

## 2012-2013 Annual Program Assessment Report

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College and the assessment office by Monday, September 30, 2013. You may submit a separate report for each program which conducted assessment activities.

**College:** Social and Behavioral Science

**Department:** Social Work

**Program:** Master of Social Work

**Assessment liaison:** Hyun-Sun Park

### **1. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** Provide a brief overview of this year's assessment plan and process.

The Master of Social Work (MSW) program assessment pursues an outcome performance approach based on competency measurement. Competencies are measurable practice behaviors that are comprised of knowledge, values, and skills in the social work profession. The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the accrediting institution of social work programs, delineates ten core competencies and requires all accredited programs to conduct a competency-based assessment.

The goal of the MSW program assessment is to evaluate the students' attainment of the ten competencies. To this end, the following three data collections were planned for AY 2012-2013 and implemented as planned:

- (1) Self-Efficacy Pretest from incoming students during the first week of curriculum instruction in the program (collected in August 2012)

The purpose of this online survey via Moodle is to assess where the incoming students are in terms of their efficacy in performing the ten social work competencies. This pretest will be compared to a posttest which will be collected from the same student cohort during the last week of instruction before they graduate the program. The comparison is to measure whether the MSW program is effective in increasing the level of students' confidence in executing social work competencies.

- (2) Self-Efficacy Posttest from graduating students during the last week of curriculum instruction in the program (collected in May 2013)

The major purpose of this posttest is to assess whether the graduating students' competencies meet our assessment benchmark of 4.0. This data is compared with the same students' pretest score to measure whether their competency has increased as a result of their MSW education.

- (3) Course grids from the instructors who teach a required course at the end of each semester (Fall 2012, Spring 2013, and Summer 2013).

There are 14 required courses in the MSW program, and each of the courses shares a common assignment and its corresponding grid with the other sections of the same course. The common assignment is designed to build course-related competencies in the curriculum and is used to identify the attainment of the relevant competencies by the students. MSW faculty members complete a course grid for each student that they teach in a required course for Fall, Spring, and Summer semesters. In AY 2012-2013, three collections of course grids were made in December 2012, May 2013, and August 2013.

2. **Assessment Buy-In.** Describe how your chair and faculty were involved in assessment related activities. Did department meetings include discussion of student learning assessment in a manner that included the department faculty as a whole?

Department chair, Dr. Amy Levin, facilitated collection of assessment data by soliciting the students and faculty members who failed to complete the assessment survey by the requested deadline. This increased the response rates of assessment data, thus improving the representativeness of the assessment results.

Assessment data was analyzed following each collection and the analysis was presented in faculty meetings three times during 2012-2013 (August 2012, October 2012, and February 2013). Faculty discussion followed each presentation in the faculty meeting, and the curriculum committees of four social work sequences (practice, policy, research, and human behavior and social environment) had separate meetings to further discuss each sequence based on the assessment results.

3. **Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project.** Answer items a-f for each SLO assessed this year. If you assessed an additional SLO, copy and paste items a-f below, BEFORE you answer them here, to provide additional reporting space.

### 3a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?

The MSW program uses “competency” as a term for SLO in order to be consistent with the Educational Policies (EP) developed by CSWE. In AY 2012-2013, the MSW program measured the following ten competences (EP 2.1.1 – 2.1.10) that CSWE required:

- (1) EP 2.1.1 Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly
- (2) EP 2.1.2 Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice
- (3) EP 2.1.3 Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments
- (4) EP 2.1.4 Engage diversity and difference in practice
- (5) EP 2.1.5 Advance human rights and social and economic justice
- (6) EP 2.1.6 Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research
- (7) EP 2.1.7 Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment
- (8) EP 2.1.8 Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services
- (9) EP 2.1.9 Respond to contexts that shape practice
- (10) EP 2.1.10a-d Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities

The tenth competency was divided into four sub-categories and each sub-category assesses EP 2.1.10(a) engage, EP 2.1.10(b) assess, EP 2.1.10(c) intervene, and EP 2.1.10(d) evaluate.

### 3b. Does this learning outcome align with one or more of the university’s Big 5 Competencies? (Delete any which do not apply)

- Critical Thinking
- ~~Oral Communication~~
- ~~Written Communication~~
- ~~Quantitative Literacy~~
- ~~Information Literacy~~

One of the ten competencies, “EP 2.1.3 Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments,” is in line with the University’s competencies, Critical Thinking. Social workers use critical thinking to appraise and integrate research-based knowledge and practice wisdom. The students’ achievement of critical thinking is measured by asking if they (1) act from an integrated knowledge base and (2) apply appropriate models of prevention and intervention to the client population.

**3c. Does this learning outcome align with University's commitment to supporting diversity through the cultivation and exchange of a wide variety of ideas and points of view? In what ways did the assessed SLO incorporate diverse perspectives related to race, ethnic/cultural identity/cultural orientations, religion, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, socio-economic status, veteran status, national origin, age, language, and employment rank?**

The fourth competency listed in 3a, "EP 2.1.4 Engage diversity and difference in practice," is consistent with the University's commitment to diversity. Social workers understand multiple dimensions of diversity that shape the human experience (i.e., age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, political ideology, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation). In addition, they appraise that an individual may experience oppression, marginalization, and alienation, as well as power and privilege as a result of these differences. The students' competency in performing diversity is assessed by asking if they could (1) identify the multiple sources of diversity, (2) understand how this diversity, often intersectionality of multiple different factors, shapes the life of an individual, and (3) demonstrate self-awareness in eliminating the influence of personal values in working with diverse groups.

**3d. What direct and/or indirect instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?**

Assessment of the MSW program used the following direct and indirect instruments:

(1) Student Self-Efficacy Scale (indirect measurement):

This is a 39-item, 5-point Likert scale to measure students' level of confidence in performing 10 social work competencies. Students are asked to report their own confidence in executing the competency-related practice behaviors by selecting one of the following responses: "5= very strong", "4= strong", "3= average", "2= weak", and "1= very weak".

(2) 14 course grids (direct measurement):

There are 14 required courses in MSW program and each course uses a course grid to assess students' performance on a common assignment that is shared across different sections of each required course. Faculty completes a course grid for each student in the required course to assess the student's competencies associated with the common assignment. Each course grid includes 6 -13 items and has a 5-point Likert scale including "5= very strong", "4= strong", "3= average", "2= weak", and "1= very weak". These response categories are designed to be consistent with the ones used on the Student Self-Efficacy Scale so that a comparison of the results can be made effectively.

**3e. Describe the assessment design methodology:** For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (Comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

The Student Self-Efficacy Scale was aimed to gather assessment data longitudinally: pretest by the students' entrance of the program and posttest by their exit of the program. Pretest and posttest have a 2-year interval for the 2-year program students and a 3-year interval for 3-year program students. During AY 2012-2013, the scale was administered to the incoming MSW students in August 2012 (pretest of incoming students) and to the graduating students in May 2013 (posttest of graduating students). The analysis of the pretest and posttest for AY 2012-2013 is reported in the subsequent section 3f.

The grids of the 14 required courses were designed to gather cross-sectional data for assessment purposes: assessing students' performance in course-related competencies at the time that the students complete the common assignment of the course. In AY 2012-2013, the course grids were administered to faculty each semester (Fall 2012, Spring 2013, and Summer 2013), and the analysis of the grids is reported in 3f.

**3f. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO:** Provide a summary of how the results were analyzed and highlight findings from the collected evidence.

Both the Student's Self-Efficacy Scale and course grids use a 5-point Likert scale ("5= very strong", "4= strong", "3= average", "2= weak", and "1= very weak") and a score of 4.0 is used as a benchmark.

#### Summary of Assessment Outcomes:

The outcomes of the MSW program assessment are summarized as follows:

- (1) Table 1 presents the results of Self-Efficacy pretest collected in August 2012. The pretest was administered to the entire incoming students, and 178 out of 184 incoming students responded resulting in a completion rate of 96.7%. The numbers in the table represent the aggregated mean score of the items of the Self-Efficacy Scale that measure each corresponding competency. It shows that most of the mean scores of incoming students were below 4.0 for every competency.

**Table 1. Results of Self-Efficacy Pretest, August 2012 (96.7% completion rate, N= 178/ 184)**

<b>Competency</b>	<b>incoming students in total</b>	<b>2-14 cohort (on-site)</b>	<b>3-15 cohort (on-site)</b>	<b>COC-15 cohort (off-site)</b>	<b>Online-14 cohort (online)</b>
EP 2.1.1 Professionalism	3.70	3.73	3.54	3.64	3.87
EP 2.1.2 Ethics	3.75	3.78	3.58	3.70	4.0
EP 2.1.3 Critical Thinking	3.14	3.21	2.80	3.04	3.46
EP 2.1.4 Diversity	4.18	4.32	3.91	4.00	4.41
EP 2.1.5 Justice	3.44	3.52	3.34	3.29	3.61
EP 2.1.6 EBP	3.04	3.15	2.78	2.97	3.13
EP 2.1.7 HBSE	3.11	3.23	2.78	3.15	3.19
EP 2.1.8 Policy	3.07	3.03	2.75	3.12	3.45
EP 2.1.9 Respond to contexts	3.31	3.32	3.03	3.37	3.57
EP 2.1.10a Engage	3.51	3.59	3.28	3.51	3.65
EP 2.1.10b Assess	3.37	3.39	3.16	3.38	3.48
EP 2.1.10c Intervene	2.88	2.88	2.64	2.85	3.16
EP 2.1.10d Evaluate	2.87	2.85	2.56	2.95	3.17

(2) Table 2 shows the results of Self-Efficacy posttest collected in May 2013. All graduates (N=109) were asked to complete the posttest and 98 graduates completed it, resulting in a response rate of 89.9%. The analysis indicates that mean scores of all graduates met the benchmark of 4.0 in nine practice competencies. In other words, the students who graduated in May 2013 reported having “strong” confidence in executing nine practice competencies. The four competencies with mean scores below 4.0 were EP 2.1.6 (M= 3.92), EP 2.1.8 (M= 3.97), EP 2.1.10c (M= 3.94), and EP 2.1.10d (M= 3.85). Examination of three graduating cohorts (2-13, 3-13, and DPSS-13 cohorts) shows that they are only marginally different in terms of the competencies that reached or did not reach the benchmark. The comparison of the three cohorts revealed no significant mean difference among the groups. These results will be reported to the entire MSW faculty during a faculty meeting scheduled in October 2013 and ways to incorporate these findings in future curriculum will be discussed.

**Table 2. Results of Self-Efficacy Posttest, May 2013 (89.9% completion rate, N= 98/ 109)**

<b>Competency</b>	<b>Graduates In total</b>	<b>2-13 Cohort (on-site)</b>	<b>3-13 Cohort (on-site)</b>	<b>DPSS-13 cohort (off-site)</b>
EP 2.1.1 Professionalism	4.50	4.49	4.55	4.47
EP 2.1.2 Ethics	4.42	4.37	4.49	4.56
EP 2.1.3 Critical Thinking	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.30
EP 2.1.4 Diversity	4.67	4.60	4.71	4.90
EP 2.1.5 Justice	4.19	4.14	4.19	4.40
EP 2.1.6 EBP	3.92	3.83	4.06	4.03
EP 2.1.7 HBSE	4.45	4.39	4.42	4.69
EP 2.1.8 Policy	3.97	3.87	4.08	4.16
EP 2.1.9 Respond to contexts	4.08	4.04	3.97	4.38
EP 2.1.10a Engage	4.47	4.43	4.56	4.49
EP 2.1.10b Assess	4.42	4.37	4.42	4.57
EP 2.1.10c Intervene	3.94	3.91	3.85	4.20
EP 2.1.10d Evaluate	3.85	3.85	3.75	4.03

(3) Table 3 compares the Self-Efficacy posttest scores of 2013 graduates with their pretest scores. The comparison was made for the students who completed both pretest and posttest: matching n=57/60 for 2-13 cohort (2-year program cohort that graduated in 2013), matching n=24/31 for 3-13 cohort (2-year program cohort that graduated in 2013), and matching n= 15/18 for DPSS-13 cohort (off-campus DPSS cohort that graduated in 2013). The analysis showed a significant mean improvement in all paired competencies (EP 2.1.1 – EP 2.1.10d). These mean differences indicate that the students' level of confidence in performing the ten competencies significantly improved as a result of their MSW training.

**Table 3. Comparison of Self-Efficacy Pretest with the Posttest of 2013 Graduates**

Competency	2-13 Cohort (on-site)		3-13 cohort (on-site)		DPSS-13 cohort (off-site)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
EP 2.1.1	3.56	4.49	3.42	4.55	4.02	4.47
EP 2.1.2	3.69	4.37	3.46	4.49	3.97	4.56
EP 2.1.3	3.04	4.11	2.92	4.23	3.00	4.30
EP 2.1.4	4.13	4.60	3.76	4.71	4.30	4.90
EP 2.1.5	3.54	4.14	2.97	4.19	3.50	4.40
EP 2.1.6	3.02	3.83	2.44	4.06	2.75	4.03
EP 2.1.7	3.05	4.39	2.51	4.42	2.81	4.69
EP 2.1.8	3.16	3.87	2.51	4.08	3.29	4.16
EP 2.1.9	3.28	4.04	2.79	3.97	3.29	4.38
EP 2.1.10a	3.42	4.43	3.15	4.56	2.98	4.49
EP 2.1.10b	3.23	4.37	3.02	4.42	3.11	4.57
EP 2.1.10c	3.81	3.91	2.56	3.85	2.62	4.20
EP 2.1.10d	2.79	3.85	2.54	3.75	2.71	4.03

- (4) An analysis of 14 course grids was made. Completion rate of course grids was 80% (N=744/930) for Fall 2012 and 100% (N=1303) for Spring and Summer 2013. Due to the extensive length of the grid results, tables that show analysis of each course grid are attached to the report in an appendix.

Analysis of the 12 courses produced a mean score that met the benchmark of 4.0 for course-related competencies. Two courses, SWRK 520 and SWRK 521, produced scores below 4.0.

Results of the SWRK 520 grid indicated three out of seven items fall below 4.0 for the 2-14 cohort (Fall 2012), but all items reached above 4.0 for 3-15 cohort (Summer 2013). This implies possible differences in different student cohorts given the consistency of curriculum components and instructors who delivered the course materials. This result will be presented to the faculty during a faculty meeting in October 2013 for further discussion.



SWRK 521 used a new common assignment and new course grid in 2012-2013. This change was made based on the assessment results of the previous year, 2011-2012. However, all four items of the SWRK 521 grid produced a mean score below 4.0, indicating that the change was not successful in improving students' competencies.

Results of course grids will be reported to the entire faculty during a faculty meeting in October 2013.

**3g. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO:** Describe how assessment results were used to improve student learning. Were assessment results from previous years or from this year used to make program changes in this reporting year? (Possible changes include: changes to course content/topics covered, changes to course sequence, additions/deletions of courses in program, changes in pedagogy, changes to student advisement, changes to student support services, revisions to program SLOs, new or revised assessment instruments, other academic programmatic changes, and changes to the assessment plan.)

The assessment analysis for 2011-2012 indicated inconsistent results in the two course grids: SWRK 501 and SWRK 521. The curriculum committee of SWRK 501 discussed the results and restructured the course curriculum by moving from age-specific approaches to human development to a theme-based approach to human development. The redesign of the course yielded positive changes in assessment outcome and all 11 items of the course grid reached above 4.0 as shown in the analysis of SWRK 501 grid.

The SWRK 521 curriculum committee discussed the inconsistent results of the 2011-2012 analysis and changed the common assignment and the corresponding grid. However, the new common assignment and course grid were not effective in improving student competencies that SWRK 521 covered in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. After a more thorough review, the committee realized that the failure to improve students' competencies was due to attempting to cover too much material on macro practice (i.e., at the group and community level) in one course. Thus, the course material for SWRK 521 was restructured to be covered over two courses, and a new course, SWRK 621, was created and will be first implemented in Spring 2014. This change is also expected to improve the posttest scores for two competencies, "EP 2.1.10(c) Intervene" and "EP 2.1.10 (d) Evaluate," since curriculum components that are related to these two competencies will be covered more thoroughly in SWRK 621.

The assessment analysis for 2012-2013 will be reported to faculty in October 2013. Based on this evidence, faculty will discuss possible changes to improve student learning. Any changes confirmed by the curriculum committee will be implemented in AY2013-2014.

4. **Assessment of Previous Changes:** Present documentation that demonstrates how the previous changes in the program resulted in improved student learning.

The discussion made in the above section (3g) can be supported by the following tables. The first table presents the results of the SWRK 501 grid implemented in Fall 2012, and it shows that the effort made by the curriculum committee produced desirable changes in student outcomes. The second table shows the analysis of the SWRK 521 grid implemented in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013, and the findings indicate that the new common assignment and new grid were not successful in improving students' competencies that SWRK 521 covered.

(1) Results of SWRK 501 grid, Fall 2012

SWRK 501	Fall 2012
1. Student articulates a specific issue that effects a vulnerable population (EP 2.1.4)	4.88
2. Student describes the issue from the Ecological Model (EP 2.1.7)	4.63
3. Student includes a specific developmental theory (Attachment, Social Learning) (EP 2.1.7)	4.58
4. Student articulates bio-psycho-social-spiritual dimensions of the issue (EP 2.1.7)	4.65
5. Student identifies a specific age-cohort with its opportunities and challenges (EP 2.1.7)	4.86
6. Student describes the role of family in the issue (EP 2.1.4)	4.78
7. Student describes the role of community in the issue (EP 2.1.4)	4.81
8. Student discusses published research studies on issue (EP 2.1.7)	4.76
9. Student Presents a specific community-level [prevention or promoting wellbeing] model (EP 2.1.7)	4.80
10. Student Advocates for a (micro or macro-level) related policy that promotes wellbeing (EP 2.1.4)	4.68
11. Overall oral presentation (poster) of the material e.g. professionalism in use of language and visuals. (EP 2.1.7)	4.73

(2) Results of SWRK 521 grid, Fall 2012 & Spring 2013

SWRK 521	Fall 2012	Spring 2013
1. Illustrate critical thinking related to the communication of professional Judgments (EP 2.1.3)	3.61	3.63
2. Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination (EP 2.1.5)	3.74	3.69
3. Uses scientific inquiry and research evidence to inform practice (EP 2.1.6)	3.50	3.63
5. Respond to contexts that shape practice by continuous discovery, appraisal of emerging societal trends that impact communities (EP 2.1.9)	3.63	4.00

**5. Changes to SLOs?** Please attach an updated course alignment matrix if any changes were made. (Refer to the Curriculum Alignment Matrix Template, [http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms\\_guides.html](http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html).)

N/A

**6. Assessment Plan:** Evaluate the effectiveness of your 5 year assessment plan. How well did it inform and guide your assessment work this academic year? What process is used to develop/update the 5 year assessment plan? Please attach an updated 5 year assessment plan for 2013-2018. (Refer to Five Year Planning Template, plan B or C, [http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms\\_guides.html](http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html).)

N/A

**7. Has someone in your program completed, submitted or published a manuscript which uses or describes assessment activities in your program?** Please provide citation or discuss.

No

**8. Other information, assessment or reflective activities or processes not captured above.**

## **Appendix**

### **Analysis of Course Grids, 2012-2013**

Included are the results of course grids that MSW program administered to faculty to assess students' achievement of course-related competencies during AY 2012-2013.

SWRK 501

SWRK 502

SWRK 510

SWRK 520

SWRK 521

SWRK 525

SWRK 535

SWRK 601

SWRK 602

SWRK 603

SWRK 630

SWRK 635

SWRK 645

SWRK 698

<b>SWRK 501</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>
1. Student articulates a specific issue that effects a vulnerable population (EP 2.1.4)	4.88
2. Student describes the issue from the Ecological Model (EP 2.1.7)	4.63
3. Student includes a specific developmental theory (Attachment, Social Learning) (EP 2.1.7)	4.58
4. Student articulates bio-psycho-social-spiritual dimensions of the issue (EP 2.1.7)	4.65
5. Student identifies a specific age-cohort with its opportunities and challenges (EP 2.1.7)	4.86
6. Student describes the role of family in the issue (EP 2.1.4)	4.78
7. Student describes the role of community in the issue (EP 2.1.4)	4.81
8. Student discusses published research studies on issue (EP 2.1.7)	4.76
9. Student Presents a specific community-level [prevention or promoting wellbeing] model (EP 2.1.7)	4.80
10. Student Advocates for a (micro or macro-level) related policy that promotes wellbeing (EP 2.1.4)	4.68
11. Overall oral presentation (poster) of the material e.g. professionalism in use of language and visuals. (EP 2.1.7)	4.73

<b>SWRK 502</b>	<b>Spring &amp; Summer 2013</b>
1. Student demonstrates the role of family in healthy adult development. (EP 2.1.4)	4.38
2. Student recognizes the importance of differences in shaping life experiences. (EP 2.1.4)	4.51
3. Student explicitly articulates adult development by age (early, middle and late) adulthood. (EP 2.1.7)	4.36
4. Student critiques adult problems/ solutions from the “person in environment” perspective. (EP 2.1.7)	4.44
5. Student demonstrates the role of meaning in healthy adult development. (EP 2.1.7)	4.40
6. Student demonstrates the role of community integration in healthy adult development. (EP 2.1.7)	4.38
7. Student demonstrates the role of family in healthy adult development. (EP 2.1.7)	4.37
8. Student demonstrates the role of sexuality in healthy adult development. (EP 2.1.7)	4.18
9. Student demonstrates the role of health in healthy adult development. (EP 2.1.7)	4.40
10. Student applies knowledge of “person in environment” perspective in presentation of a community model of social work practice. (EP 2.1.7)	4.36
11. Overall oral presentation (poster) of the material e.g. professionalism in use of language and visuals. (EP 2.1.7)	4.40

<b>SWRK 503</b>	<b>Spring &amp; Summer 2013</b>
1. Student articulates assumptions, values and perspectives underlying DSM-IV-TR as they relate to the client/family system. (EP 2.1.3)	4.31
2. Student discriminates diagnostic formulation (articulates his/her rationale) using the DSM-IV-TR multiaxial diagnostic system. (EP 2.1.3; 2.1.4 )	4.19
3. Student demonstrates complexities of assessment & treatment choices from a diversity lens. (EP 2.1.4)	4.21
4. Student demonstrates complexities of assessment & treatment choices from Social Work's Person-In-Environment perspective. (EP 2.1.7)	4.28
5. Student identifies environmental-cultural factors, social justice issues, oppression and privilege impacting client system. (EP 2.1.5, 2.1.9)	4.25
6. Student uses critical thinking to inform professional decisions regarding assessment and diagnosis. (EP 2.1.3)	4.16

<b>SWRK 510</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>
1. Student clearly articulated the agency's mission, target population and expertise. EP 2.1.10(a)	4.74
2. Student clearly states the client's wishes (in the client's words). EP 2.1.10(a)	4.59
3. Student clearly states from the client's perspective what would be different (in observable and measurable terms) if the client achieved his/her wishes. EP 2.1.10 (a)	4.56
4. Student identified how they engaged the client (specific strategies used stated in professional terms). EP 2.1.10(a)	4.53
5. Student articulates a comprehensive psychosocial (assessment). EP 2.1.10(b)	4.44
6. Student able to clearly state the treatment plan and published research that informed their decision. Attached treatment protocol outline. EP 2.1.10(b, c)	4.41
7. Student identified how they evaluated the client's progress, specific tools used. EP 2.1.10(d)	4.44
8. The student able to critically summarize their role in the client's care. EP 2.1.1, 2.1.2	4.44

<b>SWRK 520</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>	<b>Spring 2013</b>
1. Student clearly described how he/she perceive the self. (EP 2.1.4)	4.16	4.73
2. Student clearly described how he/she is perceived by others. (EP 2.1.4)	4.16	4.74
3. Student critically addressed his/her experiences as a raced/ethnic person. (EP 2.1.4, 2.1.5)	4.02	4.70
4. Student critically addressed his/her experiences as a class person. (EP 2.1.4, 2.1.5)	4.02	4.70
5. Student critically addressed his/her experiences as a gendered & sexual person. (EP 2.1.4, 2.1.5)	3.32	4.72
6. Student critically reflected on the interactional experience of identity. (EP 2.1.4, 2.1.7)	3.80	4.72
7. Student clearly described what identity means to him/her. (EP 2.1.4)	3.91	4.72

<b>SWRK 521</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>	<b>Spring 2013</b>
1. Illustrate critical thinking related to the communication of professional judgments (EP 2.1.3)	3.61	3.63
2. Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination (EP 2.1.5)	3.74	3.69
3. Uses scientific inquiry and research evidence to inform practice (EP 2.1.6)	3.50	3.63
4. Respond to contexts that shape practice by continuous discovery, appraisal of emerging societal trends that impact communities (EP 2.1.9)	3.63	4.00

<b>SWRK 525</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>	<b>Spring 2013</b>
1. Identify & utilize various models to articulate, analyze, and support or oppose social welfare legislation and related policy issues. (EP.2.1.3, 2.1.8)	4.41	4.21
2. Identify national and international political entities, legislative representatives, policy analysts, and grassroots organizations and utilize a strategy to approach to take action. (EP 2.1.1, 2.1.5, 2.1.8)	4.32	4.15
3. Articulate discrimination in key social welfare policies and advocate for change to ameliorate it. (EP 2.1.8)	4.42	4.21
4. Utilize the strengths-based approach in analyzing and changing social welfare policy. (EP 2.1.3, 2.1.8)	4.43	4.24
5. Articulate philosophical and historical social welfare policy trends and the relationship of these trends to current policy. (EP 2.1.1, 2.1.8)	4.44	4.12
6. Identify how social work values influence policy. (EP 2.1.2)	4.22	4.24

<b>SWRK 535</b>	<b>Spring 2013</b>
1. Student clearly formulated research question (and/or hypothesis). (EP 2.1.3)	4.48
2. Student critically appraised the main empirical studies related to the research question. (EP 2.1.6)	4.13
3. Student clearly operationalized the variables in the study. (EP 2.1.6)	4.38
4. Student appropriately developed the research design. (EP 2.1.6; 2.1.10(b))	4.33
5. Student properly selected or developed the measure(s) for data collection. (EP 2.1.6; 2.1.10(b))	4.35
6. Student clearly interpreted findings of the study. (EP 2.1.6; 2.1.10(d))	4.14
7. Student critically evaluated the study with discussion of strengths and limitations. (EP 2.1.6; 2.1.10(b))	4.20



<b>SWRK 601</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>	<b>Spring 2013</b>
1. Student clearly conceptualizes (including risks & protective factors) an urban family 'case'. (EP 2.1.3)	4.70	4.42
2. Student articulates how they would engage an urban family (specific strategies, e.g. motivation interviewing). (EP 2.1.10(a))	4.75	4.51
3. Student articulates how they would assess an urban family including specific strategies & tools; psychosocial. (EP 2.1.10(b))	4.75	4.44
4. Student demonstrates a competent psychosocial that draws on family's strengths. (EP 2.1.10(b))	4.64	4.49
5. Student discusses that critiques published research that would inform their treatment plan. (EP 2.1.6)	4.41	4.33
6. Student articulates the intersection of family's goals/ wishes, treatment context and published research in selecting the intervention. (EP 2.1.10(c))	4.36	4.43
7. Student describes in steps/ phases the proposed treatment protocol (prevention, intervention or recovery). (EP 2.1.10(c))	4.64	4.43
8. Student communicates succinctly how they would evaluate the family's progress and outcomes. (EP 2.1.10(d))	4.57	4.42
9. Student discusses termination issues.	4.59	4.44
10. Student presents social justice issues (e.g. treatment access) for a specific family. (EP 2.1.5)	4.50	4.53
11. Student demonstrates relevant issues of diversity. (EP 2.1.4)	4.48	4.40

<b>SWRK 602</b>	<b>Spring &amp; Summer 2013</b>
1. Student clearly defined the client treatment context (e.g. outpatient drug treatment program).	4.54
2. Student discussed social justice and other ethical issues (e.g. access to care).	4.46
3. Student identified client's wishes, strengths and diversity.	4.53
4. Student described engagement with client and specific strategies employed (e.g. motivational interviewing, solution-focus, etc.).	4.44
5. Student presented assessment of client with specific tools and strategies.	4.39
6. Student presented clear treatment plan including brief overview of relevant research.	4.35
7. Student utilized scientifically tested treatment protocol.	4.42
8. Student developed treatment goals and rationale.	4.36
9. Student utilized evaluation tools and strategies.	4.34

<b>SWRK 630</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>	<b>Summer 2013</b>
1. Student identified a trauma's impact on population (EP 2.1.3, 2.1.7)	4.57	4.49
2. Student showed an understanding of Human Behavior in the Social Environment in his/her description of the population (EP 2.1.7)	4.46	4.49
3. Student identified risk for developmental trajectory without treatment (EP 2.1.7)	4.51	4.17
4. Student defined the severity/intensity of the trauma as simple or complex with thoughtful justification (EP 2.1.7)	4.57	4.20
5. Student identified the population's relevant diversity. (EPAS 2.1.4)	4.53	4.49
6. Student critiqued the relevant treatment research (published studies) specific to the population and context. (EP 2.1.6; 2.1.10c)	4.27	4.45
7. Student identified method of implementation on target population (EP 2.1.9)	4.43	4.45
8. Student described Herman's phases of recovery specific to the population (EPAS 2.1.10c)	4.68	4.07
9. Student identified strengths to help with recovery (EP 2.1.7)	4.43	4.36
10. Student identified barriers (e.g. stigma, economic, cultural) to accessing treatment for this population (EP 2.1.10c)	4.51	4.51
11. Student explored effects of trauma work on self - [Student's available resources--internal and external -by reflection and self-correction] (EP 2.1.2)	4.62	4.48
12. Student explored strategies to overcome personal obstacles (EP 2.1.10c)	4.61	4.48

<b>SWRK 635</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>
1. Student clearly formulated research question/hypothesis. (EP 2.1.6)	4.37
2. Student addressed the issue of social and economic justice for study population. (EP 2.1.5)	4.11
3. Student critically synthesized the existing literature on student's study topic(s). (EP 2.1.6)	4.03
4. Student appropriately developed the research design. (EP 2.1.6, 2.1.10(b))	4.36
5. Student properly selected or developed the measure(s). (EP 2.1.6, 2.1.10(b))	4.29
6. Student's sampling and data collection methods were appropriate to answer research question(s). (EP 2.1.6, 2.1.10(b))	4.31
7. Student utilized a culturally competent approach to construct research method. (EP 2.1.4)	4.18
8. Student critically addressed the application of social work value and ethics. (EP 2.1.2)	4.29

<b>SWRK 645</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>	<b>Spring &amp; Summer 2013</b>
1. The advocacy practice issue is clearly defined. (EP 2.1.3; 2.1.8)	4.83	4.54
2. How the advocacy practice effort affects urban family policy is articulated. (EP 2.1.5; 2.1.8)	4.57	4.27
3. How the target population (client) is involved in the advocacy effort is outlined. (EP 2.1.8)	4.83	4.20
4. Demographics of the target population/client are described. (EP 2.1.3)	4.83	4.34
5. The advocacy practice project follows consistent strategies. The strategies and expectations are discussed in the paper. (EP 2.1.8; 2.1.9)	4.70	4.37
6. How the advocacy practice project addresses cultural issues on a local and/or international level is clear. (EP 2.1.4; 2.1.5)	4.57	4.18
7. How the advocacy practice project addresses urban family strengths is briefly addressed. (EP 2.1.5; 2.1.8)	4.70	4.20
8. The results including the evaluation of the advocacy project are clear and reflect social justice issues for urban families and communities. (EP 2.1.8; 2.1.9)	4.70	4.38
9. How this project affects your future practice is discussed. (EP 2.1.9)	4.57	4.11

<b>SWRK 698</b>	<b>Spring 2013</b>
1. Student clearly formulated research question/hypothesis. (EP 2.1.6)	4.59
2. Student critically synthesized the existing literature on student's study topic(s). (EP 2.1.6)	4.51
3. Student appropriately developed the research design. (EP 2.1.6; 2.1.10(b))	4.48
4. Student properly selected or developed the measure(s). (EP 2.1.6; 2.1.10(b))	4.54
5. Student's sampling and data collection methods were appropriate to answer research question(s). (EP 2.1.6; 2.1.10(b))	4.50
6. Student utilized a culturally competent approach to construct research method. (EP 2.1.4)	4.50
7. Student clearly interpreted the findings and discussed their importance in social work. (EP 2.1.6; 2.1.10(b))	4.39
8. Student critically acknowledged the study's strength and limitations. (EP 2.1.6; 2.1.10(d))	4.53
9. Student discussed implications for social work practice, policy and research. (EP 2.1.6; 2.1.8; 2.1.9; 2.1.10(c); 2.1.10(d))	4.57