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INTRODUCTION

This report is based on the Assessment Plan of the MSW Program of the School of Social Work at St. Catherine University and the University of St. Thomas (Appendix A) as implemented for students entering the program in fall 2013 and for students who exited the program in spring 2013. The data are based on the MSW Program’s implementation of the 2008 Educational Policy and Assessment Standards of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), as articulated by our program (Appendix B). Outcomes are based on student and field faculty reports of competence of the clinical practice behaviors which measure the 10 advanced competencies for clinical social work practice. Specifically, this report summarizes the findings of the Entry Survey, the Exit Survey and the Final Field Evaluations completed by both field instructors and students as outlined in the Assessment Plan (Appendix A).

Part I of this report presents the profile of students entering the MSW program in the fall of 2013. This report includes basic demographic information, reasons for choosing this graduate degree and program and ratings of perceived proficiency on the 49 practice behaviors that measure the SCU/UST MSW program’s articulation of the 10 advanced competencies. The option of a Not Applicable (NA) response is offered, since the practice behaviors measured reflect the scope of practice expected at exit from the program. The survey link is administered to students during the first or second class of the GRSW 500 History and Philosophy of Social Work course; weekend cohort students and AS 1-year students take the survey in June and day/evening program students take the survey in early September.

Part II of the report presents the findings of the Exit survey completed by the 2013 graduating students and the findings of both Field Instructors’ and students’ assessments of their attainment of 49 practice behaviors which measure the 10 Competencies for Advanced Clinical Social Work Practice. The Exit Survey includes two embedded data points regarding the measurement of advanced practice behaviors: one asks students to rate their level of competence on all the practice behaviors at entry and another asks them to rate their level of competence on all practice behaviors at the time they are graduating. This pre-post reporting model allows for a person-specific reporting of perceived difference (pre-post mean ratings for all respondents are tested for significance). In addition to basic demographics regarding their program path (e.g. day/weekend, regular standing/advanced standing, program track) students are asked about their experiences in the program related to support services used, participation in student organizations and co-curricular events/activities, perceptions of inclusiveness, current job status, future plans and both helpful and challenging aspects of the MSW Program. Measures of dimensions of the implicit curriculum have been formally included in the Outcome Study since 2010-2011.
Part I: Entering MSW Students

This section of the report will present the data collection and analysis Methods and Findings for the data provided by students entering the program in fall 2013. The Entry Survey was introduced electronically to students through their official SCU/UST email and administered through Qualtrics in their first or second class of the GRSW 500: History and Philosophy of Social Work course.

Method

Incoming students rate themselves on the practice behaviors articulated at the advanced level for clinical social work practice. Entry-level assessments measure students’ perceptions of their ability to perform specific advanced clinical social work practice behaviors. Because the practice behaviors are articulated for the advanced level, incoming students are given the option to choose NA for “not applicable” to identify areas that would be beyond the scope of practice of an entering student.

Entry Survey Instrument

The SCU/UST MSW Program Entry Survey measures 10 Competencies at the Advanced Clinical Social Work level including: identifying as a social worker; applying ethical principles; applying critical thinking; engaging diversity; advancing human rights; engaging research-informed practice and practice-informed research; applying knowledge of human behavior; engaging in policy practice; responding to context that shape practice, and; practice with client systems (including engagement, assessment, intervention and evaluation). For each competency, including the four sub-competencies under competency10, there are three to five related practice behavior statements (Appendix B). In total, students are asked to rate themselves on 49 advanced level practice behavior statements that measure the 10 competencies (Appendix B). The ratings given to each item are averaged within each competency to compute the mean score for a competency.

To measure competency, students are asked to rate the degree to which they believe they are competent in particular practice behaviors on a five-point Likert scale, with an option of “NA” for not applicable. For example, the survey directions begin:

Recognizing that not every student comes to our program with direct social work experience, please respond to the following statements by selecting the answer that best describes you. If an item does not apply, please choose NA for ‘not applicable.’

An example item (practice behavior) for the first competency of 2.1.1 Identifying as a professional social worker and conducting oneself accordingly, is:

I demonstrate professional use of self with clients.
Very Little  |  Very Much  |  NA
---|---|---
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0

These response options are uniform across all of the practice behavior items.

Four statements that reflect the MSW program’s commitment to Social Justice were incorporated into three of the competencies (engaging diversity (one item); advancing human rights (two items), and engaging policy practice (one item)), however, the ratings for these four questions are *not included* in the creation of the scale score for that competency. These mean scale scores for added social justice item are presented separately, in Table 6. In addition, this Entry Survey instrument asks students questions about their background, reasons for pursuing an MSW degree, and reasons for coming to *this* program.

**Data Collection**

The survey was developed using Qualtrics survey software. Students entering the weekday MSW Program in the fall of 2013 were emailed the survey link through their UST email during the very first day of classes. Students were asked to wait to take the survey during class, spanning September 4th – September 12th. Data collection was formally closed on September 18th, 2013. The students entering Weekend Cohort and Advanced Standing 1-year program followed the same process in summer 2013 when they take this class. These surveys were administered on June 8, 2013. The responses from students in both program formats - day/evening and weekend cohort - are combined in this report.

**Data Analysis**

To create the score for each curriculum competency, the average score of the self-rated statements that make up each of the 10 competencies is determined. There is one distinction: due to its focus on four dimensions of practice with client systems, mean ratings for competency 10 are calculated for each of its four categories: engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation. Each of these sub-competencies has a set of respective practice behaviors. For analysis, all responses of “NA” are deleted from calculations of the mean score. The mean score for each competency (and aforementioned sub-categories) has the potential of falling between 1 and 5.

Descriptive statistics were run for demographic and background information including gender, age, past education, and reasons for entering the program. As noted, the average score of the self-rated statements that measure each practice behavior was calculated. Subsequently, an average score for each competency is calculated. There is one distinction: due to its focus on four dimensions of practice with client systems, mean ratings for competency 10 are calculated for each of its four categories: engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation. Likewise, the
means for each of the respective practice behaviors for each sub-competency of Competency 10 was calculated.

Findings and Discussion

Of the 139 entering students in fall 2013, 137 completed the Entry Survey for an overall response rate of 98.6% (Appendix D). The administration of the online survey in class has resulted in a very high response rate. We will continue with this model next year for both the MSW weekday and weekend cohort groups.

Basic Demographic and Background Information

Table 1 includes the basic demographic and background information on the students entering the program in the fall of 2013. The number of men entering the program is 13.2%, (n=18) slightly higher from the past years. Women make up 86.8% of the incoming student body. The mean age of students is 31.18 years. The average age of entering students remains fairly consistent between 28 and 31 over the last six years.

The largest number of students entering in 2013 comes from Minnesota public universities (38.0%, n = 52), followed by other private universities or colleges (24.8%, n =34) and schools outside of Minnesota, (23.4%, n=32). Following this are SCU (6.6%, n = 9) and UST (5.8%, n = 8). As Table 1 shows, percentages have not changed much from last year. Two respondents, (1.5%) did not reply to this question.

The baccalaureate majors reported by incoming MSW students demonstrated some notable changes from last year. The percentage of students with BSWs increased from 35% in 2012 to 46.7% (n=64). The percentage of students with B.A.s in psych decreased from 33.5% in 2012 to 22.6% (n = 59). “Other Human Service” major only represented 2.2% (n=3) of the incoming students. “Other” continues to be a large category (21.2%) and contains a diverse range of baccalaureate degrees from theater (n = 1) and chemical engineering (n = 1). There were some majors which seemed to relate to macro-level issues in living, however, such as Community and public health, corrections, political science, social justice, international relations, and women’s studies. There was not one major that appeared to be an emerging feeder to the program.

Of the entering students responding, 42 (30.7%) have a social work license (LSW), one is a Licensed Alcohol and Drug Counselors (LADC), and six (4.4%) have some other license. The greatest proportion (62.8%, n = 86) does not have a professional license. The average number of years in paid or volunteer social service experience was 4.9 years.
#### Table 1. Background Information: Entering MSW Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7 5.1</td>
<td>13 10.0</td>
<td>8 10.1</td>
<td>14 8.1</td>
<td>18 13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>128 94.1</td>
<td>114 89.1</td>
<td>71 89.9</td>
<td>157 91.3</td>
<td>119 86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>29.61</td>
<td>30.32</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>31.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of B.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>2 1.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 2.6</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>3 2.3</td>
<td>5 3.9</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
<td>4 2.27</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>15 11.4</td>
<td>17 13.6</td>
<td>6 7.9</td>
<td>11 6.25</td>
<td>12 9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>111 84.7</td>
<td>85 66.4</td>
<td>45 59.2</td>
<td>80 45.45</td>
<td>39 29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010s</td>
<td>n.a. n.a.</td>
<td>18 14.4</td>
<td>22 28.9</td>
<td>81 46.02</td>
<td>77 58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA College:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCU</td>
<td>10 7.4</td>
<td>13 10.2</td>
<td>4 4.3</td>
<td>10 5.7</td>
<td>9 6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UST</td>
<td>5 3.7</td>
<td>6 4.7</td>
<td>7 7.5</td>
<td>7 4.0</td>
<td>8 5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-MN</td>
<td>51 37.5</td>
<td>38 29.7</td>
<td>29 31.2</td>
<td>59 33.5</td>
<td>52 38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Private-MN</td>
<td>39 21.3</td>
<td>26 20.3</td>
<td>16 17.2</td>
<td>44 25.0</td>
<td>34 24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of MN</td>
<td>40 29.4</td>
<td>41 32.8</td>
<td>26 28.0</td>
<td>52 29.5</td>
<td>32 23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Major:</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>72 52.9</td>
<td>52 40.6</td>
<td>38 40.9</td>
<td>62 35.2</td>
<td>64 46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>35 25.7</td>
<td>37 28.9</td>
<td>15 16.1</td>
<td>59 33.5</td>
<td>59 22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>4 2.9</td>
<td>3 2.3</td>
<td>2 2.2</td>
<td>8 4.5</td>
<td>9 6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Service</td>
<td>3 2.2</td>
<td>2 4.5</td>
<td>2 2.2</td>
<td>7 4.0</td>
<td>3 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22 16.2</td>
<td>34 26.6</td>
<td>26 28.0</td>
<td>35 19.9</td>
<td>29 21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Licenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSW</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>26 28</td>
<td>44 25.0</td>
<td>42 30.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADC</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td>2 1.1</td>
<td>1 0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (LMFT, etc.)</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>3 3.2</td>
<td>9 5.1</td>
<td>6 4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>53 57</td>
<td>116 65.9%</td>
<td>86 62.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Social Service Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * = Was not asked during these administrations

Seventy-five percent of respondents indicated that they were in the weekday/evening program, while 24.1% were in the weekend cohort program (see Table 2). The largest percentage of respondents is in the Regular Standing 2-year program (24.8, n = 34), followed by the Advanced Standing 3-year program (19.7%, n= 27). The Regular Standing 3-year program comprised 11.7% (n=16) of the student body, while AS 1-year, RS 4-year weekend cohort, and AS 3-year weekend cohort had 10.2% (n=14) apiece. AS 3-year represented 6.6% (n=9) and the smallest group was RS 4-year with 5.8% (n=8) of students. The biggest change from last year is the increase in the
numbers of AS-2 students who came to the program from 10.2% (2012) to 19.7% (2013) of the total MSW entering class. Likewise, the decrease in the percentage of RS 3-year students, from 17.6% (2012) to 11.7% (2013) of all entering students, is also of note.

### Table 2. Program Format and Track of Entering MSW Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday/Evening</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Cohort</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 2-year</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 3-year</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 4-year</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 4-year Weekend</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 1-year</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2-year</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 3-year</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 3-year Weekend</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * = Was not asked during these administrations

### Students’ Reasons for Entering and Future Planning

As noted on Table 3, overall, students who entered the program in the fall of 2013 report pursuing a MSW from this program because of the clinical focus of the program and professional enhancement.

The clinical focus of the MSW program continues to be the primary reason for coming to this program with 52.6% (n=72) of students indicating this response (see Table 3). Professional enhancement as a reason to come to the School was a little higher than in 2012 with 27.9% (n=38) in 2013.

In terms of getting an MSW in general, the most common response was to be able to engage in clinical practice and get an LICSW. Career Advancement increased to 32.1% (n = 44), which is similar to 2012 data. Have a new experience/career change received 6.6% of responses and further education comprised 5.1%, followed by improve skills (4.4%). Non-clinical work was not chosen.
Table 3. MSW Students’ Reasons for Entering and Future Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Focus</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputaion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Enhancement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-clinical Practice</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary reason for wanting an MSW degree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Advancement</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Practice/LICSW</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-clinical LISW</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Experience/Career Change</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students also reported on plans for area of practice five years after receiving their MSW (Table 4). The categories in Table 4 represent the social work areas of practice as identified by the Council on Social Work Education which was added to the Entry Survey for 2010 in order to standardize our data for future comparative analysis. As presented in Table 4, the 10 most often noted areas of future practice included mental health (62.0%), family services (40.9%), school social work (33.6), crisis intervention (27.7%), health (26.3%), aging (24.1%), child welfare (21.9), group services (21.2%), and substance abuse and domestic abuse with 18.2% apiece. Some notable trends include the decline in “crisis intervention” which fell from 36.4% in 2012 to 27.7% in 2013, as well as a decrease in “social policy,” which fell from 19.9% in 2012 to 8.8% in 2013, and finally a decline in “child welfare” from 28.4% in 2012 to 21.9% in 2013. Mental health also saw a decline from 68.2% in 2012 to 62% in 2013, however this number is similar to that of 2011. The increases in interest seemed to be of lesser amounts, but spread across more categories including: school social work, aging, group services, domestic abuse, administration, housing, and program evaluation.
Table 4. Plans for Area of Practice Five Years after MSW Program: Entering MSW Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Practice</th>
<th>2010 No. (%)</th>
<th>2011 No. (%)</th>
<th>2012 No. (%)</th>
<th>2013 No. (%)</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>82 (66.1)</td>
<td>56 (60.2)</td>
<td>120 (68.2)</td>
<td>85 (62.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family services</td>
<td>63 (50.8)</td>
<td>42 (45.2)</td>
<td>79 (44.9)</td>
<td>56 (40.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School social work</td>
<td>44 (35.5)</td>
<td>25 (26.9)</td>
<td>51 (29.0)</td>
<td>46 (33.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td>24 (19.4)</td>
<td>30 (32.3)</td>
<td>64 (36.4)</td>
<td>38 (27.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>34 (27.4)</td>
<td>27 (29)</td>
<td>49 (27.8)</td>
<td>36 (26.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging</td>
<td>25 (20.2)</td>
<td>21 (22.6)</td>
<td>37 (21.0)</td>
<td>33 (24.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare</td>
<td>39 (31.2)</td>
<td>22 (23.7)</td>
<td>50 (28.4)</td>
<td>30 (21.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group services</td>
<td>22 (17.7)</td>
<td>16 (17.2)</td>
<td>33 (18.8)</td>
<td>29 (21.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>28 (22.6)</td>
<td>13 (14)</td>
<td>30 (17.0)</td>
<td>25 (18.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic abuse</td>
<td>16 (12.9)</td>
<td>22 (23.7)</td>
<td>23 (13.1)</td>
<td>25 (18.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>13 (10.5)</td>
<td>8 (8.6)</td>
<td>20 (11.4)</td>
<td>20 (14.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental disabilities</td>
<td>14 (11.3)</td>
<td>13 (14)</td>
<td>21 (11.9)</td>
<td>17 (12.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>22 (17.7)</td>
<td>7 (7.5)</td>
<td>23 (13.1)</td>
<td>16 (11.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>6 (4.8)</td>
<td>6 (6.5)</td>
<td>12 (6.8)</td>
<td>16 (11.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>8 (6.6)</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
<td>10 (5.7)</td>
<td>14 (10.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community planning</td>
<td>10 (8.06)</td>
<td>7 (7.5)</td>
<td>20 (11.4)</td>
<td>13 (9.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social policy</td>
<td>15 (13.0)</td>
<td>15 (16.1)</td>
<td>35 (19.9)</td>
<td>12 (8.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public assistance</td>
<td>3 (2.4)</td>
<td>5 (5.4)</td>
<td>8 (4.5)</td>
<td>8 (5.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>9 (7.3)</td>
<td>3 (3.2)</td>
<td>13 (7.4)</td>
<td>7 (5.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational rehabilitation</td>
<td>1 (0.8)</td>
<td>3 (3.2)</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td>5 (3.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals equal more than 100% as respondents could choose more than one response.

**Entering Student Ratings on Advanced Clinical Competencies**

The 2013 entering group assessed themselves in terms of advanced clinical social work competencies as articulated through advanced clinical practice behaviors (see Table 5). It is assumed that upon entry, students will not meet the 3.75 or 4.0 benchmarks established by the program on any educational competence for two reasons: first, many of the outcome measures would be beyond the scope of practice for entering students unless they were already licensed in another mental health profession, and secondly, these measures are expectations for students as they are graduating. Students are measured at the beginning of the program in order to ascertain students’ ratings of practice behaviors as they enter the program and provide a cohort-based baseline for program assessment.

The highest area of self-assessment is for “Identifying as a professional social worker and conducting oneself accordingly,” with a mean score of 3.49, which may reflect that a portion of the incoming MSWs already hold a BSW, and that people who have chosen this program have an orientation to social work as a profession. The lowest scores related to engaging in research (1.93), policy (1.89), and evaluation (1.72).
Table 5. Mean Scores on Educational Competencies: Entering MSW Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 128</td>
<td>n = 93</td>
<td>n = 176</td>
<td>1 = 137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying as a professional</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social worker and conducting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oneself accordingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying social work ethical</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principles to guide professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying critical thinking</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to inform and to communicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional judgments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging diversity and</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference in practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancing human rights and</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social economic justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in research-informed</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice and practice-informed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying knowledge of human</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior and the social environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in policy practice</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to advance social and economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well-being and to deliver effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social work services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to contexts that shape</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement, assessment, intervention,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and evaluation with individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families, groups, organizations, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ratings of NA were deleted from calculations.

All other mean scores ranged between 2.39 (Assessment of individuals, families, groups, and organizations) and 3.21 (Engaging diversity and difference in practice). As we would expect, these scores indicate that students do not yet feel confident on all of the competencies for advanced social work practice.

The School of Social Work has an ongoing commitment to social justice that is intentionally presented, articulated and reinforced throughout the MSW curriculum, beginning with the course everyone, regular and advanced standing, takes as a foundation bridge to our program: GRSW 500: History and Philosophy of Social Work. In an ongoing effort to measure the degree to which students understand principles of social justice and how to implement them in their practice, four items are included in the entry survey (Table 6). Students’ mean scores for these social justice items were 2.55, similar to the mean score from 2012 of 2.40. Of these four items, entering students tended to assess themselves the highest on the item, “I practice informed by a social justice perspective,” with a mean score of 2.94. They rated themselves the lowest on the item, “I understand and can apply frameworks related to social justice, such as relevant portions of Catholic Social Teaching,” with a mean score of 2.21.
Table 6. Mean Scores on Social Justice Measures: Entering MSW Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I practice informed by a social justice perspective</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand and can apply frameworks related to social justice, such as the NASW Code of Ethics.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand and can apply frameworks related to social justice, such as relevant portions of Catholic Social Teaching</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to analyze policy from a social justice perspective and to advocate, when applicable.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of Social Justice Measures</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contextual Factors Related to Findings Based on the Entry Survey

There may be some limitations in gathering information during entry. Questions about competencies assume that students have a fairly good notion of the topics being addressed in the practice behaviors. For example, students’ assessments of their understanding about behaviors related to diversity may be much less than they realize because they have not been exposed to the theory and research on the topic. Therefore, students are rating their proficiency regarding a competency before really knowing what it encompasses. To this point, evaluators have noted in past years that real time entry ratings were much higher than retrospective entry ratings, perhaps because students had gained a sense of the parameters of the topic. In essence, before they entered, they did not know, what they did not know, whereas, as they left, they did know, what they did not know at entry. We will continue to observe patterns captured with the new outcome assessment instrument.

Changes in the administration of the electronic Entry Survey based on competencies resulted in dramatic improvement in the response rates compared to its first use in 2011 (Appendix D). Incoming students in spring 2011 were invited to complete the Entry Survey on their own, resulting in a response rate of 59%. Typical response rates for Entry Surveys administered at new student orientation were typically in the range of 84 – 100%. The School of Social Work Assessment Committee, in consultation with the Dean, now embeds the administration of the Entry Survey in GRSW 500: History and Philosophy of Social Work, the first course taken by all students to ensure a more comprehensive view of new student status. This procedure has resulted in an increase response rate with that of 98.6% in 2013 (Appendix D).
Part II: Graduating MSW Students

This section of the report will present the data collection and analysis Methods and Findings for data provided by students who exited the program in spring 2013. The Exit Survey was electronically sent to students through their official SCU/UST email and administered through Qualtrics in May 2013 during the Clinical Methods course. The final clinical field evaluation was administered through the online Intern Placement Tracking (IPT) system and completed by both the student and the field instructor as they completed their final evaluations through August 2013. Both the Qualtrics and IPT data were transferred to SPSS for data analysis.

Method

Exiting MSW students were surveyed regarding the degree to which they attained competencies for advanced clinical social work practice using an Exit Profile Instrument. They were also asked about their perspectives on School supports, activities, and climate in an effort to capture dimensions of the implicit curriculum. Questions related to the implicit curriculum were added to the Exit Survey for 2011 and continue to be a part of this survey.

Exit Survey Instrument

As in the Entry Profile Instrument, the 10 advanced clinical competencies were operationalized through the 49 articulated Practice Behaviors. In the exit survey instrument when measuring the 10 advanced clinical competencies students are no longer offered the option of “N.A.” when assessing their competency level for each Practice Behavior. At this point in their education students are expected to have achieved some level of experience and proficiency in all of the Practice Behaviors that measure the Competencies. In addition, this instrument gathers information about the students’ experiences while in the MSW Program and plans for their future career. Among the items asked are: employment prospects at graduation; satisfaction with various aspects of their MSW education; participation in school activities; supports received while at the school; assessment of the School’s cultural responsiveness; plans for their career in five years; areas of practice in which they hope to work in five years; and open-ended questions regarding the helpful and challenging aspects of their MSW education.

Data Collection

Graduating students were sent a link to the exit survey on April 29th, 2013 and asked to wait to complete it in their Clinical Methods Course that week. The MSW Program converted to using Qualtrics as the survey platform in the Spring of 2011, with students completing the Exit Survey in response to an email only invitation, resulting in a response rate of 57%. MSW faculty recommended that data collection should be returned to the context of the methods class; this change was implemented in spring, 2012. In this third year of the online survey administration
and second year of an online administration in class, the response rate was 83.5%, nearly the same as last year (see Appendix D). Out of a possible 133 students, 111 completed the survey.

**Data Analysis**

The heart of this program assessment lies in the findings of the student and field instructor reports on demonstrated mastery of 10 competencies operationalized through 49 practice behaviors and measured in the Exit Survey and the Final Clinical Field Evaluation. Findings in Part II of the Outcome Study are presented on data from the Exit Survey including: gender, age, program track, employment prospects, satisfaction with aspects of the program, participation in school activities, School supports received, School’s cultural responsiveness, five-year career plans, and areas of future practice.

For both the Exit Survey and for the final clinical field evaluation, descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the 49 practice behaviors, which operationalize the 10 Advanced Clinical competencies (Appendix B). In addition to the pre- and post-program comparisons in the Exit Survey, descriptive statistics were also calculated for the final field evaluation data using students’ and Field Instructors’ ratings for students’ achievement of clinical level practice behaviors within the context of their practicum site. It should be noted that while the student ratings are based on self-report, Field Instructors’ ratings are based on observed behaviors.

**Findings and Discussion**

The MSW Program Manager assists the Assessment Coordinator to determine the students who are graduating in that year. The MSW Program Manager emails these students a cover letter with a link to the exit survey. Students are directed to complete this survey in their GRSW 604 Methods of Clinical Social Work class (this email with survey link is sent just a week before the scheduled time they will take it in their class). This year 133 graduating students were emailed the survey with 111 completing it for a response rate of 83.5% (Appendix D).

**Basic Demographic and Background Information**

Table 7 presents background information for 2013 graduating students (n = 111). Of the 111 students who responded to the demographic questions, 89.2% were women, 9.9% were men, 0.9% did not respond. The mean age of responding students was 31.2 years and 82% (n = 91) of respondents were in the weekday/evening program and 17.1% (n = 19) of respondents were in the weekend cohort program. The proportion of students reporting membership in NASW increased from 16.9% in 2012 to 25.2% in 2013. While this is an increase, it is still below percentages in 2011 and 2010. Please see Table 7 for a further breakdown of program standing.
Table 7. Background Information: Graduating MSW Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 136</td>
<td>n = 128</td>
<td>N = 81</td>
<td>N = 118</td>
<td>N = 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>32.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASW Member</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Day/Weekend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day/Evening</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Cohort</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 2-year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 3-year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 4-year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 4-year Cohort</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 1-year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2-year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 3-year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 3-year Cohort</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exit Survey: Graduating Student Ratings on Advanced Clinical Competencies

The mean benchmark score set by the MSW program for each Curriculum Competency is 75% at a 4.0 (on a scale from 1 to 5), and 90% at 3.75. For each individual competency and practice behavior, the MSW Program considers any score below 3.75 as a concern that requires follow up by the appropriate curriculum committee to identify any changes in the curriculum that need to be made. Findings for 2013 Exit Survey are reported on Table 8.

As noted on Table 8, the mean ratings for all but one curriculum competency (A2.1.8 Engaging in policy practice; 3.4) were above 3.75, the benchmark mean score. Two other competency mean ratings scored below the challenge benchmark of 4.0: Advancing Human Rights and Justice (A2.1.5) with a score of 3.88 and Evaluation (A2.1.10 (d)) with a score of 3.91. Of particular note was “Identifying as a professional social worker” (A2.1.1) competency with a mean score of 4.67 (higher than even last year’s score of 4.5). Likewise, in rank order, students rated their levels of competency above 4.0 on: “Applying knowledge of HBSE,”(A2.1.5) with 4.52, “Applying social work ethical principles” (A2.1.2) with a mean score of 4.5, “Applying critical thinking,” (A2.1.3) with 4.4, “Engagement of individuals, families, groups, and communities” (A2.1.10(a)) with 4.46,
“Assessment of individuals, families, groups, and communities” (A2.1.10 (b)) with 4.44, and “Intervention of individuals, families, groups, and communities” (A2.1.10(c)) with 4.39. “Engaging diversity” (A2.1.4) also scored above the challenge benchmark with 4.3, as did “Responding to contexts that shape practice” (A2.1.9) with 4.27. “Research-informed practice and practice-informed research” (A2.1.6) was slightly over the benchmark with 4.08.

As noted on Table 8, three curriculum competency scores fell below the challenge benchmark of 4.0: “Evaluation” of individuals, families, groups, and communities (A2.1.10 (d) (mean score of 3.91), “Advancing human rights and justice” (A2.1.5) (mean score of 3.88), and “Engaging in Policy Practice” (A2.1.8) (mean score of 3.4). While the evaluation score and human justice scores stayed nearly the same from 2012, Engaging in Policy Practice increased some. This small, but noticeable change in the policy score may have to do with the changes to the curriculum which were implemented in the spring and summer of 2012 and fall of 2012. These changes may becoming apparent in these scores as the students who graduated in 2013 would have been the first to experience the benefits of changes to the policy curricula. As part of our work on continuous improvement, the findings of 2013 have been assessed by the MSW curriculum committee as a whole and its review and action plans are outlined in the Addendum to this report (Appendix F), with intentional consideration of the practice behaviors and competencies that did not meet the benchmarks, (Table 13). We will continue to monitor their impact on the findings reported in 2014.

In the second layer of analysis related to meeting benchmark percentages (Table 8), it is interesting to note that the benchmark of 90% of graduates having a mean rating of 3.75 for each competency was met for only four competencies: A2.1.1 Identifying as a professional SW, n=111 (99.1%); A2.1.2 Applying SW ethical principles, n=108 (97.3%); A2.1.7 Applying knowledge of HBSE, n=103 (93.0%); and A2.1.10 Engagement, n=101 (91.0%). On the other hand 8 of the 13 competency means [competency 10 includes 4 measurements] met the benchmark challenge of having 75% of graduates with a mean of 4.0+. Those competencies that did not meet either benchmark challenge: A2.1.5 Advancing human rights and justice, n=64 (57.7%); A2.1.6 Engaging research-informed practice and practice-informed research, n=80 (72.1%); A2.1.8 Engaging in policy practice, n= 41 (37.0%); A2.1.9. Responding to contexts that shape practice, n=79 (71.2%); and A2 10 (d) Evaluation, n=69 (62.2%) are congruent with field instructor ratings that resulted in mean scores less than 4.0 (Table 12), with the exception that Responding to context that shape practice (A2.1.9) is slightly above 4.0.

Clearly there are consistencies in the findings across settings; however, it will take more experience with these measurement instruments and further opportunities to ‘drill down’ into the data to glean a better understanding of their meaning. While curriculum committees made changes to the curriculum that were based on 2011 findings with the new competency-based measurements, exiting students of last year would have included the first group of students who experienced these changes. Some of the graduates of 2013, however, would not have experienced
these curriculum changes and will be graduating this year. In the meantime, curriculum committees have reviewed these findings and implemented changes in the curriculum for 2013-2014, which will provide further opportunities for monitoring the implementation of a competency-based curriculum and measurement and evaluating the outcome of the next group of graduates.

### Table 8. Mean Scores on Curriculum Competencies: Graduating MSW Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Competency</th>
<th>Graduated 2012 (n = 118)</th>
<th>Graduated 2013 (n = 111)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (Standard deviation)</td>
<td>No. (%) above 3.75 <strong>90%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.1 Identifying as a professional SW</td>
<td>4.5 (.402)</td>
<td>109 (99.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.2 Applying SW ethical principles</td>
<td>4.37 (.54)</td>
<td>99 (90.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.3 Applying critical thinking</td>
<td>4.36 (.471)</td>
<td>100 (91.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.4 Engaging diversity</td>
<td>4.27 (.624)</td>
<td>85 (72.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.5 Advancing human rights and justice</td>
<td>3.86 (.773)</td>
<td>67 (60.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.6 Engaging research-informed practice and practice-informed research</td>
<td>4.1 (.717)</td>
<td>75 (68.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.7 Applying knowledge of HBSE</td>
<td>4.41 (.521)</td>
<td>97 (88.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.8 Engaging in policy practice</td>
<td>3.25 (1.18)</td>
<td>41 (37.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.9 Responding to contexts that shape practice</td>
<td>4.12 (.735)</td>
<td>80 (72.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 Engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation</td>
<td>4.32 (.576)</td>
<td>93 (84.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (a) Engagement</td>
<td>4.32 (.576)</td>
<td>93 (84.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (b) Assessment</td>
<td>4.287 (.590)</td>
<td>97 (88.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (c) Intervention</td>
<td>4.32 (.600)</td>
<td>95 (86.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (d) Evaluation</td>
<td>3.92 (.877)</td>
<td>70 (63.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. For some competencies, no mean scores were recorded between the 3.75 and 4.0 benchmarks, thus the number of students who scored above 4.0 was also identified in the number of students who scored 3.75+.  
** Benchmark and *** Benchmark Challenge.
Social Justice Measures
Four statements that reflect the MSW program’s commitment to Social Justice are addressed in the context of three relevant competencies: engaging diversity (one item); advancing human rights (two items), and engaging policy practice (one item). However, the ratings for these four questions are not included in the creation of the mean score for that competency. The mean scores for these social justice items are presented separately in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I practice informed by a social justice perspective</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand and can apply frameworks related to social justice, such as the NASW Code of Ethics.</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand and can apply frameworks related to social justice, such as relevant portions of Catholic Social Teaching</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to analyze policy from a social justice perspective and to advocate, when applicable.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of Social Justice Measures</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students were asked to what degree they meet a variety of social justice practice measures. As seen in Table 9, students give themselves the highest ratings on “I practice informed by a social justice perspective” at 4.53. On the item, “I understand and can apply frameworks related to social justice, such as the NASW Code of Ethics,” students’ mean score was 4.39. Interestingly, the social justice measure of “I am able to analyze policy from a social justice perspective and to advocate, when applicable,” had a mean score of 3.8, closer to the 2011 score. The mean score for, “I understand and can apply frameworks related to social justice, such as relevant portions of Catholic Social Teaching,” was 3.64, very similar to the previous two years of 2011 and 2012. While the assessment of practicing with a social justice perspective was high, the assessment of analyzing policy with a social justice perspective was less so, which may relate to the somewhat lower policy competency score. The MSW Program Committee may want to more carefully consider these distinctions when assessing the findings of the Exit Survey.

Exit Survey: 2013 Graduating Student Curriculum Competency Paired Comparisons

The Exit Survey of the Outcome Study attempts to measure students’ growth in the 49 practice behaviors that operationalize the 10 Advanced Clinical Competencies from the entry to the completion of the MSW program. Students rate their perception of themselves both retrospectively at entry into the program and currently at the time of their graduation. There are some limitations to this method. First, the retrospective measurement is taken post-hoc so it is subject to respondents’ recall. Second, self-reports such as this are based solely on respondents’
perspectives, rather than an external assessment of their performance. However, these reports do provide perspectives from the students about their growth as social workers. These self-reported ratings are supplemented by a comparison with students’ and field instructors’ ratings of practice behaviors in the context of field placements (See Tables 11 and 12) and other measures that are part of the overall assessment plan such as GPA and the completion of the Clinical Research Project (not included in this report).
As noted on Table 10, when students rated themselves at graduation, they reported significant growth as evidenced by statistically significant t-test results for all 10 competencies. Students reported growth reflected in practice behaviors to demonstrate increases in mean competency ratings from 1.75 points (Advancing human rights and social justice) to 2.41 points (Assessment). All comparisons resulted in a statistically significant difference between the beginning and end of the program at p < .01.
2013 Field Assessments and Comparisons to Exit Survey

Table 11 shows three assessments of Curriculum Competencies: Students’ assessment on the Exit Survey, Field Instructors’ final field evaluation, and Students’ final field self assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Competency</th>
<th>Exit Survey (n =111)</th>
<th>Field Instructor Assessment (n= 129)</th>
<th>Marked “N.A.” (n, %)</th>
<th>Field Student Self-Assessment (n= 129)</th>
<th>Marked “N.A.” (n, %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.1 Identifying as a professional SW**</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.2 Applying SW ethical principles *</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1 (.8%)</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1 (.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.3 Applying critical thinking*</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.4 Engaging diversity**</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 1.5 Advancing human rights and justice**</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>5 (3.9%)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>7 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.6 Engaging research-informed practice and practice-informed research*</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3 (2.3%)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.7 Applying knowledge of HBSE*</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1 (.8%)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1 (.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.8 Engaging in policy practice**</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>13 (10.1%)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>12 (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.9 Responding to contexts that shape practice**</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1 (.8%)</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 1.10 Engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (a) Engagement*</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (b) Assessment*</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3 (2.3%)</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>5 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (c) Intervention**</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1 (.8%)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1 (.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (d) Evaluation*</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>5 (3.9%)</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>6 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Difference between Field Instructor and student on mean competency scores statistically significant at p < .05  
** - Difference between Field Instructor and student on mean competency scores statistically significant at p < .001

Field Instructors tended to rate their students very well; only in four areas did field instructors rate their students with a mean competency score less than the challenge benchmark of 4.0: Advancing human rights (3.90), Engaging in Research-informed practice (3.96), Engaging in policy practice (3.71), and Evaluation with client systems (3.95).

Students, within their field context, evaluated themselves below 4.0 on five competencies: Advancing human rights (3.75), Engaging research-informed practice and practice-informed research (3.82), Engaging in policy practice (3.57), Responding to contexts that shape change
(3.89), and Evaluation with client systems (3.85). Students’ assessment of their competency in the field tends to be less than both the assessments of their field instructors and their assessments of their understanding in the curriculum context (except for Engaging in policy practice in which they assess themselves lower in the classroom than in the field). In no competency did field instructors overall rate students lower than students rated themselves in the field context.

A comparison between curriculum (learned in the classroom) and field (applied in practice) demonstrate that there are not wide variations in assessments of competencies among the three domains. The ratings do show a pattern. Overall, students rate themselves slightly higher in the classroom than they rate themselves or that their Field Instructors assess them in the field. For 10 of the 13 competencies measured, students rated themselves higher in the curricular assessment than their Field Instructor rated them in the field. Interestingly, for 12 of the 13 competencies (in essence there are 13 competencies as Competency 10 is broken into four sections), students rated themselves higher in the curricular survey, than in their assessment of the same competencies when applied in the field. The noticeable exception, however, are those competencies in which students’ scores on the curriculum survey were lowest already: A2.1.4, Advancing Human Rights and Justice, A2.1.8, Engaging in Policy Practice, A2.1.10d, Evaluation. Among these three competencies, Field Instructors rated students higher in field than student did in the curricular assessments. For A2.1.8, Engaging in Policy Practice, students rated themselves higher in the field than in the classroom. It is not certain what these distinctions mean, although it is noteworthy that these differences are only distinguishable in those competencies that are below the challenge benchmark of 4.0.

All differences, are statistically significant at $p < .05$, and a number of them are statistically significant at $p < .001$ (See Table 11).

It is important to note that the large number of “Not Applicable” marks in field assessments in 2012 have decreased dramatically in 2013 by both the supervisor and students. There has been a decline in the use of “N.A” by field instructors in the competencies of “Advancing Human Rights and Social Justice” (from 12% to 3.9%), “Engaging in Research-Informed Practice and Practice-Informed Research” (from 17% to 2.3%), “Engaging in Policy Practice” (from 33% to 10.1%), and “Evaluation of Client Systems” (from 16% to 3.9%). These are notable changes in the use of N.A. which demonstrate that the efforts of the Field Curriculum Committee in educating Field Faculty during the Field Instructor Training Series (FITS), in field newsletter (Field Matters), and in conversations during field seminar and site visits have made a difference in the use of N.A.s. The one competency which still has a fairly notable N.A. proportion is “Engaging in Policy Practice” with 10.1% of Field Instructors selecting this.
## 2013 Field Assessments and Comparisons to Exit Survey

### Multiple Measures of Competencies of Students Graduating in 2012 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Assessments</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate 2012 n = 118 (before)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 2012 n = 118 (after)*</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructors' Field Assessment (n = 124)</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Field Assessment</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Assessments</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate 2013 n = 111 (before)</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 2013 n = 111 (after)*</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructors' Field Assessment (n = 129)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Field Assessment</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12. Multiple Measures of Competencies of Graduating Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.1</strong> Identifying as a professional SW</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.2</strong> Applying SW ethical principles</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.3</strong> Applying critical thinking</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.4</strong> Engaging diversity</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.5</strong> Advancing human rights and justice</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.6</strong> Engaging research-informed practice and practice-informed research</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.7</strong> Applying knowledge of HBSE</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.8</strong> Engaging in policy practice</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.9</strong> Responding to contexts that shape practice</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.10</strong> Engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.10 (a)</strong> Engagement</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.10 (b)</strong> Assessment</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.10 (c)</strong> Intervention</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2.1.10 (d)</strong> Evaluation</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 presents four assessments that evaluate the degree to which competencies were reached for advanced clinical social work practice for students graduating in 2012 and 2013. In addition to assessments of students in their exit survey and field (by student and Field Instructor), this table presents their estimation of their mean attainment of the competencies at entry.

**Competencies Below Benchmark and Challenge Benchmark: Practice Behavior Scores**

The Competency 2.1.8 Engage in Policy Practice to Advance Social and Economic Well-being and to Deliver Effective Social Work Services is below the benchmark for the program in all arenas of student evaluation: classroom self-rating, Field Instructor rating, and student in field rating. To further understand these scores, the specific practice behavior means are presented in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13. Practice Behavior Detail of Competencies below Benchmark and below Challenge Benchmark</th>
<th>Mean Score Exit Survey</th>
<th>Mean Score Field Instructor</th>
<th>Mean Score Student in Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8. Engaging in Policy Practice</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8a Communicate to stakeholders the implication of policies and policy change in the lives of clients</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8b Use evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence to analyze, formulate and advocate for policies and programs that advance social and economic well-being</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8c Advocate with and inform administrators and legislators to influence policies that impact clients and services</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5 Advancing Human Rights and Justice</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5a I use knowledge of the effects of oppression, discrimination, and historical trauma on client and client systems to guide treatment planning and intervention</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5b I advocate at multiple levels for policy change that improves the overall mental health of clients and communities</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.10(d) Evaluation</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.10(d)a Contribute to the theoretical knowledge base of the social work profession through practice</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.10(10)b Use clinical evaluation of the process and/or outcomes to develop best practice interventions for a range of bio-psycho-social-spiritual conditions</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 demonstrates that certain practice behaviors within each of these competencies fare worse than others. For example, in 2.1.8 Engaging in Policy Practice competency, the practice behavior, “Advocate with and inform administrators and legislators to influence policies that impact clients and services,” is well below the benchmark of 3.75 with a score of 3.25 for students’ assessment of themselves within the Exit Survey. This is also the lowest practice behavior score within this competency for both Field Instructors (3.63) and Students in Field.
All other practice behaviors for this competency are below the benchmark scores in all but one point of measurement (Field Instructors’ assessment of 2.1.8b).

With regard to 2.1.5 Advancing Human Rights and Justice, while this competency is above the benchmark (3.88), it is one of the few below the challenge benchmark. Table 14 demonstrates that the practice behavior, “I advocate at multiple levels for policy change that improves the overall mental health of clients and communities,” is well below its other practice behavior with scores of 3.54, 3.69, and 3.48 among exit survey scores, Field Instructors, and students in field, respectively.

The Competency 2.1.10(d), which is below the challenge benchmark at 3.91, also has one practice behavior which is below the program benchmark. This practice behavior is “Contribute to the theoretical knowledge base through practice,” received scores of 3.74, 3.84, 3.74 from exit survey scores, Field Instructors, and students in field, respectively.

These competencies and practice behaviors appear to be the ones that the MSW Program faculty should target when considering curricular changes for the following year.

**Weekend Cohort and Weekday/Evening Mean Student Competencies**

The MSW faculty and the CSWE Accreditation Report both recommended that further attention be paid to assessing whether there are any differences in educational outcomes for those students in the Weekend Cohort track and the Weekday track. Table 14 presents this comparison with mean competency scores for students who are in any version of the Weekend Cohort Program (Advanced Standing 3-year and Regular standing 4-year) to those in any version of the Weekday Program (including all advanced standing and regular standing options).
Table 14. Comparison between Weekend Cohort and Weekday/Evening Mean Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Weekend Cohort n=19</th>
<th>Weekday n=91</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.1 Identifying as a professional SW</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.2 Applying SW ethical principles **</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.3 Applying critical thinking</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.4 Engaging diversity</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.5 Advancing human rights and justice</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.6 Engaging research-informed practice and practice-informed research</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.7 Applying knowledge of HBSE</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.8 Engaging in policy practice</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.9 Responding to contexts that shape practice</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 Engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (a) Engagement</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (b) Assessment</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (c) Intervention</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (d) Evaluation</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .05, ** = p < .001

Table 14 demonstrates that means scores appear to be quite similar to one another between the weekend cohort and weekday programs. Only one competency demonstrated a statistically significant difference between the mean scores for the 2.1.2 competency of applying social work ethical principles (p < .001). In this instance, the weekend cohort group’s mean score was higher than that of the weekday group. While the difference was not great (.29), it was evident and consistent enough to become statistically significant. The other competencies in which the weekend cohort’s mean scores were somewhat higher than the weekday cohort were 2.1.1 identifying as a professional social worker (4.71 to 4.65, respectively) and 2.1.9 Responding to contexts that shape practice (4.35 to 4.25, respectively).

Many competencies’ mean scores between the two groups were remarkably similar to one another. Scores which were different by 0.2 or less included: 2.1.4 Engaging diversity, 2.1.7 Applying knowledge of HBSE, 2.1.10a Engagement, and 2.1.10d Evaluation.

Those competencies in which Weekday students had a mean score of .3 or more higher on a competency than the weekend cohort students included: 2.1.3 Applying critical thinking (4.75 to 4.46, respectively), 2.1.5 Advancing human rights and justice (3.90 to 3.76, respectively), 2.1.6 Engaging research-informed practice and practice-informed research (4.1 to 3.95, respectively), 2.1.8 Engaging in policy practice (3.41 to 3.37, respectively), 2.1.10b Assessment (4.47 to 4.34, respectively), and 2.1.10c Intervention (4.41 to 4.30, respectively). It is important to note the great difference in sample size between the weekend cohort (n=19) and the weekday group (n=91). Due
to the small sample of the weekend cohort, it is hard to determine statistically significant differences that might be apparent if there were a larger sample.

Based on the means scores of the sample above, it appears that overall educational competency scores were quite similar with one another. However, due to the small sample size of the weekend cohort, note should be taken of some of the differences that were not large, but may be indicating distinctions between the two groups. It is also interesting to note that the weekday mean scores were more often higher (although not by much), than those of the weekend cohort.

A grade point comparison was also conducted between the Weekend Cohort Students and the Weekday/Evening students. The grade point averages between these two groups are remarkably similar: Weekend Cohort students had a grade point average of 3.778, compared to the Weekday/Evening students who have a combined grade point average of 3.776. The difference of .002 between these groups is not statistically significant (p = .958).

**Advanced Standing 1-Year and More Year Program Options**

Another area of interest to the MSW Faculty is the educational outcomes of 1-year Advanced Standing students and students in programs that extend past one year. Faculty have expressed interest in determining whether the rigorous and fast pace of the 1-year program might affect their educational outcomes.

| Table 15. Comparison of Advanced Standing 1-year Program and 2-year and More Program Mean Competencies |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                               | 2013                        | 2014                        |                                                               |
|                                                               | AS 1-Year 2 or More Year  | AS 1-Year 2 or More Year  |
|                                                               | n=18  | n = 92                      |                                                               |
| A2.1.1 Identifying as a professional SW                       | 4.68  | 4.66  |                                                               |
| A2.1.2 Applying SW ethical principles                         | 4.47  | 4.52  |                                                               |
| A2.1.3 Applying critical thinking                             | 4.54  | 4.37  |                                                               |
| A2.1.4 Engaging diversity                                     | 4.41  | 4.25  |                                                               |
| A2.1.5 Advancing human rights and justice                     | 4.03  | 3.85  |                                                               |
| A2.1.6 Engaging research-informed practice and practice-informed research  | 4.35  | 4.02  |                                                               |
| A2.1.7 Applying knowledge of HBSE*                            | 4.74  | 4.47  |                                                               |
| A2.1.8 Engaging in policy practice                            | 3.72  | 3.34  |                                                               |
| A2.1.9 Responding to contexts that shape practice             | 4.52  | 4.22  |                                                               |
| A2.1.10 Engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation  |       |      |                                                               |
| A2.1.10 (a) Engagement*                                       | 4.65  | 4.42  |                                                               |
| A2.1.10 (b) Assessment*                                       | 4.71  | 4.39  |                                                               |
| A2.1.10 (c) Intervention*                                     | 4.64  | 4.35  |                                                               |
| A2.1.10 (d) Evaluation                                        | 4.22  | 3.84  |                                                               |

* = p < .05, ** = p < .001
Table 15 presents a comparison of the mean competency scores between AS-1 students (n = 18) and students who are in the program for two years or more (n=92). This comparison demonstrates that for all but one competency (2.1.2 Applying social work ethical principles) that the AS-1 group has somewhat higher scores than the rest of students, all of whom are in a program that consists of two years or more. In fact there are four principles in which there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups, and in all cases, the 1-year Advanced Standing student group is higher: 2.1.7 Applying knowledge of HBSE, 2.1.10a Engagement, 2.1.10b Assessment, 2.1.10c Intervention.

These scores indicate that although students take all classes within one year, they assess themselves as doing well on nearly all competencies. In fact, in all but one competency (2.1.8 Engaging in policy practice), students assessed themselves as meeting not only the benchmark, but also the challenge benchmark of 4.0. This may reflect the fact that all of these students come to the program with a BSW and may feel a sense of some competency in these areas already.

A grade point comparison was also conducted between the AS-1 students and all other students (all of whom are in the program for more than one year). The grade point averages between these two groups are remarkably similar: AS-1 students have a grade point average of 3.75, compared to all other students who have a combined grade point average of 3.78. The difference of .03 between these groups is not statistically significant (p = .431).
Benchmark Progress across Exit Survey, Fieldwork Instructor, and Student in Field

One of the strengths of the School’s assessment plan is the multiple measures from different perspectives. Table 16 presents a comparison of benchmark achievement across the perspectives of the students’ exit survey, fieldwork instructors, and students’ assessment of themselves in field.

Table 16. Benchmark Progress across Exit Survey, Fieldwork Instructor, and Student in Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Student Exit Survey (n = 111)</th>
<th>Fieldwork Instructor (n = 129)</th>
<th>Student in Field (n = 129)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. (%) above 3.75</td>
<td>No. (%) above 4.0</td>
<td>No. (%) above 3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>75%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.1 Identifying as a professional SW</td>
<td>110 (99.1)</td>
<td>107 (96.4)</td>
<td>120 (93.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.2 Applying SW ethical principles</td>
<td>108 (97.3)</td>
<td>103 (92.8)</td>
<td>112 (86.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.3 Applying critical thinking</td>
<td>99 (89.2)</td>
<td>94 (84.7)</td>
<td>104 (80.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.4 Engaging diversity</td>
<td>88 (79.3)</td>
<td>88 (79.3)</td>
<td>102 (80.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.5 Advancing human rights and justice</td>
<td>64 (57.7)</td>
<td>64 (57.7)</td>
<td>69 (55.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.6 Engaging research-informed practice</td>
<td>80 (72.1)</td>
<td>80 (72.1)</td>
<td>74 (58.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.7 Applying knowledge of HBSE</td>
<td>103 (93.0)</td>
<td>103 (93.0)</td>
<td>94 (70.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.8 Engaging in policy practice</td>
<td>41 (37.0)</td>
<td>41 (37.0)</td>
<td>50 (43.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.9 Responding to contexts that shape practice</td>
<td>79 (71.2)</td>
<td>79 (71.2)</td>
<td>83 (64.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 Engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (a) Engagement</td>
<td>93 (84.5)</td>
<td>93 (84.5)</td>
<td>95 (73.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (b) Assessment</td>
<td>97 (88.2)</td>
<td>84 (76.3)</td>
<td>100 (77.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (c) Intervention</td>
<td>95 (86.4)</td>
<td>90 (81.8)</td>
<td>108 (83.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1.10 (d) Evaluation</td>
<td>70 (63.6)</td>
<td>70 (63.6)</td>
<td>77 (62.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. For Fieldwork Instructors and Students in Field, numbers responding varies per competency based upon whether N.A. was selected. Similar respondent numbers may result in different percentages among competencies.

Table 16 demonstrates the percentage of students who met the benchmark and challenge benchmark for each competency among three different data collection perspectives: the exit survey, the fieldwork instructor, and the student in field. In terms of meeting the benchmark of 3.75 for 90% of students, it is interesting to see that this is more difficult to do than it might
appear. For students in the exit survey, only in three competencies did students meet the benchmark (Competency 1: Identifying as a professional social worker; Competency 2: Applying social work ethical principles; and. Competency 4: Applying knowledge of HBSE). Among Fieldwork Instructors’ scores, students reached the 90% above 3.75 benchmark for only the first competency, which is the same for students in field self-assessments too.

Exit Survey 2013 Graduating Student Program Satisfaction

Students were asked about their satisfaction of many aspects of their MSW education. Table 17 presents students’ appraisals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17. Students’ Satisfaction with Aspects of MSW Education, 2013 (n =111)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Satisfied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum Experience(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of my social work identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of peer relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of professional relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program format (weekend/evening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class time offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship, grant, and assistantship opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW Information Session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Not all percentages add up to 100% due to missing data

Overall, students were satisfied with their MSW Program experience. Areas that students seemed particularly satisfied with (over 90% satisfied or very satisfied), included development of social work identity (94.9%), program format (94.6%), coursework (91.9%), practicum experiences (91.9%), faculty (90.1%), development of professional relationships (90.1%), and development of peer relationships/networks (90.0%). Areas in which students were still fairly satisfied (80% or more) included: the MSW information sessions (88.3%), class time offerings (82.9%), and student support services (81.1%). It is important to note that these aspects of the MSW Education scored well last year, but for each of them, they scored somewhat higher this year.

Finally students designated two areas where they were less than 80% satisfied with the program. Of the exiting students who completed the survey, 73.0% stated they were satisfied or very satisfied with advising; no analysis of whether these students used their advisor is possible, and it should be noted that students are often referred to their advisor, or contacted by their advisor when there are problems – personal, interpersonal, or academic, that have been identified by faculty. It is interesting to note that the percentage of students who were satisfied with advising has increased from 55.1% in 2012 to 73.0%. This is a marked improvement. Assessment of
access to grants, scholarships and assistantships fared the worst: only 42.3% of students were satisfied or very satisfied with this, while 52.2% were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with this aspect of the MSW Program; this may be a reflection of the preponderance of financial aid based on student loans and limited resources for grants and scholarships. Here again, it is interesting to note that this percentage went up considerably, too, from the 2012 from 22.0% of students being satisfied to 42.3% of students. It may be that student assistantships should be separated from this category, since they are funded through different means than grants and scholarships, and they are based on student initiative for employment, rather than on merit awards.

Exiting Students: Involvement in School Activities

Table 18 lists student feedback about a variety of activities offered at the School of Social Work. Students were asked to indicate those activities in which they had participated. They could select as many options as were relevant.

| Table 18. Student Involvement in School Activities for Exiting Students (n =111) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Activity                                           | 2011 (n, %) | 2012 (n, %) | 2013 (n, %) |
| MSW Orientation                                     | 38 (45.2%)  | 63 (53.4%)  | 62 (55.9%)  |
| Licensure Preparation Workshop                      | 23 (27.4%)  | 42 (35.6%)  | 46 (41.4%)  |
| Day at the Capitol                                  | 24 (28.6%)  | 37 (31.4%)  | 40 (36%)    |
| SSW Scholarships                                    | 13 (15.5%)  | 21 (17.8%)  | 18 (16.2%)  |
| Institutes                                          | 13 (15.5%)  | 19 (16.1%)  | 19 (17.1%)  |
| Research Refreshers                                 | 21 (25.0%)  | 18 (15.3%)  | 16 (14.4%)  |
| Room at the Table                                   | 9 (10.7%)   | 12 (10.2%)  | 8 (7.2%)    |
| MSW Diversity Forum                                 | 7 (8.3%)    | 7 (5.9%)    | 3 (2.7%)    |
| Salons                                             | 14 (16.7%)  | 6 (5.1%)    | 2 (1.8%)    |
| MSW Student Association                             | 4 (4.8%)    | 6 (5.1%)    | 9 (8.1%)    |
| Justice Lecture                                     | 10 (11.9%)  | 5 (4.2%)    | 11 (9.9%)   |
| Area of Emphasis in Aging                          | 6 (7.1%)    | 3 (2.5%)    | 6 (5.4%)    |
| Service Projects                                    | 3 (3.6%)    | 3 (2.5%)    | 4 (3.6%)    |
| DSWAP                                               | 2 (2.4%)    | 2 (1.7%)    | 2 (1.8%)    |
| Other                                               | 4 (4.8%)    | 2 (1.6%)    | 7 (6.3%)    |

The most commonly noted activity was the MSW Orientation (55.9%), which entering students are strongly encouraged to attend. Other School of Social Work and MSW program activities reported were: the Licensure Preparation Workshop (41.4%), Day at the Capitol (36.0%), Institutes (17.1%), School Scholarships (16.2%), Research Refreshers (14.4%), the Justice Lecture (9.9%), MSW Student Association (8.1%), Room at the Table (7.2%), Area of Emphasis in Aging (5.4%), Service Projects (3.6%), Salons (1.8%), and DSWAP (1.8%). It is important to note that the MSW Diversity Forum is no longer in existence and will be deleted from the “School Activities” involvement list in the 2014 Exit Survey. The Salons have undergone some change in that they were not open to students in 2012-13 academic year and were presented to faculty as part of the Full-time Faculty Meetings. This format is being reconsidered in the 2013-2014 academic year.
While the percentage of students who were involved in the MSW Association increased from 5.1% in 2012 to 8.1% in 2013, this is still a low participation rate given that it is an organization to which all MSW students automatically belong. Similarly, service projects were sparsely attended by the respondents (3.6%). Perhaps it is telling that when asked to comment on the statement that the School encourages participation in these activities, 14.4% stated that they strongly agreed, 39.6% stated that they agreed, 38.7% stated that they somewhat agreed, 3.6% stated they disagreed, and 0.9% stated that they strongly disagreed. It could be that the school could do more communication about available opportunities and activities.

Table 18 displays some shifting in the involvement in certain school activities from 2011 through 2013. Activities that show increased involvement over time include the MSW Orientation (from 45.2% to 55.9%) and the Licensure Preparation Workshop (from 27.4% to 41.1%). Other activities in which reported student involvement grew include Day at the Capitol, and Institutes. Areas in which there is a trend of less student participation from 2011 to 2013 include the Research Refresher, Room at the Table, and Salons. Again, the Salon format is being reconsidered for the 2013-14 academic year.

Supports Received While at the School

Table 19 presents many of the supports offered to students in the MSW Program and exiting students’ reports about those they have used while at the School of Social Work.

| Table 19. Graduating Students' Reports on Supports Used during MSW Program |
|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                 | 2011    | 2012    | 2013 n = 11 | 2014    |
|                 | (n, %)  | (n, %)  | (n, %)     |         |
| Informal Consult with Faculty | 50 (59.5%) | 69 (58.5%) | 75 (67.6%) |         |
| Advising        | 26 (31%) | 25 (21.2%) | 41 (36.9%) |         |
| Faculty Recommendations/References | 24 (28.6%) | 45 (38.1%) | 44 (39.6%) |         |
| Scholarships    | 17 (20.2%) | 23 (19.5%) | 25 (22.5%) |         |
| Writing Assistance | 7 (8.3%) | 10 (8.5%) | 14 (12.6%) |         |
| Research Tutoring | 3 (3.6%) | 10 (8.5%) | 16 (14.4%) |         |
| Disability Services | 3 (3.6%) | 2 (1.7%) | 2 (1.8%) |         |
| None            | 11 (13.1%) | 15 (12.7%) | 9 (8.1%) |         |
| Other           | 8 (9.5%) | 3 (2.5%) | 3 (2.7%) |         |

Exiting students reported that they engaged in informal consultation with faculty (67.6%), at almost two times the rate of advising (36.9%). The use of faculty recommendations or references was also fairly common with 39.6% stating they were supported this way. School scholarships were used by nearly one-fifth of the respondents (22.5%). Both writing assistance (12.6%) and research tutoring (14.4%) were used somewhat by respondents, while disability services had been a source of support for 1.8% of students. Nearly 3% (2.7%) indicated they had used some other service and only 8.1% of students had not accessed any of the services available. Overall, then, most students (91.9%) are accessing some supports available while at the School.
Students’ Opinions of the School’s Approach to Issues of Diversity and Social Justice

Students were asked to what degree they believed the School addressed issues of diversity and social justice. Table 20 presents their opinions. Some students indicated that they somewhat agreed that they felt pressure to fit in at the School of Social Work. While only 5.4% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, 18.9% somewhat agreed. Nearly 73% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

| Table 20. Students’ Opinions of School’s Approach to Issues of Diversity and Social Justice (n =111) |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Somewhat Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Pressure to fit in at School | 2 (1.8%) | 4 (3.6%) | 22 (19.8%) | 59 (53.2%) | 21 (18.9%) |
| School encourages open discussion about difference | 33 (29.7%) | 49 (44.1%) | 21 (18.9%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (4.5%) |
| Encouraged to speak up about diversity issues important to me | 33 (29.7%) | 55 (49.5%) | 16 (14.4%) | 4 (3.6%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| School responds effectively to discrimination and harassment in School | 19 (17.1%) | 64 (57.7%) | 16 (14.4%) | 1 (0.9%) | 1 (0.9%) |
| School demonstrates commitment to social justice | 52 (46.8%) | 46 (41.1%) | 9 (8.1%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.9%) |

When asked whether the School encourages open discussion about difference, 73.8% stated they agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (this is a considerable increase from 51.8% in 2012). About a fifth of the students (18.9%) stated that they somewhat agreed with this statement, while 4.5% stated they strongly disagreed with this statement. A similar pattern emerged in terms of feeling encouraged to speak up about diversity issues that are important to them: 79.2% of students agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, 14.4% somewhat agreed, and 3.6% stated that they disagreed.

When asked whether the School responds effectively to discrimination and harassment, 74.8% agreed or strongly agreed, 14.4% somewhat agreed, and 1.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This is a considerable improvement from 2012 when only 56% of students agreed or disagreed with this statement. However, compared to the previous items on discussion on difference and diversity, fewer students responded with “strongly agree.”

For all measures discussed, the proportion of students who disagree or strongly disagree with the School’s approach to issues of diversity and social justice is small, ranging from 0.9% - 4.5%. In terms of the School’s demonstration of a commitment to Social Justice, 87.9% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this. A total of 8.1% somewhat agreed with this idea, while only 0.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This is quite an increase from 2012 when only 67%
agreed or strongly agreed that the School of social work demonstrates a commitment to social justice.

**Students’ Comfort in Discussing Topics of Difference**

Table 21 displays students’ responses about their level of comfort with discussions about various topics of difference. In terms of comfort in talking about sexuality, 72.1% of students felt comfortable, 14.4% felt somewhat comfortable, and 5.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed that they felt comfortable discussing sexuality. A total of 73.7% of respondents felt they were comfortable talking about race and ethnicity, 12.7% felt somewhat so, and 5% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>39 (35.1%)</td>
<td>51 (45.9%)</td>
<td>13 (11.7%)</td>
<td>5 (4.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td>42 (37.8%)</td>
<td>55 (49.5%)</td>
<td>9 (8.1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Spirituality</td>
<td>37 (33.3%)</td>
<td>47 (42.3%)</td>
<td>17 (15.3%)</td>
<td>5 (4.5%)</td>
<td>2 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Ability</td>
<td>42 (37.8%)</td>
<td>57 (51.4%)</td>
<td>7 (6.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td>46 (41.4%)</td>
<td>53 (47.7%)</td>
<td>6 (5.4%)</td>
<td>2 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1 (.09%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to comfort in discussing religion and spirituality, 75.6% agreed or strongly agreed, 11.7% somewhat agreed, and 4.5% disagreed. In terms of race and ethnicity, 87.3% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable talking about that topic. A little more than 8% were somewhat comfortable, and only 0.9% disagreed that they felt comfortable bringing up the topic. When asked about their comfort discussing physical ability, 89.2% agreed or strongly agreed, 6.3% somewhat agreed, and 0.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed. A total of 89.1% agreed or strongly agreed that they felt comfortable discussing social class, 5.4% somewhat agreed, and 2.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Overall, students seem to be fairly comfortable discussing various topics of difference in the School and in classes. One aspect that changed somewhat from 2012 is the discussion of religion and spirituality which increased from 60.2% of respondents in 2012 to 75.6% in 2013.

**School’s Demonstration of Commitment to Diversity**

Students were asked about the School of Social Work’s demonstration of a commitment to diversity. When asked whether the School demonstrated commitment to diversity through the curriculum, 74.7% agreed or strongly agreed, 13.5% somewhat agreed, and 8.1% disagreed or strongly agreed (see Table 22). With regard to field education, 86.4% agreed or strongly agreed that it demonstrated a commitment to diversity. A total of 9.9% somewhat agreed with this statement, and 0.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this.
Table 22. School’s Demonstration of Commitment to Diversity (n = 111)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>31 (27.9%)</td>
<td>52 (46.8%)</td>
<td>15 (13.5%)</td>
<td>8 (7.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Education</td>
<td>43 (38.7%)</td>
<td>57 (47.7%)</td>
<td>11 (9.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>32 (28.8%)</td>
<td>48 (43.2%)</td>
<td>20 (18.0%)</td>
<td>7 (6.3%)</td>
<td>1 (.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and</td>
<td>26 (23.4%)</td>
<td>51 (45.9%)</td>
<td>19 (17.1%)</td>
<td>9 (8.1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exactly 72% of students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the School demonstrated a commitment to diversity through its faculty. A total of 18.0% somewhat agreed and 7.2% disagreed or strongly disagreed. When asked if the administration and staff demonstrated a commitment to diversity, 69.3% agreed or strongly agreed, 17.1% somewhat agreed, and 9.0% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

Overall, students report that the School as doing a fairly good job in its commitment to diversity, especially in its Field Education. However, in terms of curriculum, faculty, and administration and staff there is room for improvement in that about three-quarters of students believed the school demonstrated commitment to diversity through these. Even though there is room for improvement, these scores are slightly higher than those of 2012, especially with regard to Field Education which increased from 69.5% to 86.4% in agreement from students on commitment to diversity. Also, agreement that faculty demonstrated commitment also increased from 55.9% to 72%.

**Students’ Perceptions of Being Treated with Respect**

Table 23 presents students’ perceptions of being treated with respect by faculty, administration and staff, and fellow students.

Table 23. Students’ Perceptions of Being Treated with Respect (n = 111)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>70 (63.1%)</td>
<td>31 (27.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (5.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and</td>
<td>58 (52.3%)</td>
<td>36 (32.4%)</td>
<td>10 (9.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (3.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow Students</td>
<td>69 (62.2%)</td>
<td>34 (30.6%)</td>
<td>4 (3.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked whether students were treated with respect by faculty, 90.0% agreed or strongly agreed and 5.4% disagreed. Students also believed that administration and staff treated them with respect: 84.7% agreed or strongly agreed, 9.0% somewhat agreed, and 1.8% disagreed. Students also assessed fellow students as treating them with respect: 92.8% agreed or strongly agreed, 4.3% somewhat agreed, and 0.9% disagreed. Overall, students tended to agree that all three groups treated them with respect.
Students’ Comfort in Contacting School Representatives regarding Concerns

To further understand the degree of support students feel in the program, students were asked to what degree they were comfortable contacting different representatives of the School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>55 (49.5%)</td>
<td>37 (33.3%)</td>
<td>11 (9.9%)</td>
<td>3 (2.7%)</td>
<td>2 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors</td>
<td>39 (35.1%)</td>
<td>32 (28.8%)</td>
<td>17 (15.3%)</td>
<td>14 (12.6%)</td>
<td>6 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>30 (27.0%)</td>
<td>22 (19.8%)</td>
<td>34 (30.6%)</td>
<td>14 (12.6%)</td>
<td>7 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students reported that they felt comfortable contacting faculty with concerns (see Table 24). A total of 82.8% stated they agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable contacting faculty with concerns, 9.9% stated they somewhat agreed, and 4.5% disagreed. This is a fairly positive result, and demonstrates an increase from 72.1% agreement in 2012. Only two indicated strong disagreement. Advisors were not rated as highly as faculty: 63.9% of students agreed or strongly agreed that they felt comfortable contacting advisors with concerns (also an increase from 2012 with 46.7%), 15.3% somewhat agreed with this, and 18.0% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this. Students were the least comfortable contacting administration regarding concerns. Only 46.8% agreed that they felt comfortable contacting administration, 30.6% somewhat agreed, and 19.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This improved a little from last year (where only 42.4% felt comfortable contacting administration), but could be improved. It could be that these proportions represent the degree of natural exposure students have to these groups; students get to know their professors well in weekly classes and some of these professors are their advisors. Students have least natural contact with administration.

The program has improved with regard to students’ impressions of feeling comfortable contacting all representatives of the School of Social Work. However, while both advisors and administration received scores that were higher than those in 2012, they are still rather low. The role of advisor is important in that it is a contact separate from the roles of student-teacher and student-administrator wherein objective and independent consultation can occur. Information, direction, support, and problem solving are roles that the advisor could play. It may be that many students have little need for this type of interaction with an advisor as their academic program experience is unproblematic. Similarly, it could be for administration that the need to contact administration directly is only in case of concern, and therefore the lack of comfort in contacting administration may reflect the feeling of not having to contact them as their experience is going well. In any event, the MSW Program may want to look more closely at these numbers and see how they might proceed given these numbers.

Both the categories of comfort in contacting faculty and administration should be considered more carefully to improve these impressions.
Employment Prospects at Graduation

Table 25 shows that nearly 40% of respondents stated that they currently had a job in social work that they intended to keep (13.5%), have or have been offered a job at their field site (15.3%), or have or have been offered a job in social work someplace else (10.8%). Of the remaining respondents, 47.7% stated they were currently seeking a job in social work and 11.7% stated they have some other arrangements. Overall, these numbers are similar to those of last year.

Of those students who have a job or a job offer (n = 44), 70.5% reported that the focus of the job was therapy or counseling. Case management was the focus of this job for 45.5% (n=20) of jobs and 25% (n=11) reported that there was some other focus. Percentages are higher than 100% as respondents could check up to three responses to this item. These are by far the most common responses. It is interesting that mental health counseling was so prominent compared to last year (when only 47.7% of respondents said it was a focus). A drop in case management from 61.4% (2012) to 45.5% (2013) was noted, as well as supervision from 9.1% to 2.3%. The fewest respondents responded that they would be involved in management /administration. The number of “other” responses (25%) show that of these 44 students, a fair number (n=11) have a variety of focuses in their jobs, including assessment work, hospital social work, school social work and work with persons in residential settings.
Table 25. Students’ Employment after Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Situation at Graduation</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a job in social work I intend to keep</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have or have been offered a job at field placement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have or have been offered a social work job not at field placement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently seeking a job in social work</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Focus of Current Job or Job Offered*                                                        | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| (n)                                          | (%)  | (n)  | (%)  |
| Therapy/Counseling                          | 21   | 49   | 21   | 47.7 | 31   | 70.5 |
| Case Management                             | 19   | 44   | 27   | 61.4 | 20   | 45.5 |
| Practice and Program Evaluation             | 1    | 2    | 3    | 6.8  | 1    | 2.3  |
| Supervision                                 | 3    | 7    | 4    | 9.1  | 1    | 2.3  |
| Management/Administration                   | 4    | 9.3  | 2    | 4.5  | 2    | 4.6  |
| Advocacy/Policy Development                 | 3    | 7    | 3    | 6.8  | 1    | 2.3  |
| Other                                       | 9    | 20.9 | 17   | 38.6 | 11   | 25   |

| Services Provided at Current Job or Job Offered*                                             | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| (n)                                          | (%)  | (n)  | (%)  |
| Administration                               | 7    | 16.3 | 2    | 4.5  | 3    | 6.8  |
| Aging Services                               | 5    | 11.6 | 12   | 27.3 | 5    | 11.4 |
| Alcohol/drug/substance abuse counseling       | 10   | 23.3 | 14   | 31.8 | 16   | 36.4 |
| Child welfare                                | 9    | 20.9 | 8    | 18.2 | 6    | 13.6 |
| Community planning                           | 3    | 7    | 1    | 2.3  | 3    | 6.8  |
| Corrections/ Criminal justice                 | 1    | 2    | 3    | 6.8  | 4    | 9.1  |
| Developmental Disabilities                   | 6    | 14   | 6    | 13.6 | 6    | 13.6 |
| Domestic Abuse                               | 3    | 7    | 4    | 9.1  | 4    | 9.1  |
| Crisis Intervention                          | 15   | 34.9 | 30   | 68.2 | 25   | 56.8 |
| Family Services                              | 17   | 39.5 | 18   | 40.9 | 23   | 52.3 |
| Group Services                               | 13   | 30.2 | 14   | 31.8 | 17   | 38.6 |
| Health                                      | 12   | 27.9 | 14   | 31.8 | 17   | 38.6 |
| Housing                                     | 8    | 18.6 | 10   | 22.7 | 10   | 25.0 |
| International                               | 1    | 2    | 1    | 2.3  | 0    | 0    |
| Mental Health                               | 26   | 60.5 | 41   | 93.2 | 43   | 97.7 |
| Program Evaluation                          | 3    | 7    | 5    | 11.4 | 0    | 0    |
| Public Assistance                            | 1    | 2    | 6    | 13.6 | 8    | 18.2 |
| Occupational Rehabilitation                 | 1    | 2    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| School Social Work                           | 2    | 4.7  | 1    | 2.3  | 3    | 6.8  |
| Social Policy                                | 0    | 0    | 2    | 4.5  | 2    | 4.5  |

Note: * = More than one possible answer was allowed: Up to three for the focus of work and five for services they will provide.

These 44 respondents were also asked about the services they will provide in their current or future job and were allowed to check up to five options. The most prominent response was mental health with 97.7% (n=43) indicating this area of practice. Crisis Intervention (56.8%, n=25) was also very common with more than two-thirds of responding students. Family Services were selected by 52.3% (n=23) of respondents, while Group Services, Health, and Alcohol/drug/substance abuse counseling were next most common with more than a third of the responses apiece. Housing (25%, n=10), Public Assistance (18.2%, n=8), child welfare and
developmental disabilities (13.6%, n=6), and Aging Services (11.6%, n=5) all had fairly common responses. The rest of the services provided in current or offered jobs are listed in Table 25.

Exit Survey: Students’ Five-Year Career Plans

Students were asked about the plans for their career in five years and about the areas of practice in which they hope to work at that point. Students selected as many options as they thought were applicable. Table 26 shows that the vast majority of students (87.4%) wanted to be providing therapy or counseling in five years. A total of 47.7% believed they would be engaged in supervision. A total of 43.2% believed they would be providing case management, and 30.6% thought they would be involved in advocacy and policy development. Management or administration involvement increased somewhat from 2012, climbing from 16.1% to 23.4%. Another increase was apparent in practice and program evaluation from 11.9% in 2012 to 21.6% in 2013. A total of 4.5% stated some other area in which they believed they would be working.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 26. Students’ Five-Year Career Plans at Exit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy/Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy/Policy Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice and Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Students could select as many options as were relevant, so percentages add up to more than 100%.

It is significant to note that while therapy/counseling is the most commonly selected option, that nearly a quarter to a half of students selected policy-related options such as supervision, advocacy/policy development, management, and practice and program evaluation. Therefore, as the MSW Program considers future work within the curriculum, it should be noted that although the clinical focus is important, that policy and research focuses in the curriculum are also significant. Overall, these findings demonstrate that students predict that their future jobs will be multidimensional; they believe they will be engaged in many roles and providing a variety of services in their careers in five years.

Exit Survey: Comments about the MSW Program and School of Social Work

In the spring of 2013, the MSW Faculty changed the single open-ended question about students’ experiences in the program to two open ended questions – one regarding helpful aspects of the MSW Program and one about challenging aspects.
Students’ Perspectives about Helpful Aspects of the MSW Program
At the end of the survey, students were asked, “What was valuable about/helpful to you during your MSW education?” Table 27 presents a content analysis of responses to this question from 89 students, representing 77.4% of total respondents (n = 111).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 27. Helpful Aspects of MSW Program</th>
<th>2013 n = 86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Faculty</td>
<td>33 38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Practicum experience</td>
<td>25 29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor support, relationship</td>
<td>25 29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer support</td>
<td>12 14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good classes/curriculum</td>
<td>11 12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor practice experience</td>
<td>10 11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Model</td>
<td>6  7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical courses/focus</td>
<td>6  7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>5  5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field faculty</td>
<td>5  5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work identity encouraged/Faculty Inspired</td>
<td>3  3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class times schedule</td>
<td>3  3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of student perspectives</td>
<td>3  3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good electives</td>
<td>2  2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Faculty</td>
<td>2  2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Supervisors</td>
<td>2  2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on ethics (NASW &amp; SJ Principles)</td>
<td>2  2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>2  2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Program</td>
<td>2  2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (library, in-person not online, pursued personal interests in classes, small class sizes, office staff, program/administration flexibility, crossover from classroom to field)</td>
<td>6  7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers add up to more than 100% because people could give more than one response.

Thirty-three students mentioned that the great faculty was valuable or helpful to them during their education. Twenty-five students stated that their field practicum experience was valuable to them. Another twenty-five students mentioned that professor support and relationships were important to them. Support of peers was also important to graduating students’ experience in the MSW Program with 12 responses. Good classes and curriculum were noted by 11 students and 10 stated that the professors having practice experience to share in the classroom was important to them. Six students mentioned that the cohort model was important as was having a focus on clinical methods. Five students mentioned that teaching methods were important and five stated that field faculty were valuable to them. The rest of the responses were available in Table 27.

Students Perspectives regarding Challenging Aspects of the MSW Program
Students were asked, “What if any challenges to your learning did you encounter in the MSW Program that we as a program should consider?” Seventy-eight students responded to this question (see Table 28), representing 70.3% of respondents (n = 111).
Table 28. Challenging Aspects of MSW Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682 (too much – took away from other classes, issues with chair, IRB deadline issues, begin</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earlier, presentations later)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited electives or unavailable when wanted</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum issues (need leadership, program management, theory and practice sooner, self-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care, more trauma in regular Methods classes; some classes repeats from BSW: history and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy; curriculum order; should have to take Methods before Field; more discussion on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity; cohort model for weekday)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field placement process (outside of TC, stressful, interviewing, placed at a “do not accept”</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site, 2nd round process, termination process and loss of hours too much, more AEA Scholar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>placements needed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload too heavy, too much homework, especially with working (2 year program, especially)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Faculty need improvement in teaching methods</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration not approachable, rigid</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to get classes/instructors times wanted</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods, Classroom control, more practice in clinical classes, more direct</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion of “tough” issues, too much paper writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of program, cost of UST insurance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-1 too short, crazed, issues (fewer hours toward knowledge content areas. More</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication to do block placement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty unsupportive, uncaring</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Program preparation of students for graduation and employment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More diverse students needed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too clinical</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More preparation for licensure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct faculty needed help with teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More trauma classes options</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective on substance abuse/CD treatment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend cohort activities and coordination to participate in School activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty need more practice experience, ties to clinical community</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much research, especially for those with research backgrounds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative view not valued</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan/scholarship should also consider SES and single parent status</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clinical enough, not clinical enough during first year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/logistical program aspects: Smaller class sizes and larger classrooms, Parking needs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement, SCB computer lab noisy, two institutions consuming to navigate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field seminar class should have resume writing, LGSW exam preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty need to confront insensitive, non-SW value statements in class</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnect between class material and field experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers add up to more than 100% because people could give more than one response.

Of the 78 students who responded to this question, 13 of them mentioned changing the 682 Clinical Research Project in some way with most responses indicating the heavy workload during the last year. The second most common challenge to the clients’ education was having a limited selection of electives or the one particular desired elective not available. Related to this was the statement from six students who said they had difficulties getting into required classes during the time periods wanted or with their preferred instructors. “Curriculum Issues” was the next most common theme with 11 responses, which included any kind of suggestion for changing the curriculum including course sequencing, texts, and suggested content in courses.
Nine students stated that the workload was too heavy, especially during the second year of the 2-year program. Many of the students discussed the difficulty of working, going to school, and having a family. Of the 78 students who responded, eight of them reported that full-time faculty members needed improvement in their teaching methods (which was higher than for adjunct faculty with only three students commenting on this). Other issues included seven students stating that the administration was rigid to requests or unapproachable when there were programmatic issues. Five students indicated that there were particular teaching method issues that should be addressed such as classroom control and addressing “tough” issues head-on. The rest of the challenges exiting MSW student found are listed in the Table 28.

In summary, students comment on a program whose strengths lie in its faculty, field practicum experience, relationship with faculty and peers, as well as an excellent curriculum. At the same time, particular areas of improvement were suggested by students, especially with regard to altering the 682 project in terms of its timing or scope, curricular suggestions, and suggestions for the field placement process and teaching method suggestions.
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Appendix A

MSW Program Assessment Plan and Activities
(Effective 2011)

Assessment Measures, Procedures and Timeline
As illustrated in Table 29, The summative Assessment Plan includes three primary points of measurement conducted by the program (entry to the program, exit from the program, exit from clinical field placement), two bivariate measures mandated for graduation, and one measurement report by the ASWB on licensure pass rates. A total of 4 program-based reports on the proficiency of a student’s competence related to the practice behaviors that operationalize the advanced competencies are collected in online formats. Two, the entry survey and the exit survey, are collected using Qualtrics; and two, from the student and the field instructor, are collected at exit from the clinical field placement using the Intern Placement Tracking (IPT) online system. In addition to these survey data, students’ completion of the GRSW 682 Clinical research Project demonstrates an integrative demonstration of their competency in the application of research, theory and practice to a social work practice-related issue at the micro, mezzo or macro level; completion of this project is required for graduation, along with a the required number of credits (60 credits for Regular Standing, 42 credits for Advanced Standing) and a minimum GPA of 3.0. A report from ASWB on licensure pass rates provides a post graduation measurement of competency.

Table 29. MSW Program Assessment Plan and Measurement Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>1st Measurement Point</th>
<th>2nd Measurement Point</th>
<th>3rd Measurement Point</th>
<th>4th Measurement Point</th>
<th>5th Measurement Point</th>
<th>6th Measurement Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY</td>
<td>Survey provides base line of incoming students’ perceptions of competency on MSW clinical practice behaviors.</td>
<td>EXIT 1</td>
<td>Survey provides two embedded data points: one asking for student reports on all the practice behaviors at entry and a second asking for student reports on competence for all practice behaviors at exit.</td>
<td>EXIT 2</td>
<td>Field evaluation at the end of students’ MSW clinical field course. This survey, based on the advanced clinical practice behaviors covered in the exit survey, includes two data points: EXIT 2a: student ratings of their competence with each of the practice behaviors and</td>
<td>EXIT 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Administered through Qualtrics at entry (orientation)</td>
<td>Administered through Qualtrics at exit through the context of final practice course: GRSW 604.</td>
<td>Administration of both instruments is through the IPT system at the completion of the clinical field course, GRSW 608.</td>
<td>Successful completion is designated by the Clinical Research Chair and verified by the MSW Program Manager, upon submission of the required copies and paperwork.</td>
<td>This measure is monitored and verified through the MSW Program Manager.</td>
<td>This report is sent to the Dean of the School of Social Work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items measured</td>
<td>Demographics, reasons for choosing this graduate degree and program, perceived proficiency on the 49 clinical practice behaviors with NA option, Perceived competency on 49 clinical practice behaviors (pre-post), basic demographics regarding their program path (e.g. day/weekend, regular standing/advanced standing, program track), social justice questions, experiences in the program related to support services used, participation in student organizations and co-curricular events/activities, perceptions of inclusiveness, current job status and future plans</td>
<td>2a. Students rate of their perceived level of competence with each of the practice behaviors</td>
<td>2b. Field instructors rate students’ level of competence with each practice behavior, based on their observations of the student in the field placement.</td>
<td>Completion of the GRSW 682 clinical research project</td>
<td>Final GPA</td>
<td>Licensure pass rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the program administered measurement points and tools will be addressed specifically. The measurement instruments are included in the Appendix C of this 2013 Outcome Study report.

The Assessment Plan for the SCU/UST Master of Social Work program has three primary points of measurement to assess achievement of the advanced clinical competencies.

1. **At entry** to the program, students complete an online survey on Qualtrics which collects basic demographic information, reasons for choosing this graduate degree and program and asks them to rate their perceived proficiency on the 72 practice behaviors that measure the SCU/UST MSW program’s articulation of the ten advanced competencies. We allow the option of a *Not Applicable (NA)* response, since the practice behaviors measured reflect the scope of practice expected at exit from the program. The survey link is administered to students in the day/evening program at orientation in May and to the weekend cohort students at orientation in June.

2. **At exit** from the program, a list of students who have applied for graduation is used to identify students who are eligible to take the exit survey. The exit survey has two data points regarding the measurement of advanced practice behaviors embedded: one asks students to rate their level of competence on all the practice behaviors at entry and another asks for them to rate their level of competence on all practice behaviors at the time they are graduating. This pre-post reporting model allows for a person-specific analysis of perceived difference (pre-post), which is tested for significance. In addition to basic demographics regarding their program path (e.g. day/weekend, regular standing/advanced standing, program track,) students are asked about their experiences in the program related to support services used, participation in student organizations and co-curricular events/activities, perceptions of inclusiveness, current job status and future plans. Measures of dimensions of the implicit curriculum were formally included in the 2010-2011 Outcome Study (attached as AS 4.05) for the first time; in order to complete a point in time assessment, these items were also included in a Qualtrics-administered survey to continuing students and those findings are included in the 2010-2011 Outcome Study.

3. The third measurement points occur when students **exit** their MSW clinical field experience (**Exit 2a and Exit 2b**), specifically completion of *GRSW 608: Field Practicum and Seminar IV*. This measurement uses the final clinical field evaluation form; both the student and the field instructor enter responses electronically into the Intern Placement Tracking (IPT) database. The field evaluation form is based on the advanced clinical practice behaviors that operationalize the ten advanced clinical competencies. Because of the variability in the specific nature of a clinical field placement, we offer a *not applicable (NA)* response category. The frequency and distribution of NA responses is monitored, and used to guide further curriculum
development on the integration of theory and practice for both students and field instructors.

**EXIT 2a:** Students rate their perceived level of competence with each of the practice behaviors and,

**EXIT 2b:** field instructors rate their students’ level of competence with each of the practice behaviors, based on their observations of the student in the field placement.

4. A fourth measurement at **EXIT** is a bivariate measure of completion of the GRSW 682 clinical research project measured as pass/no pass. In fact a student cannot complete the requirements for graduation without passing this course.

5. A fifth measurement at **EXIT** is that of a minimum GPA of 3.0, required for graduation. This requirement is a cumulative assessment of the student’s demonstration of competence across the curriculum. The course objectives across the required foundation and advanced clinical curriculum are grounded in the competencies and practice behaviors and measured through course assignments. All competencies and practice behaviors at both levels are incorporated throughout the curriculum in multiple ways. Thus the minimum GPA is a demonstration of competency.

6. The sixth measurement is a post graduation ASWB report of licensure pass rates.

**Benchmarks**

Benchmarks are established to demonstrate both minimum and ideal goals for student demonstration of competency. These benchmarks are evaluated in an ongoing process in relation to the curriculum and student feedback.
Table 30. MSW Benchmarks for Each Assessment Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Benchmark minimum</th>
<th>Benchmark Challenge</th>
<th>Outcome 2012 Benchmark Minimum</th>
<th>Outcome 2012 Benchmark Challenge</th>
<th>Outcome 2013 Benchmark Minimum</th>
<th>Outcome 2013 Benchmark Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 1</td>
<td>90% of graduates will demonstrate competency means of 3.75</td>
<td>75% of graduates will demonstrate competency means of 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post Test</td>
<td>There will be a significant difference between the self ratings of pre-post competency level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 2 a</td>
<td>90% of graduates will demonstrate competency means of 3.75</td>
<td>75% of graduates will demonstrate competency means of 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 2 b</td>
<td>90% of graduates will be rated by their field instructor with competency means of 3.75</td>
<td>80% of graduates will be rated by their field instructor with competency means of 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 3</td>
<td>100% of students will pass</td>
<td>100% of students will pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 4</td>
<td>100% of students will have 3.0 GPA</td>
<td>90% will have a GPA of 3.5 and above</td>
<td>100% of 140</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Grad</td>
<td>75% of students will pass licensure exam</td>
<td>85% of students will pass licensure exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81% pass rate (compared to 70% nationally)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

Because the 2008 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards have fundamentally changed the focus for assessment, the School of Social Work MSW Program extensively revised its measurement instruments. In addition, with the availability of Qualtrics technology on the UST campus, the Assessment Committee decided to administer the Entry and Exit Profile surveys online. It is our belief that as we develop the administrative logistics, response rates will improve and random error due to student idiosyncrasies in entering responses and subsequent data entry will be reduced. Students will complete the Entry Profile on-line during their first or second class in the GRSW 500 History and Philosophy Course (which all entering students take during their
first semester) and will complete the Exit Profile on-line on their own just prior to graduation (See Table 29, “Entry” and “Exit 1” columns). In the Exit Profile, students are asked to assess their degree of competency for each practice behavior both as they entered the program and as they are exiting the program. The retrospective assessment is also conducted as students, at the end of their program, have a better appreciation of what is entailed in the knowledge and skills addressed in the practice behaviors that measure each competency. Students take the Exit Survey during one of the last classes in their Clinical Methods Course (which almost all take in their final semester). At both data collection points, an email link to the survey will be sent to all entering or graduating students.

**Data Analysis**

**Entry and Exit Profiles**

Given this data collection plan, students are assessed five times on their level of acquisition of the competencies as evidenced through their practice behavior scores. This allows for some interesting snapshot descriptions, as well as comparisons. **First**, we plan to analyze the Entry Profile data as a cohort profile. In this way, the instrument captures students in both formats: day/evening and weekend cohort and the eight different tracks that regular and advanced standing students can use to progress through the program. Likewise, because students often change tracks in their time in the program, it is impractical to compare groups based on their date of graduation. **Second**, we analyze students’ outgoing assessment of their acquisition of practice behaviors using the Exit Profile instrument. These findings include students’ perceptions of growth in their competency for all 49 practice behaviors from entry to exit and findings from the ‘exit’ means for each competency are compared to the MSW Program’s benchmark mean rating. Furthermore, we also compare these exit mean ratings to the students’ retrospective assessment of their acquisition of these program behaviors as they entered, which is also captured in the Exit Profile Instrument. A t-test comparison demonstrates whether student scores have significantly improved at the end of the program.

**Field Evaluations**

**Third**, both student and Field Instructor mean ratings on the MSW Field instrument (which also includes the practice behavior items) are analyzed. Mean ratings from the students and field instructors’ final field evaluations are compared to the 3.75 and 4.0 benchmarks (Table 16). Additionally, the ratings of the students and the field instructors will be compared with a t-test to see if there is a difference between their assessments. If there is, the Field Program will use this information for future field education planning. Including the Field Instructors’ scores will improve the validity of competency scores, as there will be an external, objective rating of the students’ acquisition of curricular competencies.

The findings of these analysis are reported in the Outcome Study Report and shared with curriculum committee chairs, who, along with their committees, review the findings to determine the relevance of the findings relative to the courses reviewed in their area, changes made in
previous years, and to determine what will be affirmed and/or changed to make changes in the implicit and explicit curriculum to enhance student performance. The curriculum committee recommendations are reviewed by the MSW Program Committee to identify overlapping recommendations and plans of action. The results of this assessment process are implemented, included in the Outcome Study report and reported to the appropriate UST and SCU assessment committees.

Other Outcome and Assessment Activities

Responses from Curriculum Committees

- The Report of Educational Outcome for 2013 has been referred to the Dean, MSW Program Director, the MSW curriculum area chairs, and faculty for review and consideration.

- Curriculum committees reviewed this report in November of 2013. Actions and curriculum changes have been made to course syllabi and a broader recommendation to consider the curricular implications of the Study as a full MSW Program Committee, rather than as individual curriculum committee was decided upon.

- The report of recommendations and actions from the curriculum committees are included as an appendix to this report and will continue to be monitored by both the curriculum and the MSW program committees.

- The University of St. Thomas Assessment Committee no longer requires Units of the University to respond to particular assessment questions as it has required in the past. Rather, the Committee understands that each College and School has its own evaluative requirements and would like to have a copy of that report in their central registry to keep track of plans of evaluation. However, in an effort to focus the work of the curriculum committees this year, the committees were asked to address these items:
  - 1) Identify which competencies are directly related to your curriculum area.
  - 2) Comment on the scores that are above 4.0. Identify competencies and practice behaviors that have seen improvement from last year. To what does the group attribute these improvements?
  - 3) What areas are less than 4.0? Any ideas of why this might be? How does the committee plan to improve these areas?

Each curriculum committee responds in writing to these items. Such a report documents in written form any sustaining or corrective actions taken within the curriculum area along with documentation that the outcome study has been reviewed. This documentation is
kept on file with the faculty in charge of the outcome study in order to complete the year-end reports for UST’s Assessment Committee and reaccreditation.

- Four questions reflecting the program’s focus on Social Justice were added to the entry and exit survey beginning in 2008. They include
  - Understanding historical patterns of injustice (History)
  - Ability to practice, informed by a social justice perspective (Systems)
  - The ability to analyze policy from a social justice perspective and to advocate, when applicable (Social Policy)
  - Understanding the relationship between social structures and mental illness (Assessment & Diagnosis)

The findings are reported as part of the Outcome Study Report.

**Ongoing Activities**

- September
  - Convene the Assessment Committee to assess how the administration of surveys went
  - Identify any additional activities needed relative to reaffirmation

- Spring
  - May-June in Field: Cohort students and Field Instructors complete final field assessment instrument using IPT
  - April: All advanced clinical methods courses facilitate the administration of the Exit survey for the MSW Outcome Study in class.
  - June: Administer Entry Survey for the MSW Outcome Study in GRSW 500 History and Philosophy Courses for entering Weekend Cohort Students

- September
  - Analyze data for graduating students
  - Analyze Field data from students and Field Instructors completing
  - Convene the Assessment Committee to assess how the administration of surveys went
  - Identify any additional activities needed relative to reaffirmation

- October
  - Complete writing the extensive Report
  - Submit report to Dean, MSW Program Director, curriculum committee chairs, and faculty
  - MSW curriculum committees review findings, identify implications, determine actions, and submit results in writing to Outcome Study Coordinator for distribution to MSW Program committee.
  - MSW program committee reviews findings and approves changes, including actions related to implicit curriculum

- November
  - Reports from curriculum committees compiled and added as an addendum to the outcome report
- Completed Outcome Study report is posted on SSW Blackboard and Website; SCU Assessment Drive
- Write Outcome Study report for Perspectives
- Continue assessment of the revised survey items and format and the process for data collection, coding, data entry, analysis, reporting and dissemination.
- Yearly report sent to UST Assessment committee responding to the following questions.
  - Summarize the findings and analysis of your assessment results
  - Delineate the actions or curriculum changes that you made or are planning to make based on your assessment process
  - Briefly describe any changes you have made to your assessment plan this year.
Appendix B

Advanced Clinical Competencies and Practice Behaviors for Social Work Practice

In 2010 the instrument was significantly altered to measure students on the new EPAS standards of competence. The survey items are taken directly from the wording of the EPAS standards, measuring students on practice behaviors related to the 10 social work competencies. In addition, there are four items that distinctly measure social justice application to practice. These are assessed separately and not figured into the means of different competencies.

Table 31 outlines the ten advanced clinical practice competencies and the associated practice behaviors adopted by the SCU/UST MSW program. The practice behaviors inform the items on our entry and exit surveys and the field evaluations as demonstrated in the MSW Assessment Plan outlined in Table 29.

Table 31. Advanced Clinical Competencies and Practice Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 1. Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Readily identify as social work professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate professional use of self with client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand and identify professional strengths, limitations and challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop manage, and maintain therapeutic relationships with clients within the person-in-environment and strengths perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand the need for and use clinical social work supervision and consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 2. Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Apply ethical decision-making skills to issues specific to clinical social work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employ strategies of ethical reasoning to address the use of technology in clinical practice and its effect on client rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and use knowledge of relationship dynamics, including power differentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognize and manage personal biases as they affect the therapeutic relationship in the service of the clients’ well-being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 3. Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Engage in reflective practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and articulate clients’ strengths and vulnerabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate, select, and implement appropriate multidimensional assessment, diagnostic, intervention, and practice evaluation tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of multiple theoretical perspectives and differentially apply them to client situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicate professional judgments to other social workers and to professionals from other disciplines, in both verbal and written format</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 4. Engage diversity and difference in practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Research and apply knowledge of diverse populations to enhance client wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work effectively with diverse populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and use practitioner/client differences from a strengths perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 5. Advance human rights and social and economic justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Use knowledge of the effects of oppression, discrimination, and historical trauma on client and client systems to guide treatment planning and intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate at multiple levels for policy change that improves the overall mental health of clients and communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 6. Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Use the evidence-based practice process in clinical assessment and intervention with clients
- Participate in the generation of new clinical knowledge, through research and practice
- Use research methodology to evaluate clinical practice effectiveness and/or outcomes

### Competency 7. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment
- Synthesize and differentially apply theories of human behavior and the social environment to guide clinical practice
- Use bio-psycho-social-spiritual theories and multiaxial diagnostic classification systems in formulation of comprehensive assessments
- Recognize the impact of health and medication on diagnosis and treatment

### Competency 8. Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services
- Communicate to stakeholders the implication of policies and policy change in the lives of clients
- Use evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence to analyze, formulate and advocate for policies and programs that advance social and economic well-being
- Advocate with and inform administrators and legislators to influence policies that impact clients and services

### Competency 9. Respond to contexts that shape practice
- Assess the quality of clients’ interactions within their social contexts
- Develop intervention plans to accomplish systemic change
- Work collaboratively with others to effect systemic change that is sustainable

### Competency 10. Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities:

#### A. Engagement
- Develop a culturally responsive therapeutic relationship
- Attend to the interpersonal dynamics and contextual factors that both strengthen and potentially threaten the therapeutic alliance
- Establish a relationally based process that encourages clients to be equal participants to the extent possible in the assessment and establishment of treatment goals and expected outcomes.

#### B. Assessment
- Use multidimensional bio-psycho-social-spiritual assessment tools
- Assess clients’ readiness for change
- Assess client coping strategies to reinforce and improve adaptation to life situations, circumstances, and events
- Select and modify appropriate intervention strategies based on continuous clinical assessment
- Use differential and multiaxial diagnoses

#### C. Intervention
- Critically evaluate, select, and apply best practices and evidence-based interventions
- Demonstrate the use of appropriate clinical techniques for a range or presenting concerns identified in the assessment, including crisis intervention strategies as needed
- Collaborate with other professionals to coordinate treatment interventions
- Consult with other professionals, as needed, to facilitate the assessment, diagnosis and treatment processes

#### D. Evaluation
- Contribute to the theoretical knowledge base of the social work professional through practice-based research
- Use clinical evaluation of the process and/or outcomes to develop best practice interventions for a range of bio-psycho-social-spiritual conditions
Appendix C: Data Collection Instruments

C1. Entry Survey and Cover Letter

Dear Entering MSW Student:

Welcome to the MSW program at the School of Social Work at Saint Catherine University and the University of Saint Thomas. As you begin, we request that you take this entry survey. This survey serves as a benchmark of your knowledge as you enter the program and marks the beginning of a self-reflective practice, which will continue throughout the program and throughout your career.

This survey is also an important way in which we will monitor and evaluate our work as educators and the program as a whole. This survey asks you to indicate to what degree you meet specific practice behaviors which constitute the major competencies of social work. The survey also asks about your decision to come to the School, as well as demographic questions. We expect this survey to take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

You will be asked to take this survey during one of your first GRSW 50 History and Philosophy of Social Work classes. You will be escorted to a computer lab and provided time to complete this. Please save this email and take this survey then. You will need to know your UST ID number in order to complete the survey.

Here is a link to the survey:

http://stthomassocialwork.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_cOX2s6YdoJcp6pn

This survey is anonymous and administered through Qualtrics. We will know who has responded to this survey, but not your individual responses to survey items.

If you have any questions or comments about this survey, you can email Dr. David Roseborough, MSW Outcome Study Co-Coordinator (djroseborough@stthomas.edu) or Dr. Carol Kuechler, MSW Program Director (efkuechler@stkate.edu).

Here is a link to the survey:

http://stthomassocialwork.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_cOX2s6YdoJcp6pn

We wish you well in your MSW program.

David Roseborough, PhD
Carol Kuechler, PhD
C2. Exit Survey and Cover Letter

To: Graduating MSW Students  
From: Dr. David Roseborough, MSW Outcome Study Coordinator  
Re: Graduating Class Exit Survey

Congratulations on your approaching graduation. As you prepare for this significant milestone, we ask that you take a moment to step back and reflect on what you have learned and your progress to date. The purpose of this survey is to obtain your assessment of how well you have achieved a number of social work competencies as measured by specific practice behaviors. In addition to your academic and practice progress, we are also interested in your overall experience of the School. We are gathering these data as part of an ongoing effort to monitor our program, engage in constant improvement and to demonstrate evidence of student development to our academic institutions and to our accrediting body, the Council on Social Work Education. Toward this end of self-assessment and improvement, we request that all graduating students take this survey.

Most of you will be taking this survey during your Clinical Methods courses in the next week and will be given time in class to complete it. Please keep this email with link to the survey so you can complete it during the allotted class times. For the few of you who are not in a Clinical Methods course right now, but are graduating, you may take this survey whenever you receive it.

The first section of the survey is divided into two columns. In the first column you are asked to rate yourself on the designated practice behaviors when you entered the program. In the second column you are asked to rate yourself now as you graduate. The second section of the survey includes demographic questions, questions about the school environment, and questions about your future career plans.

Here is the link to the survey. You will need to know your UST ID (100xxxxxx) to access the survey:  
http://stthomassocialwork.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_2bMsawaG7aBHHwx

This survey is anonymous and administered through Qualtrics. Although we will know who has responded, we will have no way of attaching these names with their corresponding responses. All findings are reported in aggregate form only. The survey should take about 20 minutes to complete. The survey will be available until May 19, 2013.

On behalf of the entire faculty and staff, I appreciate you taking the time to complete this survey. The information you provide plays an essential role in our efforts to continually improve our program.

If you have any questions, you may email David Roseborough, MSW Outcome Study Coordinator at djroseborough@stthomas.edu, or Carol Kuechler, MSW Program Director at cfkuechler@stkate.edu. Thanks for your help, and congratulations to you on your approaching graduation!

Survey link: http://stthomassocialwork.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_2bMsawaG7aBHHwx

David Roseborough, Ph.D., LICSW  
MSW Outcome Study Coordinator

Carol Kuechler, Ph.D., LISW  
MSW Program Director
Appendix D

History of Response Rates by Year and Data Collection Venue

Table 32 presents the history of response rates for the data collection process from 2010 (the last year with the old mailed survey system) through 2013.

Table 32: History of Response Rates by Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sent</td>
<td>Ret’d</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Emailed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>94.00%</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Students</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Continuing students are those students who are partway through their program. These students are assessed every five years.
Appendix E

Comparison of Mean Scores for Practice Behaviors:
Exit Survey, Final Field Evaluation by Field Instructors & Students

This Appendix provides a comparison of mean scores for each practice behavior measured in the exit measurements: the Exit survey (Qualtrics) and the final field evaluation completed by both the field instructor and by the student (IPT). These data were used by curriculum committee members in their analysis of the outcome results and as the basis for determining areas of emphasis and/or changes in the curriculum (as identified in the report attached as an appendix to this report).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 33. Mean Scores for Practice Behaviors: Exit Survey, Final Field Evaluations (Field Instructors &amp; Students) 2013 (N = 111)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 1. Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready identify as social work professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate professional use of self with client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and identify professional strengths, limitations and challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop manage, and maintain therapeutic relationships with clients within the person-in-environment and strengths perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the need for and use clinical social work supervision and consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Competency Mean | Mean Score Exit Survey | Mean Score / Field Instructor | Mean Score Student-Field |
| Apply ethical decision-making skills to issues specific to clinical social work | 4.60 | 4.43 | 4.33 |
| Employ strategies of ethical reasoning to address the use of technology in clinical practice and its effect on client rights | 4.27 | 4.09 | 4.01 |
| Identify and use knowledge of relationship dynamics, including power differentials | 4.52 | 4.34 | 4.26 |
| Recognize and manage personal biases as they affect the therapeutic relationship in the service of the clients’ well-being | 4.65 | 4.33 | 4.27 |

| Competency Mean | Mean Score Exit Survey | Mean Score / Field Instructor | Mean Score Student-Field |
| Engage in reflective practice | 4.69 | 4.47 | 4.43 |
Identify and articulate clients’ strengths and vulnerabilities & 4.66 & 4.50 & 4.53
Evaluate, select, and implement appropriate multidimensional assessment, diagnostic, intervention, and practice evaluation tools & 4.28 & 4.01 & 3.92
Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of multiple theoretical perspectives and differentially apply them to client situations & 4.10 & 3.91 & 3.84
Communicate professional judgments to other social workers and to professionals from other disciplines, in both verbal and written format & 4.27 & 4.26 & 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 4. Engage diversity and difference in practice</th>
<th>Mean Score Exit Survey</th>
<th>Mean Score / Field Instructor</th>
<th>Mean Score Student-Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competency Mean</strong></td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work effectively with diverse populations</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and use practitioner/client differences from a strengths perspective</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and apply knowledge of diverse populations to enhance client wellbeing</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 5. Advance human rights and social and economic justice</th>
<th>Mean Score Exit Survey</th>
<th>Mean Score / Field Instructor</th>
<th>Mean Score Student-Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competency Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use knowledge of the effects of oppression, discrimination, and historical trauma on client and client systems to guide treatment planning and intervention</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate at multiple levels for policy change that improves the overall mental health of clients and communities</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 6. Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research</th>
<th>Mean Score Exit Survey</th>
<th>Mean Score / Field Instructor</th>
<th>Mean Score Student-Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competency Mean</strong></td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the evidence-based practice process in clinical assessment and intervention with clients</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in the generation of new clinical knowledge, through research and practice</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use research methodology to evaluate clinical practice effectiveness and/or outcomes</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 7. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment</th>
<th>Mean Score Exit Survey</th>
<th>Mean Score / Field Instructor</th>
<th>Mean Score Student-Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competency Mean</strong></td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Synthesize and differentially apply theories of human behavior and the social environment to guide clinical practice | 4.32 | 4.11 | 3.98
Use bio-psycho-social-spiritual theories and multiaxial diagnostic classification systems in formulation of comprehensive assessments | 4.56 | 4.06 | 4.02
Recognize the impact of health and medication on diagnosis and treatment | 4.66 | 4.20 | 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 8. Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services</th>
<th>Mean Score Exit Survey</th>
<th>Mean Score / Field Instructor</th>
<th>Mean Score Student-Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency Mean</td>
<td><strong>3.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.57</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate to stakeholders the implication of policies and policy change in the lives of clients</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence to analyze, formulate and advocate for policies and programs that advance social and economic well-being</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate with and inform administrators and legislators to influence policies that impact clients and services</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 9. Respond to contexts that shape practice</th>
<th>Mean Score Exit Survey</th>
<th>Mean Score / Field Instructor</th>
<th>Mean Score Student-Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency Mean</td>
<td><strong>4.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.89</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the quality of clients’ interactions within their social contexts</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop intervention plans to accomplish systemic change</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively with others to effect systemic change that is sustainable</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 10. Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities:</th>
<th>Mean Score Exit Survey</th>
<th>Mean Score / Field Instructor</th>
<th>Mean Score Student-Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Mean</td>
<td><strong>4.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a culturally responsive therapeutic relationship</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend to the interpersonal dynamics and contextual factors that both strengthen and potentially threaten the therapeutic alliance</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a relationally based process that encourages clients to be equal participants to the extent possible in the assessment and establishment of treatment goals and expected outcomes.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Mean</td>
<td><strong>4.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.07</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use multidimensional bio-psycho-social-spiritual assessment tools</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess clients’ readiness for change</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess client coping strategies to reinforce and improve adaptation to life situations, circumstances, and events</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select and modify appropriate intervention strategies based on continuous clinical assessment</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use differential and multiaxial diagnoses</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intervention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Mean</th>
<th>4.39</th>
<th>4.24</th>
<th>4.09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critically evaluate, select, and apply best practices and evidence-based interventions</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the use of appropriate clinical techniques for a range or presenting concerns identified in the assessment, including crisis intervention strategies as needed</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with other professionals to coordinate treatment interventions</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with other professionals, as needed, to facilitate the assessment, diagnosis and treatment processes</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Mean</th>
<th>3.91</th>
<th>3.95</th>
<th>3.85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to the theoretical knowledge base of the social work professional through practice</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use clinical evaluation of the process and/or outcomes to develop best practice interventions for a range of bio-psycho-social-spiritual conditions</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Report on MSW Program Committee Response to Outcome Study
2013 Outcome Study
December 2, 2013

This is the third report on the MSW Program Committee’s response to the MSW Outcome Study in which the MSW Program Committee assesses its work based upon the 10 competencies, which are articulated through 49 practice behaviors of the new Educational Policy and Assessment Standards of the Council on Social Work Education.

Last year, the MSW Outcome Study Coordinator recommended, and the MSW Program Committee concurred, that the MSW Program Committee would respond to the Outcome Report as a committee of the Whole, rather than as separate curriculum committees. Thus for the review of the 2013 MSW Outcome Study the Coordinator presented key findings through a Power Point presentation to the MSW Program Committee on November 21, 2013. After presentation, this group was charged with responding to:

1. Recognition of what we do well
2. In what areas do we need to improve?
   a. Explicit Curriculum (Competencies and Practice Behaviors below benchmark of 3.75 and below challenge benchmark of 4.0)
   b. Implicit Curriculum (Aspects of the program which affect MSW education, such as social connection, sense of belonging, handling of disagreements, etc.)
3. Specific ways to improve in those identified areas

This report includes responses from the full MSW curriculum committee.

Full Curriculum Committee Responses to Outcome Study Report

Explicit Curriculum
First, it was noted that the MSW Program was successful in nearly every competency, meeting the benchmark mean rating in all but one competency, and even meeting the challenge benchmark mean rating in all but three of the 14 competencies (nine competencies and four “sub-competencies” of a four-part competency).

With regard to areas of improvement, the full curriculum committee noted that the Policy Competency was the only competency which did not meet our mean benchmark (3.75) with a score of 3.40. In addition, two competencies were below the challenge benchmark. In addition to this, two competencies: Means for Advancing Human Rights and Justice (3.88) and Evaluation (3.91) were below the challenge benchmark. A detail of the practice behaviors demonstrate those parts of the competency that could use attention (see Table 13 reproduced).
Table 13. Practice Behavior Detail of Competencies below Benchmark and below Challenge Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Mean Score Exit Survey</th>
<th>Mean Score Field Instructor</th>
<th>Mean Score Student in Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8. Engaging in Policy Practice</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8a Communicate to stakeholders the implication of policies and policy change in the lives of clients</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8b Use evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence to analyze, formulate and advocate for policies and programs that advance social and economic well-being</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8c Advocate with and inform administrators and legislators to influence policies that impact clients and services</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5 Advancing Human Rights and Justice</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5a I use knowledge of the effects of oppression, discrimination, and historical trauma on client and client systems to guide treatment planning and intervention</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5b I advocate at multiple levels for policy change that improves the overall mental health of clients and communities</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.10(d) Evaluation</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.10(d)a Contribute to the theoretical knowledge base of the social work profession through practice</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.10(10)b Use clinical evaluation of the process and/or outcomes to develop best practice interventions for a range of bio-psycho-social-spiritual conditions</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.8 Engaging in Policy Practice
The full curriculum committee noted that each practice behavior in the policy competency was below the benchmark and that all of these had an element of advocacy or systems change. The lowest practice behavior item in the entire study asks students to assess themselves on the ability to “Advocate with and inform administrators and legislators to influence policies that impact clients and services.” However, all practice behaviors for this competency need improvement.

Action Steps:
- The MSW Outcome Study Coordinator next year will conduct a data analysis comparing Advanced Standing and Regular Standing students to see whether those with a BSW are scoring higher on average than their non-BSW peers.
- The Field faculty will provide, for MSW faculty, a document that gives examples of what practice behaviors look like in practice. These examples will be helpful for discussing the integration of policy and practice in other courses and in discussions with students.
- The MSW Outcome Study Coordinator will coordinate a presentation by the MSW Assessment Committee of the Outcome Study findings to a student forum. This will provide an opportunity to highlight the outcomes of our MSW program and our evaluation processes, model both practice evaluation and reflective practice, and provide a venue for feedback and input from students [implicit curriculum].
• Several faculty members, as part of the MSW response to the SSW Strategic Plan, will begin a School Policy Action Initiative. This initiative will invite MSW students to select a social issue and work to address it in multiple ways including research, educating groups, and advocacy. Faculty members involved will facilitate the process, encouraging the students to take the lead to have the hands-on experience of policy practice.
• The Clinical Field Seminar will integrate a policy-based assignment into their courses to further the connection between policy and practice.

2.1.5 Advancing Human Rights and Social Justice and 2.1.10(d) Evaluation
The full committee also noted that the competencies of Advancing Human Rights and Social Justice and Evaluation were below the mean challenge benchmark. The practice behavior of advocating at multiple levels for policy change is significantly lower than the other practice behavior of 2.1.5 and the committee agreed that this one needed attention. For Evaluation, the practice behavior related to contributing to the theoretical knowledge base of social work research was marked somewhat lower than the other practice behavior.

Action Steps
• The MSW committee recommended that instructors consider introducing frameworks of risk and resilience. In this way, the idea of risks and protections can be mapped within the ecosystem for students to understand that factors in the larger environment impact the well-being of clients. This discussion should include the connection of human rights (macro-system) and individual (micro-system) well-being.
• Faculty members will respond to the invitation to comment on the developing EPAS standards regarding policy provisions.

GRSW 682 Clinical Research Seminar
Although not a competency, this particular curriculum aspect of the program was mentioned by 13 of the 78 graduating students who added comments about challenging aspects of the MSW Programs. They noted a variety of issues related to workload, relative importance in the program, and stress levels. Faculty identified their own concerns related to the impact of time commitments on student work in other courses being taken simultaneously. A work group in the 12-13 academic year explored an expansion of methodology options, ways to address controversial topics/conditions, and the feasibility of group projects. These will be revisited and determinations made about recommendations for continuing alternative models for the 682 project.

Action Steps
• Revisit the recommendations of the work group.
• Reconstitute Work group to address ongoing concerns.
• Explore having the 682 course evaluation data collated for direct student feedback on the project/process.
• The Assessment Committee will consider collecting additional data from students in the MSW Exit Survey in the spring of 2014.
Implicit Curriculum
There were two Implicit Curriculum issues which warranted special attention in the MSW Outcome Study: response rate of exiting MSW students (86%) and advising.

Exit Survey Response Rate (Appendix D)
During the Entry Survey, nearly every student takes the survey in their History and Philosophy class in their first or second class. Response rates are close to 100%. However, although the same process of deploying the survey in Qualtrics is used for the Exit Survey, a portion of students elect not to take it. Instructors report that students stated that they don’t have to take it and that they have learned, due to their research ethics coursework, that they have a right to refuse to take the survey as a research subject.

Action steps
- Clinical methods faculty to intentionally present the Exit Survey to students in a context:
  - Demonstrate the importance of the survey in providing feedback about the students’ learning and learning environment;
  - Note that the input is used to continue improving the program; AND
  - Clarify that this is program evaluation required for our CSWE accreditation.
- Discuss the difference between human subjects research for publication and program evaluation of educational outcomes.

Advising
Students experiences with their advisors received ratings we determined were not adequate for our goals. The MSW committee discussed a number of mediating factors:
- Students seek and receive informal advising from their classroom instructors,
- the survey item may not be clear enough,
- students’ experiences with assigned advisors may be around challenges – academic or personal – in the program
- advising consists of letters of recommendation, discussions about future plans,
- advising students based on areas of concentration (such as Area of Emphasis on Aging, Military focus, and Diversity initiative)
- many students never have a need to contact an advisor, they are responding to a question they cannot assess (quality of contact with advisor)

Action steps
- Instructors should remind students whom they informally advise that they have an official advisor (meet at orientation, email)
- Consider rotating the advisor roll among a few faculty members each year, rather than all faculty having advisees.
- The MSW Assessment Committee will consider having a filter question in the Outcome Study, such as “Have you worked with your advisor? If so…” or a “No opinion” option.
- The MSW Program Committee will consider or delegate to a sub-committee
  - Exploring different models from other schools
  - Letter of interest to students regarding advising
  - Identify dimensions of advising and what is needed
o Explore the idea of advising as function, not structure
o Have a Brown Bag discussion with faculty members on advising

Future Assessment Goals and Activities for the MSW Program Committee

The presentation of the MSW Outcome Study was favorably received by the MSW Program Committee along with discussions across curriculum areas about explicit and implicit issues that are affected by all aspects of the curriculum. The MSW Program Committee recommends that this evaluation format of presentation of findings, group discussion, and identification of action steps continue in following years.

Action steps will be taken up by individuals, committees, and in some cases the entire faculty in order to focus our intentional efforts at improving the MSW Program experience for our students. Next year, the presentation of the MSW Outcome Study Findings might begin with assessing the degree to which the identified action steps occurred in order to detect the impact on any improvements in these areas for improvement, keeping in mind that not all graduating students may ‘receive’ the changes identified in the action steps.