

## 2015-2016 Annual Program Assessment Report

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College, and to [james.solomon@csun.edu](mailto:james.solomon@csun.edu), Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by September 30, 2016. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. Please identify your department/program in the file name for your report.

**College:** Social and Behavioral Science

**Department:** Social Work

**Program:** Master of Social Work

**Assessment liaison:** Hyun-Sun Park

**1. Please check off whichever is applicable:**

A.  **Measured student work.**

B.  **Analyzed results of measurement.**

C.  **Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision.**

**2. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** On a separate sheet, provide a brief overview of this year's assessment activities, including:

- an explanation for why your department chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, and/or application) that it enacted
- if your department implemented assessment **option A**, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year's measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include)
- if your department implemented assessment **option B**, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year's analyses and past and future assessment activities
- if your department implemented **option C**, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities
- in what way(s) your assessment activities may reflect the university's commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups
- any other assessment-related information you wish to include, including SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes), and/or the creation and modification of new assessment instruments

**3. Preview of planned assessment activities for next year.** Include a brief description and explanation of how next year's assessment will contribute to a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

## Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s)

The Master of Social Work (MSW) program assessment follows the guidelines of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the accrediting institution of social work programs. As CSWE requires all accredited programs to conduct a competency-based assessment, the 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. Each year, the MSW program assessment measures student work based on competencies, analyze the results of the measurement, and applies the analysis to curriculum review or revision.

The goal of the MSW program assessment is to evaluate the students' attainment of the nine competencies prescribed by CSWE. To this end, the following three data collections were conducted in AY 2015-2016:

- (1) Self-Efficacy Pretest from incoming students during the first week of curriculum instruction in the program (collected in August 2015)

The purpose of this online survey via Moodle is to assess where the incoming students are in terms of their efficacy in performing the nine social work competencies. This pretest will be compared to a posttest which will be collected from the same students 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 2016)

The purpose of this posttest is to assess whether the graduating students' competencies meet our assessment benchmark of 4.0. This data is compared to the same students' pretest scores 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 2015, Spring 2016, and Summer 2016).

There are 15 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 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 2015-2016, three collections of course grids were made in December 2015, May 2016, and August 2016.

## Program SLO

The MSW program uses “competency” as a term for SLO in order to be consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) developed by CSWE. CSWE updated EPAS in June 2015 and delineated nine core competencies in replacement of ten competencies that were used from Fall 2008 to Spring 2015. In AY 2015-2016, the MSW program measured the following nine competences that CSWE required for incoming students who entered the program in August 2016:

- (1) Competency 1 - Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior
- (2) Competency 2 - Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice
- (3) Competency 3 - Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice
- (4) Competency 4 - Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice
- (5) Competency 5 - Engage in Policy Practice
- (6) Competency 6 - Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
- (7) Competency 7 - Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
- (8) Competency 8 –Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
- (9) Competency 9 –Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

In addition, the following ten competences (EP 2.1.1 – 2.1.10) were measured for the students who graduated in May 2016 in order for their posttest to be compared to their pretest.

- (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.

## **Assessment Instruments and Methodology**

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

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

This is a 35-item, 5-point Likert scale to measure students' level of confidence in performing nine 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".

The Student Self-Efficacy Scale is aimed to gather assessment data longitudinally: pretest at the students' entrance of the program and posttest at their exit of the program. The pretest and posttest have a 2-year interval for 2-year program students and a 3-year interval for 3-year program students. During AY 2015-2016, the scale was administered to the incoming MSW students in August 2015 (pretest) and to the graduating students in May 2016 (posttest).

The Student Self-Efficacy Scale was modified in the beginning of 2015-2016 to be consistent with the updated Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) issued by CSWE in June 2015. The updated scale was administered to the incoming students, and the old scale was administered to graduating students in order for the comparison of pretest and posttest to be effective.

(2) 15 course grids (direct measurement):

There are 15 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 4-11 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.

The grids of the 15 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 2015-2016, faculty who taught a required course completed a course grid for each student to assess the student's competencies associated with the common assignment at the end of each semester (Fall 2015, Spring 2016, and Summer 2016).

All 15 course grids are modified in the beginning of AY 2015-2016 to be consistent with the updated Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) published by CSWE in June 2015.

## Analysis of Assessment Data and Summary of Results

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.

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

- (1) Table 1 presents the results of Self-Efficacy pretest collected in August 2015. The pretest was administered to incoming students, and 196 out of 199 incoming students responded resulting in a completion rate of 98.5%. The numbers in the table represent the aggregated mean score of the items of the Self-Efficacy Scale that measure each corresponding competency. The second column shows that the average scores for incoming students were below 4.0, with the exception of the score for Competency 1 Ethical and Professional Behavior.

**Table 1. Results of Self-Efficacy Pretest, August 2015 (98.5% completion rate, N= 196/199)**

Competency	Total incoming students (N=196)	2-17 cohort (n=68)	3-18 cohort (n=38)	COC-18 cohort (n=21)	Ventura 3-18 cohort (n=23)	Online-17 cohort (n=46)
Competency 1 - Ethics & Professionalism	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.01	4.29	4.18
Competency 2 - Diversity	3.89	3.85	3.93	3.79	3.90	3.96
Competency 3 - Justice	3.65	3.63	3.61	3.57	3.74	3.70
Competency 4 - Research	3.29	3.40	3.12	3.33	3.30	3.22
Competency 5 - Policy Practice	3.21	3.12	3.32	3.35	3.16	3.24
Competency 6 - Engage	3.93	3.90	3.95	3.76	4.13	3.95
Competency 7 - Assess	3.58	3.59	3.67	3.48	3.64	3.52
Competency 8 - Intervene	3.51	3.48	3.56	3.49	3.59	3.49
Competency 9 - Evaluate	3.25	3.25	3.27	3.21	3.37	3.21

(2) Table 2 shows the results of the Self-Efficacy posttest collected in May 2016. All graduating students (N=161) were asked to complete the posttest and 119 students responded, resulting in a response rate of 73.9%. The analysis indicates that on average all graduates reached the benchmark of 4.0 in twelve of the thirteen practice competencies. In other words, the students who graduated in May 2016 reported to have “strong” confidence in executing the twelve practice competencies. The only competency with average score below 4.0 was EP 2.1.10c ( $M= 3.95$ ) which falls short of the benchmark by 0.05. Examination of four graduating cohorts (2-16, 3-16, COC-16, and Online-16 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 four cohorts revealed no significant average difference among the groups. These results will be reported to the MSW faculty during a faculty meeting scheduled in November 2016 and ways to incorporate these findings in curriculum will be discussed.

**Table 2. Results of Self-Efficacy Posttest, May 2016 (73.9% completion rate, N= 119/161)**

Competency	Total graduates (N=119)	2-16 cohort (n=47)	3-16 cohort (n=20)	COC-6 cohort (n=19)	Online-16 cohort (n=33)
EP 2.1.1 Professionalism	4.55	4.62	4.59	4.43	4.51
EP 2.1.2 Ethics	4.51	4.50	4.54	4.41	4.55
EP 2.1.3 Critical Thinking	4.21	4.18	4.29	4.17	4.24
EP 2.1.4 Diversity	4.72	4.72	4.79	4.69	4.70
EP 2.1.5 Justice	4.32	4.30	4.38	4.17	4.38
EP 2.1.6 EBP	4.12	4.05	4.10	4.14	4.21
EP 2.1.7 HBSE	4.51	4.57	4.48	4.43	4.51
EP 2.1.8 Policy	4.12	4.01	4.21	4.09	4.23
EP 2.1.9 Respond to contexts	4.24	4.15	4.12	4.28	4.42
EP 2.1.10a Engage	4.51	4.55	4.49	4.50	4.47
EP 2.1.10b Assess	4.44	4.35	4.51	4.53	4.48
EP 2.1.10c Intervene	3.95	3.67	4.24	4.13	4.07
EP 2.1.10d Evaluate	4.01	4.00	3.90	3.94	4.12

(3) Table 3 compares the Self-Efficacy posttest scores of 2016 graduates to their pretest scores. The comparison was made for the students who completed both pretest and posttest: matching N=106 for total graduates, matching n=44 for 2-16 cohort, matching n=17 for 3-16 cohort, matching n= 18 for COC-16 cohort, and matching n=27 for Online-16 cohort. A paired-samples t-test shows a significant improvement in all paired competencies (EP 2.1.1 – EP 2.1.10d). These significant differences indicate that the students' level of confidence in performing each competency was markedly improved as a result of MSW training. Examination of each cohort confirmed these findings.

**Table 3. Comparison of Self-Efficacy Pretest with the Posttest of 2016 Graduates**

Competency	Total graduates (N=106)		2-16 cohort (n=44)		3-16 cohort (n=17)		COC-16 cohort (n=18)		Online-16 cohort (n=27)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
EP 2.1.1	3.72	4.57	3.72	4.62	4.08	4.71	3.48	4.43	3.64	4.51
EP 2.1.2	3.77	4.49	3.80	4.52	4.02	4.49	3.39	4.44	3.84	4.47
EP 2.1.3	3.18	4.20	3.10	4.20	3.62	4.29	2.97	4.14	3.17	4.19
EP 2.1.4	4.22	4.72	4.23	4.72	4.32	4.82	4.13	4.72	4.20	4.68
EP 2.1.5	3.56	4.31	3.54	4.29	3.57	4.47	3.33	4.11	3.74	4.40
EP 2.1.6	3.01	4.13	3.02	4.09	3.44	4.18	2.67	4.14	2.96	4.15
EP 2.1.7	3.15	4.53	3.09	4.58	3.63	4.57	2.93	4.46	3.11	4.47
EP 2.1.8	3.18	4.09	3.10	3.98	3.59	4.27	2.85	4.09	3.28	4.14
EP 2.1.9	3.36	4.24	3.37	4.15	3.65	4.26	3.15	4.24	3.31	4.36
EP 2.1.10a	3.68	4.53	3.71	4.57	3.92	4.55	3.48	4.52	3.60	4.46
EP 2.1.10b	3.40	4.42	3.33	4.34	3.90	4.57	3.33	4.51	3.25	4.39
EP 2.1.10c	2.95	3.93	2.89	3.69	3.47	4.27	2.69	4.19	2.90	3.94
EP 2.1.10d	2.90	4.00	2.74	3.98	3.35	4.09	2.69	3.94	3.00	4.04

(4) An analysis of 15 course grids was made. Completion rate of course grids was 95.64% (N=1229/1285) for Fall 2015, 100% (N=1104) for Spring 2016, and 100% (N=294) for Summer 2016. Due to the extensive length of the analysis, tables that show the results of each course grid are attached to the report in an appendix.

The analysis shows that ten courses met the benchmark of 4.0 for all course-related competencies. Five courses (SWRK 501, SWRK 503, SWRK 521, SWRK 601, and SWRK 602) have one to six items that fall(s) short of the benchmark score by 0.03 to 0.33. The grids of SWRK 501 yielded one item whose average score below the benchmark for the first time in the past three years. The grids of SWRK 503 collected in Spring 2016 produced an average score higher than 4.0 for all items, but those collected in Summer 2016 showed an average score lower than 4.0 for three items. A similar result was found in AY 2013-2014 and the grid was revised in Spring 2015 based on the analysis.

Also, the grids of SWRK 521 collected in Fall 2015 met the benchmark of 4.0 for all items, but those collected in Spring 2016 showed an average score below 4.0 for all items. In AY 2014-2015 and 2013-2014, SWRK 521 met the benchmark of 4.0 for all items. Similarly, the grids of SWRK 601 did not meet the benchmark for four items, but they are below the benchmark only by 0.02 to 0.08. In AY 2014-2015 and 2013-2014, SWRK 601 met the benchmark of 4.0 for all items. Finally, SWRK 621 was first offered in Spring 2014 and its grids met the benchmark in AY 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. This year, however, the grids gathered in Fall 2016 met the benchmark score, but those collected in Summer 2016 produced an average score lower than 4.0 for all items.

SWRK 503, SWRK 521, SWRK 601, and SWRK 621 were offered to different cohorts by different faculty in different semesters, so the findings may have resulted from the discrepancies in the way that curriculum contents were delivered or students' competencies were rated on the grid. Or, this may reflect discrepancies among different cohorts in achieving competencies related to the common assignment of these courses.

All course grids were modified in the beginning of 2015-2016 to be consistent with the updated Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) issued by CSWE in June 2015. The above results may indicate that the modified grids of the five courses (SWRK 501, SWRK 503, SWRK 521, SWRK 601, and SWRK 602) may not be effective in measuring students' competencies and may need further revision or attention. These results will be presented to the faculty during a faculty meeting in November 2016. The faculty will discuss possible changes to improve student learning based on the analysis of assessment data.

### **Preview of planned assessment activities for next year**

As the MSW program assessment follows the guidelines of CSWE, its program assessment will measure student work based on competencies, analyze the results of the measurement, and applies the analysis to curriculum revision in AY 2016-2017.



## **Appendix          Analysis of Course Grids, 2015-2016**

Included are the results of course grids that MSW program administered to faculty to assess students' achievement of course-related competencies during AY 2015 -2016. All course grids were modified in the beginning of 2015-2016 to be consistent with the updated Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) issued by CSWE in June 2015.

- SWRK 501 Human Behavior in the Social Environment I
- SWRK 502 Human Behavior in the Social Environment I
- SWRK 503 Psychosocial Assessment and Diagnostic Formulations
- SWRK 510 Generalist Social Work Theory and Practice I
- SWRK 520 Social Work Practice in Multicultural Settings
- SWRK 521 Generalist Social Work Theory and Practice II
- SWRK 525 Social Policy and Services
- SWRK 535 Research Methods for Social Knowledge and Practice
- SWRK 601 Advanced Social Work Practice with Urban Families I
- SWRK 602 Advanced Social Work Practice with Urban Families II
- SWRK 621 Advanced Social Work Practice in Urban Communities
- SWRK 630 Family Crisis, Trauma and Grief
- SWRK 635 Advanced Skills in Program Evaluation and Research with Urban Families
- SWRK 645 Urban Social Policy and Advocacy I
- SWRK 698 Graduate Project

<b>SWRK 501</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Fall 2015</b> (n=174/196, 88.78%)
1. Student articulates a specific issue that effects a vulnerable population (Competency 2, 3)	4.07
2. Student describes the issue from the Ecological Model (Competency 2,4)	4.08
3. Student includes a specific developmental theory (Attachment, Social Learning) (Competency 2,4)	4.03
4. Student articulates bio-psycho-social-spiritual dimensions of the issue (Competency 6)	4.07
5. Student identifies a specific age-cohort with its opportunities and challenges (Competency 6)	4.10
6. Student describes the role of family in the issue (Competency 6)	4.09
7. Student describes the role of community in the issue (Competency 6)	4.02
8. Student discusses published research studies on issue (Competency 4)	3.96
9. Student presents a specific community-level [prevention or promoting wellbeing] model (Competency 2)	4.03
10. Student Advocates for a (micro or macro-level) related policy that promotes wellbeing (Competency 3)	4.03
11. Overall oral presentation (poster) of the material e.g. professionalism in use of language and visuals.	4.00

<b>SWRK 502</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Spring 2016</b> (n=192, 100%)
1. Student recognizes the importance of differences in shaping life experiences. (Competency 2,3, and 4)	4.48
2. Student explicitly articulates adult development by age (early, middle and late) adulthood. (Competency 2,3, and 4)	4.45
3. Student critiques adult problems/ solutions from the “person in environment” perspective. (Competency 2, 3, and 4)	4.44
4. Student demonstrates the role of meaning in healthy adult development. (Competency 2, 3, and 4)	4.49
5. Student demonstrates the role of community integration in healthy adult development. (Comptency 2, 3, and 4)	4.51
6. Student demonstrates the role of family in healthy adult development. (Competency 2, 3, and 4)	4.54
7. Student demonstrates the role of sexuality in healthy adult development. (Competency 2,3,and 4)	4.43
8. Student demonstrates the role of health in healthy adult development. (Competency 2, 3, and 4)	4.48
9. Student applies knowledge of “person in environment” perspective in presentation of a community model of social work practice. (Competency 2,3, and 4)	4.44
10. Overall oral presentation (poster) of the material e.g. professionalism in use of language and visuals. (Competency 1)	4.45

<b>SWRK 503</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Spring 2016</b> (n=111, 100%)	<b>Summer 2016</b> (n=79, 100%)
1. Student articulates reason for referral based on movie, vignette or book assignment (Competency 1)	4.31	4.29
2. Student includes intersectionality, culture or other diversity factors as relevant to client presentation, symptoms or history (Competency 2 & 3)	4.37	4.09
3. Student uses critical thinking in their synthesis and communication of <u>Symptoms/Behaviors</u> and <u>Impairments in Life Functioning</u> (Competency 1, 6, & 7)	4.39	4.11
4. Student accurately and thoroughly articulates client's <u>psychiatric history</u> (Competency 6, & 7)	4.39	3.97
5. Student accurately and thoroughly articulates client's <u>current risk and safety concerns</u> (Competency 6, & 7)	4.37	4.01
6. Student accurately and thoroughly articulates client's <u>Relevant Medical Conditions</u> and <u>Current Medications</u> (Competency 6, & 7)	4.40	3.86
7. Student accurately and thoroughly describes client's <u>Substance Use/Abuse</u> history (Competency 6, & 7)	4.32	4.01
8. Student accurately and thoroughly articulates <u>Psychosocial</u> information as relevant to the client's current symptoms, concerns or presentation and indicates <u>Additional Contacts/Relationships</u> that may be resources for treatment (Competency 1, 2, & 7)	4.40	3.96
9. Student describes client's <u>Mental Status Exam</u> observations, clarifying conflicting information or unclear information in comment section (Competency 2, 6, & 7)	4.35	4.27
10. Student uses critical thinking to develop <u>Summary/Clinical Impression</u> , including strengths (Competency 1, 2, & 3)	4.30	4.18
11. Student articulates his/her rationale for a diagnostic formulation using the proper diagnostic coding system (ie DSM-IV-TR or DSM 5). (Competency 1, 2, & 3)	4.21	4.24

<b>SWRK 510</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Fall 2015</b> (n=196, 100%)
1. Student clearly identifies themes or areas of interest obtained from the assigned text/homework assignments or additional research and integrates themes or areas of interest into a self-reflection paper. (Competency 1, 2, & 4)	4.61
2. Student included discussion on intersectionality (including diversity, power and privilege). (Competency 2)	4.56
3. Student clearly indicates the two Implicit Association tests they took and why – reasons for taking the test must relate to the course and their specific learning needs. (Competency 2)	4.54
4. Student articulates the results of the tests and how the results compare with the themes or areas of interest discussed in the prior section. (Competency 1)	4.51
5. Student clearly articulates the impact of the information identified in the self-reflection paper and the IA tests on engagement, assessment and intervention with client systems. (Competency 1, 6, 7, & 8)	4.54
6. Student clearly articulates the impact of the information identified in the self-reflection paper and the IA tests on ethical/professional practice. (Competency 1)	4.52
7. Student clearly articulates the impact of the information identified in the self-reflection paper and the IA tests on how diversity, power, privilege and social justice play out in generalist practice. (Competency 1, 2, & 3)	4.51

<b>SWRK 520</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Fall 2015</b> (n=66, 100%)	<b>Spring 2016</b> (n=111, 100%)
1. Student describes how they <i>perceive</i> the self. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.65	4.36
2. Student describes how they are <i>perceived</i> by others. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.61	4.34
3. Student addresses their experiences as a racialized/ethnic person. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.58	4.32
4. Student addresses their experiences as a class person. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.61	4.33
5. Student addresses their experiences as a gendered & sexual person. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.47	4.31
6. Student reflects on the interactional experience of identity. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.53	4.33
7. Student describes what identity means to them. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.58	4.39

<b>SWRK 521</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Fall 2015</b> (n=153, 100%)	<b>Spring 2016</b> (n=43, 100%)
1. Engages diverse clients and constituencies as experts in the community assessment plan (Competency 2).	4.43	3.81
2. Community assessment plan reflects pertinent cultural diversity, human rights, and social/economic/environmental justice issues (Competency 3).	4.42	3.74
3. Community assessment uses scientific inquiry and research evidence to inform practice (Competency 4).	4.44	3.67
4. Plan reflects assessment information that can be used to inform service delivery and improve the quality of social services (Competency 7).	4.42	3.84

<b>SWRK 525</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Fall 2015</b> (n=140, 100%)	<b>Spring 2016</b> (n=38, 100%)
1. Clearly explain a social welfare policy (Competency 5)	4.48	4.34
2. Integrate multiple sources of knowledge in analyzing and advocating for policy (Competency 5)	4.70	4.32
3. Identify national or international political entities, legislative representatives, policy analysts, and/or grassroots organizations that advocate for or against policy (Competency 3)	4.58	4.37
4. Identify organizational and institutional basic human rights issues of policy on a local or global level (Competency 3)	4.61	4.37
5. Advocate for policy that enhances client access to services (Competency 5)	4.38	4.32
6. Articulate discrimination in key social welfare policy and advocate for change to ameliorate it (Competency 2)	4.66	4.29
7. Utilize the strengths-based approach in analyzing and changing social welfare policy. (Competency 5)	4.56	4.21
8. Articulate philosophical or historical social welfare policy trends and the relationship of these trends to current policy. (Competency 5)	4.54	4.21
9. Identify how social work values influence policy advocacy. (Competency 2)	4.54	4.26

<b>SWRK 535</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Spring 2016</b> (n=177, 100%)
1. Student clearly formulated the research question and hypothesis for their single-case evaluation. (Competency 4)	4.92
2. Student critically appraised the empirical studies related to their selected target behavior/problem and intervention. (Competency 4)	4.70
3. Student clearly operationalized the variables or outcome indicators of their single-case evaluation. (Competency 4)	4.82
4. Student selected an appropriate design for their single-case evaluation. (Competency 4)	4.71
5. Student properly selected or developed the measure(s) for their intervention outcome. (Competency 4 & 7)	4.71
6. Student clearly interpreted findings of their single-case evaluation. (Competency 4 & 7)	4.72
7. Student critically discussed the strengths and limitations of their single-case evaluation. (Competency 4 & 9)	4.53

<b>SWRK 601</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Fall 2015</b> (n=106, 100%)	<b>Spring 2016</b> (n=66, 100%)
1. Student clearly conceptualizes (including risks and protective factors) an urban family 'case' (Competency 1 & 2).	4.44	4.06
2. Student articulates how they would engage an urban family (specific strategies e.g. motivation interviewing) (Competency 2 & 6).	4.33	4.05
3. Student articulates how they would assess an urban family including specific strategies & tools; psychosocial assessment (Competency 2& 7).	4.35	4.03
4. Student discusses and critiques published research that would inform their treatment plan (Competency 4 & 8).	4.27	3.97
5. Student articulates the intersection of family's goals/ wishes, treatment context and published research in selecting the intervention (Competency 2, 4 & 8).	4.28	3.98
6. Student communicates succinctly how they would evaluate the family's progress and outcomes (Competency 9).	4.37	3.92
7. Student discusses termination issues (Competency 2).	4.34	3.98
8. Student presents social justice issues (e.g. treatment access) for a specific family (Competency 1 & 3).	4.49	4.03
9. Student demonstrates relevant issues of diversity (Competency 1, 2, & 3).	4.48	4.08

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SWRK 602</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Spring 2016</b> (n=105, 100%)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Summer 2016</b> (n=67, 100%)</p>
1. Student clearly defined the client system including referral source, presenting problem, context of their work with client and brief history (Competency 1, 2, & 3)	4.69	4.49
2. Student identifies TWO theories to conceptualize and discuss client care; one EBP and one intersectionality friendly theory (ie CRT, Feminist, Queer) (Competency 2, 3, & 4)	4.49	4.36
3. Student identifies what selected theories suggest regarding engagement, how they would engage client and areas they may get stuck (based on history, presenting problem and intersectionality) (Competency 4 & 6)	4.60	4.30
4. Student identifies what selected theories suggest regarding assessment, how they would assess client and areas they may get stuck (based on history, presenting problem and intersectionality) (Competency 4 & 7)	4.51	4.30
5. Student presented brief discussion on diagnostic formulation as it relates to theory (Competency 4, 7, & 8)	4.52	4.16
6. Student developed a theory congruent treatment plan (LT goal, ST objectives and interventions). Includes relevant research (Competency 8)	4.52	4.19
7. Student explored intersectionality, social justice, power and privilege as it relates to client (including transference as applicable) (Competency 2, 3, & 4)	4.49	4.24
8. Student explored intersectionality, social justice, power and privilege as it relates to themselves (including countertransference as applicable) (Competency 2, 3, & 4)	4.49	4.24
9. Student identifies what selected theories suggest regarding evaluation and termination and discuss how they would terminate with client and evaluate progress (Competency 9)	4.47	4.24

<b>SWRK 621</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Fall 2015</b> (n=106, 100%)	<b>Summer 2016</b> (n=66, 100%)
1. Student articulates how the program design is developed from a clearly defined needs assessment of families in a specific urban community or communities. (Competencies 1 & 7)	4.62	3.95
2. Student's program design takes into account the multicultural make-up of the community that the program serves. (Competency 2)	4.55	3.97
3. Student outlines how the program addresses human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice issues of the urban community. (Competency 3)	4.73	3.97
4. Student writes a program evaluation that provides measureable process and outcome goals and objectives (Competency 9)	4.54	3.94
5. Student clearly describes how the community was and will continue to be engaged in the program. (Competency 6)	4.65	3.95
6. Student describes how the program serves as a community intervention. (Competency 8)	4.61	3.95

<b>SWRK 630</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Fall 2015</b> (n=104, 100%)	<b>Summer 2016</b> (n=82, 100%)
1. Identified how specific trauma is defined within the literature? (Competency 4)	4.54	4.51
2. Identified strengths/limitations of this definition? (Competency 4)	4.43	4.46
3. Identified the occurrence of this trauma in the general population (Competency 4)	4.41	4.50
4. Identified how specific identity markers serve as protective factors or barriers to recovery? (Competency 2)	4.50	4.38
5. Identified trauma's impact on the population's developmental trajectory? (Competency 7)	4.56	4.29
6. Identified how visibility or invisibility of the identity markers and presence/absence of privilege impact the manifestation of the trauma? (Competency 2)	4.61	4.21
7. Compare existing literature about the trauma in the general population with literature specific to your identity specific population (Competency 2,4)	4.30	4.40
8. Identified how issues of privilege and social justice contribute to the presence or absence of research about population specific literature? (Competency 2)	4.63	4.40



<b>SWRK 635</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Fall 2015</b> (n=128, %)
1. Student clearly formulated the research question/hypothesis. (Competency 4)	4.54
2. Student addressed the issue of social and economic justice for study population. (Competency 3)	4.43
3. Student critically synthesized the existing literature on student's study topic(s). (Competency 4)	4.41
4. Student appropriately developed the research design. (Competency 4)	4.50
5. Student properly selected or developed the measure(s). (Competency 4 & 7)	4.56
6. Student's sampling and data collection methods were appropriate to answer research question(s). (Competency 4 & 7)	4.61
7. Student utilized a culturally informed approach to research methods (Competency 2 & 4)	4.30
8. Student critically addressed the application of social work value and ethics. (Competency 1)	4.63

<b>SWRK 645</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)	<b>Fall 2015</b> (n=56, 100%)	<b>Spring 2016</b> (n=105, 100%)
1. The advocacy practice issue is clearly defined. (Competency 5)	4.93	4.33
2. How the advocacy practice effort affects urban family policy is articulated. (Competency 5)	4.45	4.26
3. How the target population (client) is involved in the advocacy effort is outlined. (Competency 3)	4.05	4.23
4. Demographics of the target population/client is described. (Competency 2)	4.79	4.30
5. The advocacy practice project follows consistent strategies. The strategies and expectations are discussed in the paper. (Competency 5)	4.75	4.29
6. How the advocacy practice project addresses cultural issues on a local or federal AND international level is clear. (Competency 2)	4.30	4.26
7. How the advocacy practice project addresses urban family strengths is addressed. (Competency 2)	4.11	4.15
8. How the advocacy practice project reflects human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice for urban families and communities. (Competency 3)	4.89	4.32
9. How this project is monitored and evaluation is clear. (Competency 9)	4.71	4.29

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SWRK 698</b> (Updated in Fall 2015 to be consistent with the 2015 EPAS by CSWE)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Spring 2016</b> (n=156, 100%)</p>
1. Student clearly formulated the research question/hypothesis. (Competency 4)	4.55
2. Student critically synthesized the existing literature on student's study topic(s). (Competency 4)	4.42
3. Student appropriately developed the research design (Competency 4)	4.53
4. Student properly selected or developed the measure(s) (Competency 4 & 7)	4.53
5. Student's sampling and data collection methods were appropriate to answer research question(s). (Competency 4 & 7)	4.56
6. Student utilized a culturally competent approach to construct research method. (Competency 2)	4.56
7. Student clearly interpreted the findings and discussed their importance in social work. (Competency 4 & 7)	4.44
8. Student critically acknowledged the study's strength and limitations (Competency 4 & 9)	4.56
9. Student discussed implications for social work practice, policy and research. (Competency 4)	4.47