

Master of Social Work 2016-2017 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, Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by September 30, 2017. 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. Competency is conceptualized as “holistic values, critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgement that inform performance” and involves both knowledge and performance (CSWE, 2015). The MSW program operationalizes competencies by measuring corresponding practice behaviors described by CSWE.

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 2016-2017:

- (1) MSW Pre-test from incoming students prior to the receipt of curriculum instruction in the program (collected in August 2016)

The purpose of this online survey via Moodle is to assess incoming students in terms of their confidence in performing the nine social work competencies. This pre-test will be compared to a post-test collected from the same students following the last week of curriculum instruction in the program. The comparison measures the MSW program’s effectiveness in increasing students’ confidence levels in executing social work competencies.

- (2) MSW Post-test from graduating students following the last week of curriculum instruction in the program (collected in May 2017)

The purpose of this post-test is to assess whether the graduating students’ competencies meet our assessment benchmark of 4.0. This data is compared to the same students’ pre-test scores to measure whether their competencies have increased as a result of MSW education.

- (3) Course grids from the instructors who teach required courses by the end of each semester (Fall 2016, Spring 2017, and Summer 2017).

There are 19 required courses in the MSW program, each of which shares a common assignment and its corresponding grid with 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 2016-2017, three collections of course grids were made: December 2016, May 2017, and August 2017.

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 to replace the ten competencies that were used from Fall 2008 to Spring 2015.

During 2016-2017, nine competencies from 2015 EPAS were measured by all course grids and the MSW pre-test. Also, the nine competencies were measured by the MSW post-test for the students who entered the program in 2015, while ten competencies from 2008 EPAS were measured for those who started the program in 2014 in order for their post-test to be compared to their pre-test.

The nine competencies (CSWE 2015) are:

- (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

The ten Competencies (CSWE 2008) are:

- (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

The MSW program modified assessment instruments in the beginning of 2015-2016 to be consistent with the updated Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) issued by CSWE in June 2015. During AY 2016-2017, all course grids and the MSW pre-test measured nine

competencies from 2015 EPAS. The MSW post-test measured nine competencies for students who entered the program in 2015 and ten competencies from 2008 EPAS for students who entered the program in 2014.

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

(1) MSW Student Survey (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 MSW Student Survey is aimed to gather assessment data longitudinally: pre-test at the students' entrance of the program and post-test at their exit of the program. The pre-test and post-test have a 2-year interval for 2-year program students and a 3-year interval for 3-year program students. During AY 2016-2017, the survey was administered to the incoming MSW students in August 2016 (pre-test) and to the graduating students in May 2017 (post-test).

(2) Course grids (direct measurement):

There are 19 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 consists of 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 MSW Student Survey so that a comparison of the results can be made effectively.

The grids of the 19 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 2016-2017, faculty who taught a required course completed a course grid for each student to assess the student's competencies associated with the common assignment by the end of each semester (Fall 2016, Spring 2017, and Summer 2017).

Analysis of Assessment Data and Summary of Results

Both the MSW student survey 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 MSW pre-test collected in August 2016. All incoming students (N=151) were asked to complete the pre-test, and 138 students responded with a completion rate of 91.39%. The numbers in the table indicate the aggregated mean score of the items of the

pre-test 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 for the Online-18 cohort.

Table 1. Results of MSW Pre-test, August 2016 (91.39% completion rate, N= 138/151)

Competency	Total incoming students (N=138/151)	2-18 cohort (n=70/76, 92.10%)	3-19 cohort (n=32/38, 84.21%)	Online-18 cohort (n=36/37, 97.30%)
Competency 1- Ethics & Professionalism	3.87	3.81	3.70	4.16
Competency 2 - Diversity	3.62	3.56	3.48	3.85
Competency 3 - Justice	3.29	3.20	3.06	3.65
Competency 4 - Research	2.80	2.75	2.46	3.20
Competency 5 - Policy Practice	2.74	2.56	2.59	3.23
Competency 6 - Engage	3.62	3.57	3.50	3.81
Competency 7 - Assess	3.19	3.04	2.91	3.73
Competency 8 - Intervene	3.21	3.01	3.16	3.62
Competency 9 - Evaluate	2.91	2.80	2.59	3.40

(2) Tables 2-1 and 2-2 show the results of the MSW post-test collected in May 2017. All graduating students (N=177) were asked to complete the post-test and 146 students responded, resulting in a response rate of 82.49%.

Table 2-1 indicates that the 3-17 cohort met the benchmark of 4.0 for eleven of thirteen competencies. The two competencies below 4.0 are EP 2.1.6 EBP ($M=3.93$) and EP 2.1.10c Intervene ($M= 3.90$). It also depicts that the COC-17 cohort met the benchmark for twelve of thirteen competencies. The exception was EP 2.1.10d Evaluate ($M= 3.88$). Table 2-2 shows that 2-17 cohort met the benchmark for eleven of thirteen competencies. The two competencies below 4.0 are Competency 4 Research ($M=3.97$) and Competency 9 Evaluate ($M= 3.88$). It also yields that the Online-17 cohort met the benchmark for all competencies.

The analysis of four graduating cohorts demonstrates that they are only marginally different in terms of the competencies that reached or did not reach the benchmark. Overall, the students who graduated in May 2017 reported having “strong” confidence in performing the competencies. The comparison of the 3-17 cohort with the COC-17 cohort and the 2-17 cohort with the Online-17 cohort revealed no significant average difference. These results will be reported to the MSW faculty during a faculty meeting scheduled in November 2017 and ways to incorporate these findings in curriculum will be discussed.

Table 2-1. Results of MSW Post-test for 3-17 and COC-17 Cohorts, May 2017

Competency	3-17 cohort (n=30/37, 81.08%)	COC-17 cohort (n=24/29, 82.76%)
EP 2.1.1 Professionalism	4.51	4.61
EP 2.1.2 Ethics	4.54	4.53
EP 2.1.3 Critical Thinking	4.27	4.20
EP 2.1.4 Diversity	4.79	4.73
EP 2.1.5 Justice	4.42	4.43
EP 2.1.6 EBP	3.93	4.00
EP 2.1.7 HBSE	4.57	4.40
EP 2.1.8 Policy	4.18	4.07
EP 2.1.9 Respond to contexts	4.34	4.04
EP 2.1.10a Engage	4.57	4.39
EP 2.1.10b Assess	4.38	4.44
EP 2.1.10c Intervene	3.90	4.06
EP 2.1.10d Evaluate	4.03	3.88

Table 2-2. Results of MSW Post-test for 2-17 and Online-17 Cohorts, May 2017

Competency	2-17 cohort (n=54/67, 80.59%)	Online-17 cohort (n=38/44, 86.36%)
Competency 1 - Ethics & Professionalism	4.50	4.58
Competency 2 - Diversity	4.59	4.70
Competency 3 - Justice	4.32	4.42
Competency 4 - Research	3.97	4.09
Competency 5 - Policy Practice	4.00	4.32
Competency 6 - Engage	4.46	4.67
Competency 7 - Assess	4.04	4.47
Competency 8 - Intervene	4.12	4.39
Competency 9 - Evaluate	3.88	4.33

(3) Table 3 compares the MSW post-test scores of 2017 graduates to their pre-test scores. The comparison was made for matched pre-test and post-test scores: matching N=143 for total graduates, matching n=30 for the 3-17 cohort, matching n=23 for the COC-17 cohort, matching n=54 for the 2-17 cohort, and matching n=36 for the Online-17 cohort. A paired-samples t-test yielded a significant improvement in all paired competencies for all graduating cohorts. 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 3-1. Comparison of MSW Pre-test and Post-test for 3-17 and COC-17 Cohorts (3-Year Program Cohorts)

Competency	3-17 cohort (n=30)		COC-17 cohort (n=23)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
EP 2.1.1 Professionalism	3.96	4.51	3.54	4.64
EP 2.1.2 Ethics	3.70	4.54	3.71	4.58
EP 2.1.3 Critical Thinking	3.30	4.27	3.22	4.26
EP 2.1.4 Diversity	4.16	4.79	3.97	4.79
EP 2.1.5 Justice	3.56	4.42	3.33	4.48
EP 2.1.6 EBP	3.22	3.93	2.93	4.11
EP 2.1.7 HBSE	3.50	4.57	3.00	4.51
EP 2.1.8 Policy	3.31	4.18	2.97	4.07
EP 2.1.9 Respond to contexts	3.41	4.34	3.26	4.10
EP 2.1.10a Engage	3.88	4.57	3.48	4.51
EP 2.1.10b Assess	3.73	4.38	3.38	4.53
EP 2.1.10c Intervene	3.33	3.90	2.88	4.13
EP 2.1.10d Evaluate	3.38	4.03	2.78	3.96

*Note: 1. MSW Survey for 3-17 and COC-17 cohorts is based on 2008 EPAS.

2. For both 3-17 and COC-17 cohorts, every competency yielded statistical significant mean improvement at 0.01 level.

Table 3-2. Comparison of MSW Pre-test and Post-test for 2-17 and Online-17 cohorts (2-Year Program Cohorts)

Competency	2-17 cohort (n=54)		Online-17 cohort (n=36)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Competency 1 - Ethics & Professionalism	4.05	4.50	4.17	4.60
Competency 2 - Diversity	3.88	4.59	3.98	4.69
Competency 3 - Justice	3.63	4.32	3.68	4.42
Competency 4 - Research	3.36	3.97	3.18	4.08
Competency 5 - Policy Practice	3.12	4.00	3.21	4.32
Competency 6 - Engage	3.90	4.46	3.88	4.65
Competency 7 - Assess	3.56	4.04	3.43	4.46
Competency 8 - Intervene	3.44	4.12	3.48	4.38
Competency 9 - Evaluate	3.20	3.88	3.16	4.32

*Note: 1. MSW Survey for 2-17 and Online-17 cohorts is based on 2015 EPAS.

2. For both 2-17 and Online-17 cohorts, every competency yielded statistical significant mean improvement at 0.01 level.

(4) An analysis of 19 course grids was made. Completion rate of course grids was 91.89% (N=1439/1566) for Fall 2016, 94.41% (N=1318/1396) for Spring 2017, and 91.45% (N=214/234) for Summer 2017. 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 most courses met the benchmark of 4.0 for all course-related competencies. The courses that have items that fall short of the benchmark used either a new or modified grid. For example, SWRK 535 changed a common assignment in AY 2016-2017, and its grid was modified correspondingly. The analysis yields that four items of the SWRK 535 grid fall short of 4.0 by 0.01 to 0.37. This may imply that students may not be able to fully apply curriculum content to the common assignment: a critique of a research paper. In other words, students may not have reached the level required to critique different aspects of a published research: design (item 3; $M=3.85$), operationalization of study variables (item 5; $M=3.99$), measurement (item 6; $M=3.84$), and data analysis (item 7; $M=3.63$). Or, the common assignment may expect students to perform beyond the level that the course curriculum covers. The relevance and effectiveness of the common assignment and grid may need to be discussed.

SWRK 522/523 are Foundation of Field Education I and II in the foundation year, and SWRK 622/623 are Advanced Field Practicum with Urban Families I and II in the concentration year. The four courses use the same grid which was designed in Fall 2016 and first administered in AY 2016-2017. The analysis yields that two items of SWRK 522 were below 4.0 (item 4, $M=3.72$; item 5, $M=3.50$) and two items of SWRK 622 were below the benchmark (item 5, $M=3.13$; item 9, $M=3.86$). These four items are associated with competencies that require students to engage

in research-informed practice (item 4 of SWRK 522), evaluate practice (item 9 of SWRK 622), or engage in policy practice (item 5 of SWRK 522 and SWRK 622). Also, both SWRK 522 and SWRK 622 are the first sections of consecutive field practicum courses, and research and policy related competencies measured by the four items may require more time and opportunities for students to apply the knowledge and skills learned in courses.

These results will be presented to the faculty during a faculty meeting in November 2017. Then, the faculty will meet by sequentially (practice, research, policy, HBSE, and field practicum) to discuss possible ways to improve student learning and curriculum effectiveness based on the assessment data. Any change efforts resulting from the discussion will be incorporated into future assessment activities.

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 apply the analysis to curriculum improvement in AY 2017-2018.

Appendix Analysis of Course Grids, 2016-2017

Included are the results of course grids that MSW program administered to faculty to assess students' achievement of course-related competencies during AY 2016 -2017.

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 522 & 523	Foundation of Field Education I & 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 622 & 623	Advanced Field Practicum with Urban Families I & II
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

SWRK 501 (Common Assignment: PowerPoint or Poster Presentation)	Fall 2016 (n=150, 100%)
1. Student articulates a specific issue that effects a vulnerable population (Competency 2, 3)	4.29
2. Student describes the issue from the Ecological Model (Competency 2,4)	4.28
3. Student includes a specific developmental theory (Attachment, Social Learning) (Competency 2,4)	4.19
4. Student articulates bio-psycho-social-spiritual dimensions of the issue (Competency 6)	4.22
5. Student identifies a specific age-cohort with its opportunities and challenges (Competency 6)	4.28
6. Student describes the role of family in the issue (Competency 6)	4.27
7. Student describes the role of community in the issue (Competency 6)	4.23
8. Student discusses published research studies on issue (Competency 4)	4.27
9. Student presents a specific community-level [prevention or promoting wellbeing] model (Competency 2)	4.17
10. Student Advocates for a (micro or macro-level) related policy that promotes wellbeing (Competency 3)	4.25
11. Overall oral presentation (poster) of the material e.g. professionalism in use of language and visuals.	4.19

SWRK 502 (Common Assignment: PowerPoint or Poster Presentation)	Spring 2017 (n=147, 100%)
1. Student recognizes the importance of differences in shaping life experiences. (Competency 2,3, and 4)	4.54
2. Student explicitly articulates adult development by age (early, middle and late) adulthood. (Competency 2,3, and 4)	4.59
3. Student critiques adult problems/ solutions from the “person in environment” perspective. (Competency 2, 3, and 4)	4.59
4. Student demonstrates the role of meaning in healthy adult development. (Competency 2, 3, and 4)	4.60
5. Student demonstrates the role of community integration in healthy adult development. (Comptency 2, 3, and 4)	4.53
6. Student demonstrates the role of family in healthy adult development. (Competency 2, 3, and 4)	4.60
7. Student demonstrates the role of sexuality in healthy adult development. (Competency 2,3,and 4)	4.60
8. Student demonstrates the role of health in healthy adult development. (Competency 2, 3, and 4)	4.59
9. Student applies knowledge of “person in environment” perspective in presentation of a community model of social work practice. (Competency 2,3, and 4)	4.60
10. Overall oral presentation (poster) of the material e.g. professionalism in use of language and visuals. (Competency 1)	4.60

<p style="text-align: center;">SWRK 503 (Common Assignment: Movie, Book, or Vignette Paper)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Spring 2017 (n=110, 100%)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Summer 2017 (n=40, 100%)</p>
1. Student articulates reason for referral based on movie, vignette or book assignment (Competency 1)	4.55	4.73
2. Student includes intersectionality, culture or other diversity factors as relevant to client presentation, symptoms or history (Competency 2 & 3)	4.53	4.65
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)	4.59	4.50
4. Student accurately and thoroughly articulates client's <u>psychiatric history</u> (Competency 6, & 7)	4.59	4.68
5. Student accurately and thoroughly articulates client's <u>current risk and safety concerns</u> (Competency 6, & 7)	4.55	4.68
6. Student accurately and thoroughly articulates client's <u>Relevant Medical Conditions</u> and <u>Current Medications</u> (Competency 6, & 7)	4.52	4.73
7. Student accurately and thoroughly describes client's <u>Substance Use/Abuse</u> history (Competency 6, & 7)	4.54	4.70
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)	4.52	4.45
9. Student describes client's <u>Mental Status Exam</u> observations, clarifying conflicting information or unclear information in comment section (Competency 2, 6, & 7)	4.51	4.38
10. Student uses critical thinking to develop <u>Summary/Clinical Impression</u> , including strengths (Competency 1, 2, & 3)	4.45	4.43
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)	4.35	4.33

SWRK 510 (Common Assignment: Self-Reflection Paper)	Fall 2016 (n=148, 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)	4.57
2. Student included discussion on intersectionality (including diversity, power and privilege). (Competency 2)	4.55
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)	4.30
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)	4.22
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)	4.20
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)	4.19
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)	4.48

SWRK 520 (Common Assignment: Mask Presentation)	Fall 2016 (n=81, 100%)	Spring 2017 (n=107, 100%)
1. Student describes how they <i>perceive</i> the self. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.37	4.36
2. Student describes how they are <i>perceived</i> by others. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.37	4.37
3. Student addresses their experiences as a racialized/ethnic person. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.21	4.32
4. Student addresses their experiences as a class person. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.19	4.35
5. Student addresses their experiences as a gendered & sexual person. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.21	4.36
6. Student reflects on the interactional experience of identity. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.28	4.36
7. Student describes what identity means to them. (Competency 2 & 3)	4.30	4.36

SWRK 521 (Common Assignment: Community Assessment)	Fall 2016 (n=93, 72.7%)
1. Engages diverse clients and constituencies as experts in the community assessment plan (Competency 2).	4.30
2. Community assessment plan reflects pertinent cultural diversity, human rights, and social/economic/environmental justice issues (Competency 3).	4.31
3. Community assessment uses scientific inquiry and research evidence to inform practice (Competency 4).	4.26
4. Plan reflects assessment information that can be used to inform service delivery and improve the quality of social services (Competency 7).	4.27

SWRK 522/523 (New for AY 2016-2017; Field Practicum grids are added in AY 2016-2017)	Fall 2016 (n=163, 100%)	Spring 2017 (n=118, 100%)
1. Student demonstrates ethical and professional behavior. (C1)	4.42	4.88
2. Student engages with diversity and difference in practice. (C2)	4.38	4.91
3. Student advances human rights and social, economic and environmental justice in practice. (C3)	4.13	4.71
4. Student engages in practice-informed research and research-informed practice. (C4)	3.72	4.63
5. Student engages in policy practice. (C5)	3.50	4.46
6. Student <i>engages</i> with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. (C6)	4.50	4.93
7. Student <i>assesses</i> individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. (C7)	4.22	4.88
8. Student <i>intervenes with</i> individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. (C8)	4.26	4.88
9. Student <i>evaluates practice</i> individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. (C9)	3.82	4.36

SWRK 525 (Updated in Summer 2016 for AY 2016-2017; Common Assignment: Policy Analysis)	Fall 2016 (n=134, 89.3%)	Spring 2017 (n=40, 100%)
1. Clearly explained a social welfare policy and policy analysis model (Competency 5)	4.39	4.58
2. Integrated multiple sources of knowledge in policy analysis paper (Competency 5)	4.37	4.50
3. Identified national or international political entities, legislative representatives, policy analysts, and/or grassroots organizations that advocate for or against policy (Competency 3)	4.19	4.28
4. Identified organizational and institutional basic human rights issues of policy on a local or global level (Competency 3)	4.18	4.33
5. Advocated for policy that enhanced client access to services (Competency 5)	4.32	4.43
6. Articulated discrimination in key social welfare policy and advocated for change to ameliorate it (Competency 2)	4.45	4.58
7. Utilized the strengths-based approach in analyzing and changing social welfare policy. (Competency 5)	4.10	4.25
8. Articulated philosophical or historical social welfare policy trends and the relationship of these trends to current policy. (Competency 5)	4.25	4.58
9. Identified how social work values influenced policy advocacy. (Competency 2)	4.35	4.60

SWRK 535 (Updated in Summer 2016 for a new common assignment: Critique of a Research Paper)	Spring 2017 (n=163, 89.07%)
1. Student critiqued the relevance of the research question to social work practice. (Competency 4)	4.31
2. Student critically appraised the Introduction, Background and Rationale of the study. (Competency 4)	4.26
3. Student critically appraised the appropriateness of the design. (Competency 4)	3.85
4. Student critiqued the diversity of the sample. (Competency 4)	4.22
5. Student articulated the major variables, and how they were operationalized. (Competency 4)	3.99
6. Students critiqued the measures. (Competency 4)	3.84
7. Student critically appraised the data analysis strategy. (Competency 4)	3.63
8. Student critiqued the relevance of the intervention to social work practice. (Competency 4)	4.25
9. Student critically appraised the researcher's conclusions. (Competency 4)	4.03

SWRK 601 (Common Assignment: Family Treatment Paper)	Fall 2016 (n=110, 100%)	Spring 2017 (n=75, 100%)
1. Student clearly conceptualizes (including risks and protective factors) an urban family 'case' (Competency 1 & 2).	4.41	4.49
2. Student articulates how they would engage an urban family (specific strategies e.g. motivation interviewing) (Competency 2 & 6).	4.37	4.51
3. Student articulates how they would assess an urban family including specific strategies & tools; psychosocial assessment (Competency 2& 7).	4.43	4.48
4. Student discusses and critiques published research that would inform their treatment plan (Competency 4 & 8).	4.32	4.39
5. Student articulates the intersection of family's goals/ wishes, treatment context and published research in selecting the intervention (Competency 2, 4 & 8).	4.38	4.43
6. Student communicates succinctly how they would evaluate the family's progress and outcomes (Competency 9).	4.34	4.45
7. Student discusses termination issues (Competency 2).	4.22	4.45
8. Student presents social justice issues (e.g. treatment access) for a specific family (Competency 1 & 3).	4.43	4.51
9. Student demonstrates relevant issues of diversity (Competency 1, 2, & 3).	4.39	4.55

<p style="text-align: center;">SWRK 602 (Common Assignment: Synthesis Paper)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Spring 2017 (n=97, 87.39%)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Summer 2017 (n=77, 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)	4.72	4.61
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)	4.72	4.39
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)	4.69	4.40
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)	4.66	4.38
5. Student presented brief discussion on diagnostic formulation as it relates to theory (Competency 4, 7, & 8)	4.67	4.35
6. Student developed a theory congruent treatment plan (LT goal, ST objectives and interventions). Includes relevant research (Competency 8)	4.61	4.51
7. Student explored intersectionality, social justice, power and privilege as it relates to client (including transference as applicable) (Competency 2, 3, & 4)	4.74	4.62
8. Student explored intersectionality, social justice, power and privilege as it relates to themselves (including countertransference as applicable) (Competency 2, 3, & 4)	4.70	4.56
9. Student identifies what selected theories suggest regarding evaluation and termination and discuss how they would terminate with client and evaluate progress (Competency 9)	4.65	4.49

SWRK 621 (Common Assignment: Program Design in Grant Proposal Format)	Fall 2016 (n=49, 44.95%)	Summer 2017 (n=57, 74.03%)
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)	4.43	4.53
2. Student's program design takes into account the multicultural make-up of the community that the program serves. (Competency 2)	4.37	4.53
3. Student outlines how the program addresses human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice issues of the urban community. (Competency 3)	4.45	4.54
4. Student writes a program evaluation that provides measureable process and outcome goals and objectives (Competency 9)	4.27	4.51
5. Student clearly describes how the community was and will continue to be engaged in the program. (Competency 6)	4.29	4.51
6. Student describes how the program serves as a community intervention. (Competency 8)	4.43	4.58

SWRK 622/623 (New for AY 2016-2017; Field Practicum grids are added in AY 2016-2017)	Fall 2016 (n=174, 100%)	Spring 2017 (n=216, 100%)
1. Student demonstrates ethical and professional behavior. (C1)	4.74	4.87
2. Student engages with diversity and difference in practice. (C2)	4.69	4.88
3. Student advances human rights and social, economic and environmental justice in practice. (C3)	4.41	4.89
4. Student engages in practice-informed research and research-informed practice. (C4)	4.04	4.82
5. Student engages in policy practice. (C5)	3.13	4.53
6. Student <i>engages</i> with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. (C6)	4.75	4.86
7. Student <i>assesses</i> individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. (C7)	4.58	4.88
8. Student <i>intervenes with</i> individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. (C8)	4.38	4.89
9. Student <i>evaluates practice</i> individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. (C9)	3.86	4.59

SWRK 630 (Common Assignment: Research Paper)	Fall 2016 (n=113, 100%)	Summer 2017 (n=40, 100%)
1. Identified how specific trauma is defined within the literature? (Competency 4)	4.51	4.35
2. Identified strengths/limitations of this definition? (Competency 4)	4.30	4.33
3. Identified the occurrence of this trauma in the general population (Competency 4)	4.38	4.35
4. Identified how specific identity markers serve as protective factors or barriers to recovery? (Competency 2)	4.27	4.35
5. Identified trauma's impact on the population's developmental trajectory? (Competency 7)	4.22	4.35
6. Identified how visibility or invisibility of the identity markers and presence/absence of privilege impact the manifestation of the trauma? (Competency 2)	4.20	4.35
7. Compare existing literature about the trauma in the general population with literature specific to your identity specific population (Competency 2,4)	4.24	4.35
8. Identified how issues of privilege and social justice contribute to the presence or absence of research about population specific literature? (Competency 2)	4.16	4.35

SWRK 635 (Common Assignment: Research Proposal)	Fall 2016 (n=176, 100%)
1. Student clearly formulated the research question/hypothesis. (Competency 4)	4.48
2. Student addressed the issue of social and economic justice for study population. (Competency 3)	4.63
3. Student critically synthesized the existing literature on student's study topic(s). (Competency 4)	4.28
4. Student appropriately developed the research design. (Competency 4)	4.38
5. Student properly selected or developed the measure(s). (Competency 4 & 7)	4.44
6. Student's sampling and data collection methods were appropriate to answer research question(s). (Competency 4 & 7)	4.53
7. Student utilized a culturally informed approach to research methods (Competency 2 & 4)	4.66
8. Student critically addressed the application of social work value and ethics. (Competency 1)	4.66

SWRK 645 (Common Assignment: Policy Advocacy Presentation)	Fall 2016 (n=48, 75.0%)	Spring 2017 (n=67, 60.36%)
1. The advocacy practice issue is clearly defined. (Competency 5)	4.44	4.49
2. How the advocacy practice effort affects urban family policy is articulated. (Competency 5)	4.69	4.39
3. How the target population (client) is involved in the advocacy effort is outlined. (Competency 3)	4.54	4.33
4. Demographics of the target population/client is described. (Competency 2)	4.71	4.57
5. The advocacy practice project follows consistent strategies. The strategies and expectations are discussed in the paper. (Competency 5)	4.31	4.42
6. How the advocacy practice project addresses cultural issues on a local or federal AND international level is clear. (Competency 2)	4.23	4.30
7. How the advocacy practice project addresses urban family strengths is addressed. (Competency 2)	4.60	4.30
8. How the advocacy practice project reflects human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice for urban families and communities. (Competency 3)	4.75	4.51
9. How this project is monitored and evaluation is clear. (Competency 9)	4.00	4.28

SWRK 698 (Common Assignment: Graduate Capstone Project)	Spring 2017 (n=177, 100%)
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)	4.55
3. Student appropriately developed the research design (Competency 4)	4.45
4. Student properly selected or developed the measure(s) (Competency 4 & 7)	4.50
5. Student's sampling and data collection methods were appropriate to answer research question(s). (Competency 4 & 7)	4.52
6. Student utilized a culturally competent approach to construct research method. (Competency 2)	4.55
7. Student clearly interpreted the findings and discussed their importance in social work. (Competency 4 & 7)	4.54
8. Student critically acknowledged the study's strength and limitations (Competency 4 & 9)	4.55
9. Student discussed implications for social work practice, policy and research. (Competency 4)	4.54