This report covers the School of Social Work Baccalaureate Program outcome evaluation from 2006-07 and the responses made during the 2007-08 academic year.

**Findings and Analysis of Assessment Results**

The BSW outcome assessment consists of four parts. The first part is a pre-test post-test self-assessment in which students complete a self-assessment of their knowledge and skills on entering the program and then complete it again just before they graduate. The assessment measures students’ perception of their ability according to our 18 objectives. We can compare their self-assessments before and after participating in our program to see if they have significantly different ratings after participation. These ratings are on a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being desirable. The outcome results from this section for our 18 objectives ranged from 3.84 to 4.58. All of our objectives were met in 2007, in that students had significant gain (p<.05) in their posttest ratings over pretest ratings, and both student self-ratings and field instructor ratings were well over our goal of a rating of 3.5.

The second component of our outcome study is a satisfaction survey that students complete just before graduating. Students rate each of our content areas according to their rate of satisfaction on a scale of 1-5. They are also asked to give more detailed feedback in the form of two qualitative questions, basically telling us what our strengths are and what they would like to see changed. Quantitative ratings ranged from 3.86 to 4.50. Student satisfaction was consistently above our target of 3.5 in 2007. In the qualitative responses, students had many more positive comments than negative. Strengths cited were the faculty, the student-centered nature of the program, the field program, the curriculum, and peer support. Concerns raised were course scheduling issues and a desire for more instruction on macro issues.

The third component of the outcome study is to ask field instructors to rate students on the various objectives. Because field instructors are already rating the student in their field evaluations at the end of the year, and because the field instructors’ response rate to our mailed surveys was consistently low, we decided to use an “available data” approach, identifying the questions in the field evaluations to our objectives and noting the degree of success our field instructors perceive our students to have on these objectives. To obtain the ratings, the questions that were deemed to measure each objective on the field instructor ratings were averaged, giving a score between 1 (low) and 5 (high). All mean ratings were 4.0 and above, with a range from 4.00 to 4.47.

The fourth component is a follow-up survey of graduates two years after graduation. The quantitative portion of this survey asks alumni to rate their degree of preparation in each of our 18 objectives on a scale of 1-5. The qualitative portion asks for similar feedback to the satisfaction survey. Responses ranged from 3.92 to 4.60.
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These alumni described the faculty and the learning environment (class size, women’s college), and the strong field program as strengths of the program. The only negative comment that was mentioned more than once was a desire for more content on mental illness.

**Actions taken in response to the outcome survey**

While there were no real concerns identified in last year’s outcome study, the content committees all considered changes they might recommend based on the feedback. The practice committee reviewed the way critical thinking is addressed in the curriculum, and the field committee studied issues of access under the Americans with Disabilities Act. They forwarded concerns to the BSW Program Committee for discussion during the next (2008-09) year.

**Assessment Plan Changes**

The report from the 2006-07 academic year marks the final time we will use the “old” goals and objectives for our outcome assessment. The new outcome survey that is being used for the first time in the 2007-08 academic year has been substantially changed, reflecting new goals and objectives developed by the BSW Program Committee during the 2006-07 academic year. In addition, we are gathering all of our data during one academic year. (Formerly we attempted to track cohorts of students, assessing their self-perceptions of skills on entry into the program and again on exit. But students rarely move together in a cohort, and their assessments of when they will graduate have proven to be wildly inaccurate.) So we are simply comparing two different groups of students, those who enter the program in the fall and spring to those who graduate in the spring.