

Final Assessment Report for MSW 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 MSW Program

As in previous years, FAU's MSW 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 MSW 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 (MSW) described in detail.

Quantitative Measures: Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors

1. Field Instructors' Evaluation of Student Performance

Field instructors who supervise MSW 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 (MSW) 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 MSW 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 MSW Program Objectives

M1. Analyze, assess, and critically evaluate how social work values and ethics impact practice at an advanced level as they apply to Clinical-community practice

Method of Measurement:

1. Field Instructor evaluations of students' performance (C1). Using 7 items, no individual item scores 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. Using seven items from the Field Instructor's Evaluation of Student Performance, this outcome measure asked field instructors about students' ability to (22a) demonstrate knowledge of and a

commitment to social work values and ethics, (22b) demonstrate compliance with the policies and procedures of the agency, School of Social Work and the NASW Code of Ethics, (22c) demonstrate the ability to recognize and resolve ethical dilemmas, (22d) display an understanding of the client's right to determination, (22e) prevent personal values and biases from interfering with practice decisions, (22f) demonstrate appropriate professional boundaries with co-workers and clients, and (22g) display appropriate work attire. All individual student evaluations were reviewed (N = 59), and all individual items were scored higher than 2.0 on a five point scale (1 = failing, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding). Mean score for all 7 items = 4.46, SD = .56, Mode = 5 and Median = 4.71. This meets the outcome criteria adopted by the School of Social Work.

M2. Demonstrate appraise, and critically evaluate effectiveness of social work practice with individuals with diverse backgrounds in one of three focus areas: Children and Adolescents and Families, Adults and Families, or Elders and Families, including diverse populations of gay, lesbian, Haitian, Latino, African & Caribbean American in south Florida.

Method of Measurement:

1. Field Instructor evaluations of students' performance (C2). Using 5 items, no individual item scores 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) (C2)

Outcome Data & Analysis

1. Using five items from the Field Instructor's Evaluation of Student Performance, this outcome measure asked field instructors about students' ability to (23a) demonstrate culturally competent practice in the field education setting by an awareness and sensitivity to economic class, disability, gender, age, sexual orientation, race and ethnicity, (23b) be comfortable interacting with a wide diversity of clients in the field setting, (23c) demonstrate sensitivity to gender, racial, and cultural differences in field, (23d) demonstrate sensitivity to gender differences in the field setting, and (23e) demonstrate sensitivity to people with disabilities and special needs in the field setting. All individual student evaluations were reviewed, and all individual items were scored higher than 2.0 on a five point scale (1 = Failing, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding). Mean score all five items measuring C2 = 4.46, SD = .62, Mode = 5.0 and Median = 4.8. This meets the outcome criteria adopted by the School of Social Work.

M3. Demonstrate, appraise, and critically evaluate effectiveness of Clinical-Community strategies to reduce discrimination, oppression, and economic deprivation with populations-at-risk, those experiencing social and economic injustice, including gays, lesbians, Haitian, Latino, African & Caribbean Americans, elders and families in south Florida.

Method of Measurement:

1. Field Instructor evaluations of students' performance (C3). Using 2 items, no individual item scores 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) (C3)

Outcome Data & Analysis

1. Using two items from the Field Instructor's Evaluation of Student Performance, this outcome measure asked field instructors about students' ability (24a) demonstrate in the field setting an understanding of the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination effecting the focus population and (24b) demonstrate knowledge and skill promoting social and economic justice with their focus population. All individual student evaluations were reviewed, and all individual items were scored higher than 2.0 on a five point scale (1 = Failing, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding). Mean score all five items measuring C3 = 4.24, SD = .74, Mode = 5 and Median = 4.0. This meets the outcome criteria adopted by the School of Social Work.

M4. Compare and contrast theories and apply appropriate interventions while considering the reciprocal relationships between human behavior and the social environment across the life span in terms of biological, sociological, cultural, psychological, and spiritual development for advanced clinical-community practice in one of three focus areas of Children and Adolescents and Families, Adults and Families, or Elders and Families

Method of Measurement:

1. Field Instructor evaluations of students' performance (C4). Using 4 items, no individual item scores 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) (C4)

Outcome Data & Analysis

1. Using four items from the Field Instructor's Evaluation of Student Performance, this outcome measure asked field instructors about students' ability to (25a) demonstrate increasing ability to link theory to practice, (25b) demonstrates understanding of the relationship between academic learning and social work practice, (25c) demonstrate an understanding and ability to apply one or more social work practice models, and (25d) demonstrate an understanding of the bio-psycho-social-spiritual systems and generalist intervention models and theories of practice. All individual student evaluations were reviewed, and all individual items were scored higher than 2.0

on a five point scale (1 = Failing, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding). Mean score all five items measuring C4 = 4.33, SD = .64, Mode = 5, and Median = 4.25. This meets the outcome criteria adopted by the School of Social Work.

M5. Identify and apply knowledge and skills necessary for successful clinical community practice, applying and integrating theories/models of social justice, empowerment, strengths and systems theory

Method of Measurement:

1. Field Instructor evaluations of students' performance (C6). Using 8 items, no individual item scores 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) (C6)

Outcome Data & Analysis

1. Using eight items from the Field Instructor's Evaluation of Student Performance, this outcome measure asked field instructors about students' ability to (27a) demonstrate an ability to build rapport with clients, (27b) demonstrate the ability to work as a professional team member, (27c) demonstrate the ability to apply a broad range of empirically based theoretical approaches in a focus area, (27d) demonstrate the ability to distinguish between appropriate assessment approaches and treatment modalities for a particular client in a specific focus area, (27e) demonstrate the ability to differentially apply practice models within a focus area, (27f) demonstrate advanced level of skill at problem and strength identification with clients in a focus area, (27g) demonstrate an advanced level of skill at termination with clients in a focus area, (27h) demonstrate an advanced level of skill in identifying and developing intervention strategies involving the student's focus population.. All individual student evaluations were reviewed, and all individual items were scored higher than 2.0 on a five point scale (1 = Failing, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding). The mean for 8 items measuring C5 = 4.29, SD = .62, Mode = 5.0 and Median = 4.25. This meets the outcome criteria adopted by the School of Social Work

M6. Examine, formulate, propose and critically evaluate advanced social policies and services for clinical-community practice in order to advocate for social change consistent with social work values.

Method of Measurement:

1. Field Instructor evaluations of students' performance (C5). Using 3 items, no individual item scores 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) (C5)

Outcome Data & Analysis

1. Using three items from the Field Instructor's Evaluation of Student Performance, this outcome measure asked field instructors about students' ability to (26a) recognizes the inter-relationships between social policy concepts and social work practice, (26b) demonstrates the ability to identify and advocate for clients within the structure of the agency, and (26c) demonstrates an advanced level of skill in advocating for and intervening on behalf of clients in a specific focus | area. All individual student evaluations were reviewed, and all individual items were scored higher than 2.0 on a five point scale (1 = Failing, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding). Mean score all five items measuring C6 = 4.21, SD = .72, Mode = 5.0 and Median = 4.0. This meets the outcome criteria adopted by the School of Social Work

M7. Develop, conduct, apply, and effectively communicate empirically based knowledge to improve practice, policy, and social service delivery as well as evaluating one's own practice.

Method of Measurement:

1. Field Instructor evaluations of students' performance (C7). Using 1 item, this item score will not 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) (C7)

Outcome Data & Analysis

1. Using one item from the Field Instructor's Evaluation of Student Performance, this outcome measure asked field instructors about students' ability to (28a) demonstrates advanced skill in designing and implementing practice and program evaluation strategies related to work in the focus population. All individual student evaluations were reviewed, and all individual items were scored higher than 2.0 on a five point scale (1 = Failing, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding). The mean for 8 items measuring Mean for item measuring C7 = 4.15, SD = 1.01, Mode = 3 and Median = 4.0. This meets the outcome criteria adopted by the School of Social Work

M8. Demonstrate practice competence integrating knowledge, skills, values and social work theories/models of social justice, empowerment, strengths and systems theory in the field education.

Method of Measurement:

1. Field Instructor evaluations of students' performance (C8) & Overall Evaluation score. No individual item score 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. Using two items from the Field Instructor's Evaluation of Student Performance, this outcome measure asked field instructors to rate students' overall ability (33) and whether students demonstrated an advanced level of skill in clinical community practice. All individual student evaluations were reviewed, and all individual items were scored higher than 2.0 on a five point scale (1 = Failing, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding). The mean for this item was $C8 = 4.49$, $SD = .65$, $Mode = 5.0$ and $Median = 5.0$. This meets the outcome criteria adopted by the School of Social Work.

The program shows evidence that the analysis of its outcomes is used continuously to improve the program. All outcome data were reported to the Director of the School of Social Work, the MSW 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. While program goals were met, 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.