students' ability to (22a) understand the relationship of the field agency to other agencies or organizations in the community, (22b) identify the demographic and cultural characteristics of the agency's service population, as well as inadequately or inappropriately served groups, (22c) identify the range of relevant services available in the community and the ways in which these services are used for referrals by the agency, (22d) make effective referrals and advocate appropriately for clients' needs, and (22e) demonstrate skill in case management. Mean score for this outcome measure using a group of 5 items was 3.93, SD = .73, Mode = 3.0 and Median = 3.9. Using 5 items, no individual item scores (B2) were less than 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

B3. Identify & demonstrate knowledge of strategies to reduce discrimination, oppression, and economic deprivation and to promote social & economic justice with populations at risk

Method of Measurement:

1. Evaluation of student performance in field by field supervisor - Using 4 items, no individual item scores (B3) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

Outcome Data and Analysis

1. Four outcome items were used from the Field Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors. The mean score for this outcome measure using a group of 4 items was 3.9492. This outcome measure asked field instructors to rate their students' ability to (23a) identify populations served by the agency at risk of discrimination and oppression, (23b) advocate for change on behalf of client populations at risk, (23c) demonstrate an understanding of how social, political, and economic factors impact client functioning, and (23d) demonstrate awareness of, and ability to address special issues resulting from client race, ethnicity, class, disability, gender and/or sexual orientation. Mean score for 4 items = 3.88, SD = .76, Mode = 3.0 and Median = 3.75 (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding). In this outcome measure, field instructors observed that students had demonstrated criteria expectation.

B4. Understand & apply theories & knowledge concerning the reciprocal relationships between human behavior and the social environment, in order to promote health and social well-being

Method of Measurement:

1. Evaluation of student performance in field by field supervisor - Using 5 items, no individual item scores (B4) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

Outcome Data and Analysis

1. Five outcome items were used from the Field Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors. The mean score for this outcome measure using a group of 5 items was 3.9182. This outcome measure asked field instructors to rate their students' ability to (24a) demonstrate application of classroom learning in field through discussion with field educators, (24b) recognizes and focuses on the strengths and resources of the client, (24c) demonstrates understanding of human behavior theory and applies this knowledge to practice, (24d) understands bio-psycho-social variables that affect human development and behavior, and (24e) understands macro theory as it applies to clients. Mean score for 5 outcome items = 3.85, SD = .64, Mode = 3.20 and Median = 3.70 (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding). In this outcome measure, field instructors observed that students had demonstrated criteria expectation

B5. Demonstrate an understanding of social welfare from a policy and program perspective, essential for beginning agency social work practice

Method of Measurement:

1. Evaluation of student performance in field by field supervisor - Using 3 items, no individual item scores (B5) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

Outcome Data & Analysis

1. Three outcome items were used from the Field Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors. This outcome measure asked field instructors to rate their students' ability to (25a) understand agency's policies and procedures, organizational structure, and the channels of communication within the organization, (25b) apply relevant policies and procedures to practice activities, and (25c) assess the effects of regulations, policies, and procedures on service delivery. The mean score for the 3 items was 3.83, SD = .83, Mode = 3.0 and Median = 3.33. No individual item scores (B5) were less than 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

B6. Demonstrate the knowledge & skills necessary for beginning professional generalist practice with individuals, families, groups, and communities

Method of Measurement:

1. Evaluation of student performance in field by field supervisor - Using 25 items, no individual item scores (B6) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

Outcome Data & Analysis

1. Twenty-five outcome items were used from the Field Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors. The mean score for this outcome measure using a group of 25 items was 4.1969. This outcome measure asked field instructors to rate their students' ability to (26a) apply critical thinking skills to practice experiences, (26b) understand how policy affects clients and social work practitioners, (26c) actively participate in organizational functions such as treatment team meetings, staff meetings and /or committees both within and outside the agency, (26d) listen attentively and empathically to clients, (26e) recognize and respond appropriately to non-verbal client communication, (26f) recognize the inappropriateness of moralizing, persuading, threatening, judging, and criticizing in social work interviews, (26g) maintain focus in a client interview or group meeting, (26h) help clients elaborate on problems and explore emotionally charged issues, (26i) recognize and elicit underlying feelings in an interview, (24j) adequately summarize session content, (26k) recognize and elicit information that will contribute to the understanding of the client and the client's situation, (26l) identify sources of strengths and stress in the client and the client's support system, (26m) identify group dynamics, (26n) use his/her

knowledge of group dynamics to help clients build a positive group culture, (26o) reduce larger problems into manageable parts, (26p) consider the focus of an intervention within the client system [individual, family, group], (26q) recognize and handle client resistance to seeking help, (26r) set priorities in plans for intervention, monitor the implementation plan, (26s) develop and revise mutually agreeable contract/treatment plan, (26t) model, rehearse, and imparts coping and interaction, (26u) demonstrates crisis intervention skills, (26v) make appropriate termination decisions, (26w) evaluate with the client/group the extent to which the objectives of the intervention plan have been achieved, (26x) demonstrate an understanding of how macro issues and policies impact clients, and (26y) effectively and accurately represent the agency in interaction with individuals, groups, and community organizations. The mean score for 25 items = 3.88, SD = .64, Mode = 3.50 and Median = 3.60. No individual item scores (B5) were less than 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding).

B7. Demonstrate beginning skills necessary for scientific evaluation of one's practice and critical appraisal of the findings of social work research.

Method of Measurement:

1. Evaluation of student performance in field by field supervisor - Using 2 items, no individual item scores (B7) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

Outcome Data & Analysis

1. Two outcome items were used from the Field Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors. This outcome measure asked field instructors to rate their students' ability to (27a) demonstrate an ability to analyze and apply learning from practice experience and supervisory feedback, and evaluation of one's practice, and (27b) appropriately utilize research data gathering and intervention with community based clients. The mean score for 2 items was 3.91, SD = .74, Mode = 3.50 and Median = 3.50 (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding).

B8. Demonstrate practice competence within an ecological framework, integrating knowledge, skills, values, and social work theories/models of social justice, empowerment, strengths, and systems theory.

Method of Measurement:

1. Evaluation of student performance in field by field supervisor - Using 2 items, no individual item scores (B8) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

Outcome Data & Analysis

1. Two outcome items were used from the Field Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors. This outcome measure asked field instructors to rate their students' ability to (28a) increasingly link theory skill with practice and translate concept into specific action, and (28b) use different sources of information, including non-verbal data, client's support systems, and collateral contacts in the assessment process within a community based framework. The mean score for 2 items was 3.68, SD = .77, Mode = 3.00 and Median = 3.50. (1= fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

All BSW outcome data were reported to the Director of the School of Social Work, the BSW Program Coordinator, and the entire faculty of the School of Social Work. Criteria were met in all areas. Data gathering for 2012 program objective evaluation was sufficiently rigorous to determine that the program was meeting its objectives from the perspectives of agency field instructors and students. Data were gathered during the spring 2012 semester by the Institutional Effectiveness Analysis Office at FAU; however, the IEA was no longer responsible for data collection after the spring semester. The School of Social Work developed the field evaluation forms using surveymonkey to measure educational outcomes; this created inconsistencies and lack uniformity with that data previously collected by IEA, and thus, data on this report is limited to the spring 2012 semester. The School of Social Work will improve the data collection ensuring uniformity for the upcoming year. In addition, curriculum changes will take place to incorporate the new CSWE competencies and practice behaviors. New field evaluation forms will be developed to measure these competencies.