

Augsburg College Assessment Data
BSW Academic Years 2012-13 and 2013-14

Prepared by:

Michael Schock, Ph.D., LICSW
Chair, Social Work Assessment Committee

Bibiana Koh, Ph.D., LICSW
BSW Program Director BSW

Lois Bosch, Ph.D., LISW
MSW Program Director

February 2015

The BSW Program Assessment Plan: An Overview

The Department of Social Work has a long history of program assessment. We began with alumni surveys and course assignments as indicators of student outcomes. In 2006 the department introduced a more rigorous approach to program evaluation with student self-assessment questionnaires and field assessment instruments aligned with the program goals and objectives. Yearly assessment reports have been standard agenda items for department reviews. Assessment data has been integrated into a more reflective process where outcome data are presented to the full faculty, small task groups review the findings and make recommendations to the curriculum committee. The curriculum committee then reviews the outcome data, faculty comments and lead instructor reflections. Curricular updates and large-scale revisions become the work of the curriculum committee. Reports, plans for content updates, course revisions or curricular revisions are presented each year to the Social Work faculty for discussion and action. This integrated program assessment plan has served the department well for the past decade.

Beginning in 2005 the BSW program has continuously developed and used quantitative and qualitative methods to assess its explicit and implicit curriculum. Following the publication of EPAS 2008 our two primary assessment tools, the Student Self-Efficacy Questionnaire and the Learning Agenda and Assessment were re-designed to better assess the core competencies and those practice behaviors established by CSWE and published in EPAS 2008. The field assessment instruments were developed using the 41 Core Competency practice behaviors required by CSWE. In 2012, we added two practice behaviors addressing specific skills in termination (AS 2.1.10). Currently we have two years of data from the BSW Student Self-Efficacy Questionnaire. We also have two years of data from the Learning Agenda and Assessment tools.

The implicit curriculum assessment measures student experiences on campus and in the classroom. We rely on qualitative feedback from MSW exit interviews and quantitative feedback from the Student Environmental Inventory (SEI). The Student Environmental Inventory instrument was developed to assess classroom and campus level information for the implicit curriculum. The student course evaluations also contain a number of assessment items related to our implicit curriculum. We extract summary data from the student course evaluations to complete our implicit curriculum assessment strategy.

Rationale

The principal assessment question that influences our assessment strategy is: How well does our program prepare students to meet the 10 core competencies established by CSWE and adopted by our program? In answering this question we first determined that post-test measures best address this question. Two post-test quantitative measures, the Student Self-Efficacy

Questionnaire and the Learning Agenda and Assessment were developed to assess practice behaviors in the BSW curriculum. We set item level criterion and established benchmarks, the ratio of BSW students achieving a chosen criterion. For more reliable information, we use these two measures longitudinally looking for patterns across the 10 core competencies and year-to-year shifts in these patterns. We will provide more details when we discuss the analysis of the data.

The implicit curriculum is assessed through at least two years of data from student course evaluations and exit surveys and interviews. The items in the student course evaluation go to the faculty's ability to provide a challenging and thorough course and to demonstrate commitment and respect to the student learning experience. The exit interview is designed to elicit a more holistic review of the department and curriculum by the graduating student.

Description

For the direct measure of the 10 core competencies two independent measures are used, the Student Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (SSEQ) and the Learning Agenda and Assessment (LAA). For the implicit curriculum, two measures are used, the Student Environmental Inventory and the student exit interview. Exit interviews and the SEI ask students to reflect on their entire time in the program. Data are collected annually, analyzed and reported at the beginning of each academic year. Findings are presented to the BSW Program Director, Department Chair, and Social Work Department faculty; a report is also submitted to the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Graduate and Professional Studies at Augsburg College. This report is required as a part of the College's assessment plan.

Explicit Curriculum Measures

The explicit curriculum is defined by CSWE (2010) as the formal education process that includes the curriculum and the courses. It demonstrates intentional program design to teach the practice behaviors thereby achieving the core competencies outlined by CSWE EPAS 2008. Criterion scores were established for each instrument and benchmarks were developed using 'percent achieving criterion' for a cutoff mark. Benchmarks were set at 70% for the Student Self-Efficacy questionnaire and the Learning Agenda and Assessment tool.

Student Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (SSEQ)

The Student Self-Efficacy Questionnaires (i.e., foundation, MCMP, M CCP) measures student perceptions of their level of skill for of each identified practice behavior. The responses are based on a 10-point Likert Scale (1 = Not at all confident and 10 = Highly confident). There is strong evidence that measuring one's confidence or self-efficacy corresponds with actual skill levels. Self-efficacy is a theoretical construct estimating students' level of skill or knowledge. Self-efficacy (that is, the

estimation of one's ability to complete a task or one's retention for specific knowledge) was first described in 1977 by Albert Bandura in his paper, "Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change". There is much research supporting the validity of self-efficacy as an estimation of one's knowledge or skill (Bandura, 2002). In recent years, researchers have begun to recommend self-efficacy as a measure of student learning in social work education (Holden, Barker, Meenaghan, & Rosenberg, 1999; Holden, Meenaghan, Anastas, & Metrey, 2002; Holden, Meenaghan, & Anastas, 2003; Holden, Anastas, & Meenaghan, 2005; Wilson, 2006).

Competency levels and item benchmarks for the Self-Efficacy Questionnaires were established. We determined that practice behavior scores of 8 and higher demonstrated a high level of confidence or self-efficacy as reported by the student. We set the benchmark for achieving the practice behavior at 70% of our students with a mean practice behavior score of 8 or higher indicates that the BSW program is achieving or exceeding its program goals. The mean score for this benchmark was calculated using the average of the mean practice behavior scores associated with each core competency. When the core competency scores are below the established benchmarks, mean scores for each practice behavior are used to guide a more precise understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the programs curriculum related to the specific core competency.

Learning Agenda and Assessment (LAA)

The Learning Agenda and Assessment allows the field supervisor to assess each student intern on practice behaviors in both the junior and senior years. Student interns are evaluated twice during their year-long field practicum. Field instructors complete the evaluations at the mid-term and end of the placement. The LAA instrument was developed using the core competency practice behaviors identified by CSWE. The practice behaviors were translated into a four point ordinal scale ranging from (1) unsatisfactory to (4) distinguished (Table 4.2). For each core competency, multiple practice behaviors were established from CSWE guidelines. Ten core competency scores are calculated using the average of the mean practice behaviors associated with each core competency. Given that this program evaluation is focused on learning outcomes at graduation or summative learning, only senior scores on this assessment are used.

Findings

When interpreting these data, we considered measuring competencies at the end of the students' senior year. We took the mean of the SSEQ and the LLA benchmark percentages to derive a summative outcome percentage for each of the 10 competencies. We discovered that the BSW program was rated or achieving the benchmark in all 10 core competencies. This suggests that the current curriculum is well designed as an accredited BSW program. Meeting the standards across the range of core competencies allows the faculty to begin to image innovations designed to enhance what we currently offer.

Work on the curriculum has begun on ways to update and expand student learning thereby maintaining the highest standards of professional social work.

Table 1
Summary Report of Two Academic Years of BSW Curriculum Assessment Data

Competency	2013 Graduates (N=18)					2014 Graduates (N=14)				
	Student Self-Efficacy		Learning Agenda		% Meets Benchmark	Student Self-Efficacy		Learning Agenda		% Meets Benchmark
	Score	%	Score	%		Score	%	Score	%	
2.1.1 Identify as a professional SW..	9.07	99%	3.2	92%	95.5%	9.02	98%	3.4	94%	96%
2.1.2 Apply social work ethical principles..	8.67	99%	3.3	94%	96.5%	8.48	88%	3.3	94%	90%
2.1.3 Apply critical thinking...	8.29	94%	3	90%	92%	8.03	87%	3.1	89%	88%
2.1.4 Engage in diversity and difference	9.32	100%	3.2	97%	98.5%	8.89	96%	3.3	98%	97%
2.1.5 Advance human rights and social ...	9.18	99%	3.4	97%	98%	8.56	86%	3.1	91%	88.5%
2.1.6 Engage in research-informed ...	7.67	80%	2.9	88%	84%	7.97	88%	3	97%	92.5%
2.1.7 Apply knowledge of HBSE...	8.32	90%	3	91%	90.5%	8.17	91%	3	87%	89%
2.1.8 Engage in policy practice...	8.13	80%	2.9	85%	82.5%	7.98	89%	3.2	84%	86.5%
2.1.9 Respond to contexts ...	8.30	92%	3.0	88%	90%	8.35	93%	3	77%	85%

Table 1 (con't)

Competency	2013 Graduates					2014 Graduates				
	Student Self-Efficacy		Learning Agenda		% Meets Benchmark	Student Self-Efficacy		Learning Agenda		% Meets Benchmark
	Score	%	Score	%		Score	%	Score	%	
2.1.10 Engage, assess, intervene, evaluate, and terminate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.										
2.1.10 Overall Scores	8.3	91%	3.0	93%	92%	8.0	84%	3.0	87%	85.5%
2.1.10 Engage with.	8.2	---	3.5	98%		8.0	89%	3.3	96%	92%
2.1.10 Assess with.	8.0	---	3.3	95%		8.0	85%	3.2	88%	86%
2.1.10 Intervene with.	8.2	---	3.4	96%		8.0	85%	3.1	85%	85%
2.1.10 Evaluate with.			3.3	88%				3.0	87%	
2.1.10 Terminate with.			3.2	91%				3.2	87%	

Table 2

Core Competency 2.1.8 Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well being

Competency 2.1.8	2013 Graduates					2014 Graduates				
	Student Self-Efficacy		Learning Agenda		% Meets Benchmark	Student Self-Efficacy		Learning Agenda		% Meets Benchmark
	Score	%	Score	%		Score	%	Score	%	
2.1.8.1 Analyze policies that advance social well-being	8.4	90%	3.2	86%	88%	7.5	88%	3.2	80%	84%
2.1.8.2 Formulate policies that advance social well-being	7.6	65%	3.2	86%	75%	7.4	81%	3.2	80%	80.5%
2.1.8.3 Advocate for policies that advance ...	8.4	85%	3.2	86%	85.5%	8.2	88%	3.2	80%	84%
2.1.8.4 Collaborate with colleagues	8.2	85%	3.0	86%	85.5%	8.6	94%	3.1	85%	90.5%
2.1.8.5 Collaborate with clients	8.0	80%	3.0	86%	83%	8.3	94%	3.1	85%	90.5%

Table 3***Core Competency 2.1.9 Respond to contexts that shape practice.***

Competency 2.1.9	2013 Graduates					2014 Graduates				
	Student Self-Efficacy		Learning Agenda		% Meets Benchmark	Student Self-Efficacy		Learning Agenda		% Meets Benchmark
	Score	%	Score	%		Score	%	Score	%	
2.1.9.1 Respond to contexts that shape practice	7.9	85%	2.9	82%	83.5%	8.3	94%	3.2	95%	94.5%
2.1.9.2 Provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery ...	8.7	95%	3.2	90%	92.5%	8.3	94%	2.9	80%	87%
2.1.9.3 Provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in practice...	8.5	95%	3.2	90%	92.5%	8.4	94%	2.9	80%	87%