

School of Social Work
1350 University Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

**School of Social Work Assessment Report
Submitted to College of Letters and Science
June 15, 2008**

PART ONE: ASSESSMENT PLAN

I. Program Overview

The School of Social Work offers four academic programs: Bachelor of Social Work (B.S.W.); Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science undergraduate Major in Social Welfare; Master of Social Work (M.S.W.); and Ph.D. in Social Welfare. The B.S.W. and M.S.W. are professional degrees accredited by the Council on Social Work Education. The B.S.W. prepares students for entry-level social work practice. The M.S.W. prepares students for advanced-level social work practice. The undergraduate major in social welfare is a liberal arts degree program designed to provide students with an overview of contemporary social problems and the social welfare programs and services designed to ameliorate them. The Ph.D. program prepares scholars and educators for academic careers in social work or for research and policy roles in social work and social welfare issues. The program data indicating the average number of students in each of our programs along with the average number of degrees conferred in our programs from 2000 to 2007 may be found in Table 1 below.

Table 1. 2000-2007 Program Data

	B.S.W.	Social Welfare Major	M.S.W.	Ph.D.
⌘ No. Majors	66	181	188	42
⌘ No. Degrees Conferred	30	55	106	5

Sources: Office of the Registrar, Jan. 2008; Graduate School

Mission

The mission of the UW-Madison School of Social Work is to enhance human well-being and promote social and economic justice for people who are disadvantaged to achieve an equitable, healthy, and productive society. The school aims to:

- Create, advance, strengthen, and integrate interdisciplinary knowledge for students and the profession through research, scholarship, teaching and practice.
- Educate students to become highly skilled, culturally competent and ethical practitioners who will provide effective leadership for the profession of social work within the State of Wisconsin and nationally.
- Promote change at levels ranging from the individual to national policy, including empowering communities and populations that are disadvantaged and developing humane service delivery systems.
- Create and disseminate knowledge regarding the prevention and amelioration of social problems.

II. Goals, Objectives

A. Professional Degree Programs Goals: Three goals are derived from our mission of our two professional programs (Bachelor of Social Work and Master of Social Work). They are:

1. Students will learn and be trained in professional foundation content for entry-level social work practice that builds upon a liberal arts base, reinforces the mission and the educational goals of the School of Social Work, and fosters the values, ethics, and purposes of the profession;
2. Students will acquire advanced practice knowledge, skills and values to be autonomous social work practitioners prepared to confront the realities of a changing social and human services environment and to be leaders in the development of new approaches for practice. (M.S.W. only)
3. Students will become skilled at a generalist social work framework for practice; foster a commitment to social and economic justice; and be prepared with the requisite knowledge, skills and values for culturally competent practice.

B. Ph.D. Program Goals: The goal of our doctoral program in social welfare is to develop scholars, leaders and social work educators who will advance knowledge about social work, social welfare policy, and intervention strategies from a behavioral and social science perspective to improve the quality of life of individuals and families.

C. Undergraduate Social Welfare Major Goals: Goals for this major are:

1. Students will learn to apply a liberal arts education grounded in the social and behavioral sciences to human problems;
2. Students will learn to seek out information and to think critically about their world as informed citizens who are aware of human services or social welfare problems and policies;
3. Students will learn to view social welfare in its broad social, economic and political contexts.

Objectives

Each program operates under sets of objectives that flow from the program's goals. In the case of our professional degree programs, there are extensive formalized sets of objectives. Social Work accreditation standards in part, drive their construction. One set of objectives is referred to as the "professional foundation". Foundation objectives are concerned with the bachelor of social work program and the first year of our masters program. A second set of objectives is referred to as Advanced Practice Concentration Objectives. Concentration objectives are concerned with the second year of our masters program.

Our undergraduate Social Welfare program has a less distinctive set of program objectives than that of the professional programs. Objectives for this major are built from the same B.S.W. program objectives that encompass the knowledge base and value base of social work used to examine and understand social problems. However, since social welfare is not a professional degree, this major does not have skill base objectives.

In the doctoral program students are expected to demonstrate the ability to: 1) have mastery of knowledge in a given substantive area relevant to social work or social welfare; 2) concisely communicate an integration and synthesis of empirical and theoretical knowledge, a critical analysis of prior research, and implications for future scholarly work; 3) design, conduct, report and defend an original research study addressing a significant substantive area relevant to social welfare using appropriate advanced methodology; and 4) have an ability to translate research findings into policy and program practice.

III. Strategies for Measuring Students' Performance on Program-level Goals

A. Indirect Measures

Below we discuss ways in which student performance on program goals in our professional program and our doctoral program is assessed using indirect measures. Next, we present examples of direct measures.

Our main mechanism to assess the extent to which we are meeting the objectives of our B.S.W. (Professional Foundation) and M.S.W. (Professional Foundation and Concentration year) professional programs is an Outcome Study, which is in its sixth year of implementation. Some program objectives are also measured by student evaluations of courses. Additionally, our job placement survey and student pass rates of licensure exams provide a summary assessment of the extent to which we are meeting program objectives.

We evaluate our PhD program in Social Welfare through statistics on how long it takes for students to progress through the program, data on placement of our graduates, and an examination of student reports of their learning in their course evaluations.

We have not yet instituted a formal evaluation of our B.A./B.S. in Social Welfare program. At the present time, it is evaluated solely via student course evaluations.

All of these tools are designed to provide the data necessary for regular assessment and continuous improvement.

1. Professional Programs

a.1.) Outcome Study

The Social Work Education Outcome Study is a longitudinal study of both undergraduate and graduate students that aims to provide insight about whether we are achieving general and specific program objectives. The Outcome Study includes students rating their knowledge and

skills in the first months of each academic year.¹ The same questions are then asked at the end of each academic year.² This pre-post design enables us to examine three types of questions:

- How do students rate the programs and concentrations as having fulfilled their goals (as defined by program objectives)?
- Do students assess themselves as prepared to assume entry-level practice (B.S.W.) or advanced practice in their area of concentration (M.S.W.)³? What are the areas in which students feel most or least prepared?
- To what extent are students satisfied with their respective programs and fieldwork?

The Outcome Study baseline instruments were first administered at the start of the Fall 2001-02 academic year and have been administered since (although the actual items have changed over time). Since 2003, the average response rate has been 87.8 %.

Instruments for students in professional foundation as well as in each concentration were developed. A total of 136 items were developed for the project, organized into a set of four scales listed in Table 2. Two scales were designed to yield overall program level satisfaction data and include: Program Satisfaction (e.g., quality of advising, availability of courses, accessibility of faculty), and Fieldwork Satisfaction (e.g., support given to students by agency staff, variety of practice methods used). These scales were common to both the foundation and concentration year instruments. The Fieldwork Satisfaction measure was only administered at the end of the academic year. Two additional scales, Foundation Objectives and Concentration Objectives, focused on the extent to which each program's curriculum met its objectives across multiple dimensions.

¹ To assess the validity of self-ratings, we have compared all students' self-ratings with the ratings given them by the faculty who taught their integrative field seminar. In general, students' self-ratings were not correlated with instructor ratings. In exploring this further, most field faculty had not observed each student in a substantial number of different practice situations, so they reported difficulty making an assessment of several detailed skills. As a result we are no longer trying to benchmark student self-ratings with instructor ratings. We have yet to determine another method for measuring validity.

² The exit survey is administered in the field seminar to senior undergraduate students and both first- and second-year M.S.W. students. We believe that collecting data at the end of an academic year in which students are enrolled in the field means students responses should reflect knowledge and skills gained in both the classroom and the field experience. Study participation is voluntary and the student's consent is obtained before their participation. In the consent form, students are informed that we guarantee confidentiality but not anonymity since we also obtain their permission to follow them during their time in our program. We also ask for information that will allow us to find them after graduation as we may follow them in their social work careers. Only aggregated data are used in our reports.

³ There are three concentrations: Children, Youth, and Family Welfare; Health, Aging, and Disability; and Mental Health.

Table 2. Outcome Study 2006-07 Scales

Scales (number of items)	Professional Foundation	Concentration
Program Satisfaction (10)	√	√
Fieldwork Satisfaction (16)	√	√
Foundation Objectives (36)	√	
Concentration Objectives (27)		√

Note: The outcome study also includes specific items for child welfare trainees.

We have been pleased with the reliability of the scales. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the 2006-2007 exit cohort are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Outcome Study: Exit 2006-07 Summary of Scale Reliability

Scales	N. of items	N. of cases	Alpha
Foundation Objectives (Bachelor's)	36	30	.949
Foundation Objectives (Master's)	36	43	.917
Concentration Objectives	27	89	.940

Note: Satisfaction scales not shown

The study has gone through several refinements. In the first years of implementation, the study included a large number of questions, asking Professional program students to assess their ability to fill a range of professional roles and tasks at the entry and advanced levels. This instrument proved unwieldy. These earlier versions of the instruments were too diffuse and not explicitly tied to program objectives. As a result, our assessment of whether we were meeting objectives was sometimes based on indirect data.

In 2004-05, the number of Outcome Study items was substantially shortened and targeted to assess outcomes on Foundation and Concentration Program Objectives. A final change involved eliminating concentration-specific questions (e.g., How well are you prepared to work with acute health care issues). These were replaced with questions that cut across concentrations (e.g., How well are you prepared to formulate and apply intervention strategies that address the cultural and special needs of diverse social work clientele at community and organizational levels?). This approach allows us to assess outcomes on the concentration requirements and to compare outcomes across concentrations. As the collection of the 2007-2008 exit data just recently done in late April 2008, in this document we report 2006-2007 results.

a.2.) Employer Survey Component

In 2007-08 we launched an employer survey component to our Outcome Study. We developed a pilot online survey of employers who have hired recent graduates of our professional (M.S.W and B.S.W) programs. We intend the employer survey to become part of our long-term, ongoing assessment program.

An aspect of our core mission is the preparation of social work practitioners who can meet the social and human service needs of the people of Wisconsin at the entry and advanced levels. This phase of our Study aids in addressing important questions central to the preparation of our graduates to enter the workforce:

- Are we producing advanced and beginning level professionals who are well prepared for practice?
- Is our curriculum providing our graduates with the knowledge, skills and values necessary for effective social work practice in contemporary social and human service arenas?
- Are there gaps in their preparation?

The online survey is designed to directly ask employers to assess whether our recent graduates bring to their jobs the knowledge, skills and values that we believe we impart through our curriculum. In other words, do employers find that our graduates are capable of assuming entry and advanced level practice roles their organizations with the practice model we have taught our students?

The B.S.W. survey is composed of 34 items (5 ask for information on the individual completing the survey, 23 are designed to measure how well we are meeting the School's program objectives and 6 are open-ended questions about the School). The online M.S.W. survey is composed of 29 items (5 ask for information on the individual completing the survey, 18 are designed to measure how well we are meeting the School's program objectives and 6 are open-ended questions about the School). The questions are derived from the School's professional program objectives for the B.S.W. and M.S.W. programs. The response categories for the program objective questions capture the level at which graduates are prepared and range from 1 (not prepared) to 4 (well prepared).

The basic design of the survey is that we ask recent alums for permission to contact their employers. Once permission is granted, the employer is asked to complete an online survey about the School's program objectives. We hope the data generated will provide us a picture of whether or not our curriculum objectives translate well to contemporary practice realities. Our plan is survey employers who hire our program graduates approximately 2 years after graduation and at another future point.

b.) Job Placement Survey

Each fall, the School of Social Work conducts a Job Market Placement Survey of those who graduated during the previous year. Our survey includes common questions that were also asked by other Schools of Social Work that participated in the Social Work Career Development Group survey.⁴ The survey collected data on fields of practice, job functions, settings, credentials required for positions, sources of jobs, application process, and salary range. In addition, our

⁴ Carol Nesslein Doelling and Barbara Matz, *Social Work Career Development Group, Job Market Report On 2002 M.S.W. Graduates, 2002.*

School has added an item for graduate students asking if their positions are related to their area of concentration. We also adapt the survey for use with graduates of our undergraduate program.

c.) Licensure

Whether or not graduates pass the Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) national exams for state licensure is another indicator of program success. Furthermore, we are able to compare the passage rates of our graduates with national passage rate statistics.

2. Doctoral Program

The Ph.D. Program in Social Welfare uses less formal mechanisms to measure performance on program goals. We evaluate the average time until students complete each step of the doctoral education process. In general, we would hope our students could finish the program in an average of five years. A second indirect measure is that in recent years, we have begun to track placement rates in post doctoral fellowship programs and in faculty positions in Schools of Social Work.

3. Student Evaluation of Courses

Another mechanism for assessing the extent to which we are meeting program objectives is the student evaluation of courses. Every student is asked to evaluate each course and instructor at the end of the semester, using a standard form.⁵ Many of these questions do not *directly* reflect a specific program objective (e.g., they assess instructor skill level or level of satisfaction with the course). But one of the questions asks the student to rate the extent to which the course met the course objectives. Another question asks the extent to which the course expanded knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. These two questions do provide useful information on whether we are meeting a program objective when program objectives are primarily implemented in a single course or sequence of courses.

Some of our courses are primarily focused on specific program objectives. For example, our Foundation Program objectives in the content areas (e.g., SWAPS, HBSE, and Social Work

⁵ To ensure confidentiality, School policy dictates that the students themselves collect the Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms and return them to the social work office. Faculty and teaching assistants must leave the classroom when students are completing the forms. Students are assured that faculty and teaching assistants will only be given their evaluations, including students' open-ended comments, after they have submitted their final grades. The results of the evaluations and the summary sheets are routinely distributed several weeks after the end of each semester.

Historically our student evaluations of faculty instruction have focused on an assessment of the *instructor's* skills and teaching abilities, rather than whether *course* objectives were being met. In 2003, faculty approved two changes: (a) changing the teaching evaluation form to reflect separate assessments of the instructor and of the course content; and (b) including a new item on social and economic justice and revising our items on content related to gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered persons; people of color; and women. In 2006-07 the course evaluation was further refined to include an item on values and ethics and rewording of the item pertaining to content on gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered persons; people of color and women.

Practice) all have clearly identified courses that primarily deliver the required curriculum content. Student evaluations provide less useful information related to program objectives when the required content is integrated across the curriculum. For example, many foundation courses provide required content on values and ethics.⁶ In this document, we use the most recent student evaluations data from the 2007-08 academic year. We also use course evaluations to assess the quality of instruction.

B. Direct Measures

1. Professional Programs Field and Integrative Seminars

A cogent, direct measure of whether we are meet achieving program goals and objectives in the B.S.W. and M.S.W. programs are the grades students achieve in their Field and Integrative Seminars or field course (SW 400/401 for PF [B,M] and SW 800/801 for Concentration students). The field course objectives have in turn, been built from program objectives. These seminars have a capstone-like function wherein students are expected to integrate the programs' cumulative professional foundation and/or concentration knowledge-base (theory), value base and skill base (practice) for entry and advanced level social work practice. Field course students complete a concurrent internship of 14 hours/week at the foundation level and 18 hours/week at the concentration level where students demonstrate acquisition and mastery of practice skills and objectives. Seminar grades are based on the extent to which the knowledge base is integrated with practice skill relative to field and seminar course objectives.

2. Ph.D. Program

Direct strategies for assessing student performance in the doctoral program include proxy measures that align with program goals and evaluation of student work.

a) Performance On Proxy Measures That Align With Program Goals: Annual Review of Each Student's Progress

We keep data to monitor student progress through the program. We require students to submit annual progress reports that are then reviewed by the full PhD faculty at an annual spring meeting. These progress reports assess the extent to which students have completed critical program benchmarks: required coursework; progress toward or completion of the preliminary exam proposal and exam; dissertation proposal and dissertation. Students and faculty advisors provide open-ended comments on progress achieved in the previous academic year and academic

⁶ Another limitation of this method is that all courses have multiple objectives. For example, Social Work 605 primarily provides a history and overview of the profession, but it also has objectives related to understanding oppression, becoming knowledgeable of at risk populations, obtaining knowledge of the values and ethics of the profession, etc. A low score on whether the course met its objectives could be because the information on any one of these sections was weak; with this assessment method, we would not be able to differentiate between competing hypotheses. For this reason, we do not use course evaluations in isolation, but in each case we use course evaluations together with the Outcome Study in our assessment of whether we are meeting program objectives.

and professional goals for the upcoming year. Each student's progress toward goals is discussed in an annual meeting of the Ph.D. faculty.

b) Evaluating Student Work

We rely on a faculty mentoring model to train and evaluate students. Faculty prelim and dissertation committees help to prepare students and then serve to carefully evaluate the quality of the completed work. The coursework and the prelim process are most relevant to objectives #1 and #2 and the dissertation is most relevant to objectives #3 and #4.

The purpose of the preliminary examination is for students to demonstrate mastery of knowledge in a given substantive area relevant to social work or social welfare. The exam is evaluated by a faculty committee comprised of experts in the student's chosen area. It is evaluated on the extent to which the student has demonstrated mastery. Similarly, the quality of the dissertation research proposal and the dissertation itself is evaluated by a committee of faculty experts. Students develop a dissertation proposal that must be approved by the dissertation committee. Proposals vary by topic, methods and committee preferences; however they are evaluated by the extent to which they are clearly written descriptions of a proposed original research study addressing a significant substantive area relevant to social welfare and the field of social work. A completed dissertation and the final oral examination are evaluated by all members of the dissertation committee.

IV. Administration and Reporting

The Director of the School of Social Work and the School's Outcome Committee have primary responsibility for assessing student learning in our undergraduate and our masters programs. The Chair of our Ph.D. Program has primary responsibility for assessing outcomes in the doctoral program. These leaders are not only charged with implementing assessment activities but also reporting and conveying results to the School and its constituencies as appropriate.

For some time now, we have been able to secure a small amount of summer salary support for an assistant professor to serve on the Outcome Committee. Many of our assistant professors have now served on the Committee. In this way, we have been able to create a knowledgeable cohort of future School leaders who are familiar with all aspects of our assessment efforts and who are instilled with the idea that continuous assessment activities are a vital and necessary function of a university department. We have also been fortunate to secure funding to support a doctoral student who can assist with our assessment activities. This experience should stand them in good stead as these students join faculties in Schools of Social Work.

The Outcome Committee reviews all program data (e.g., outcome study data, job placement, field course grades). The Director assures that program data, records and so forth are maintained and that there is project continuity over time. Assessment findings are disseminated in a variety of ways throughout the School of Social Work organization to complete the feedback loop. Each fall, the Outcome Committee presents the previous year's outcome study findings/trends along with any recommendations to the faculty for action. These recommendations may be policy decisions taken up by the faculty as a whole, may be charges to

the Curriculum Committee, Field Committee or other ad hoc committee or may be charges the School's administrative team. A recommendation having fiscal implications would be forwarded to the Executive Committee.

Portions of these data are typically presented to incoming M.S.W. students and B.S.W. senior majors at their orientation; annually to our community partners through our Professional Consultative Committee (the School's Advisory Board) and to our short-term staff Lecturers at their orientation each semester. By their very nature, these constituencies are transient and removed from the integrated whole of our programs' design and curricula. Presenting these data to our community partners and short term staff have proven very useful in providing a snapshot of the programs and the students who are moving through them. They offer lecturers and community advisors a context to understand our programs requirements and curricula. Students see that their experience is built on the feedback former students have given the programs.

The School's Ph.D. faculty act as a "Committee of the Whole" to assess doctoral program outcomes. This Ph.D. Committees meets annually in the Spring to review program data and determine educational policy and practice.

Much of our assessment plans are driven by the professional programs accreditation authority, the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). CSWE revises its accreditation standards on a seven year cycle and programs are reviewed on an eight year cycle. As a result, each time come up for reaccreditation, we are reviewed under a new set of standards that must be supported with current outcome data. Such a cycle means that we must regularly review our assessment plans for their alignment with standards.

PART TWO: ASSESSMENT REPORT

I. Program Overview

One of five professional schools in the College of Letters and Science, the School of Social Work offers four academic programs: Bachelor of Social Work (B.S.W.); Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science undergraduate Major in Social Welfare; Master of Social Work (M.S.W.); and Ph.D. in Social Welfare. The B.S.W. and M.S.W. are professional degrees accredited by the Council on Social Work Education.

II. Learning Objectives or Goals

The goals of the professional degree programs are to prepare students for entry-level and advanced social work practice. The goal of the undergraduate major in social welfare is to prepare students to become informed citizens about contemporary social problems from the liberal arts and social work perspectives. The Ph.D. program prepares scholars and educators who will become faculties of Schools of Social Work and/or researchers who will advance knowledge in social welfare problems and social work practice.

III. Efforts To Measure Students' Performance On Program-Level Goals

A. Professional Programs

Three indirect sources of data and one direct source of data are used to assess student performance in our professional degree programs (B.S.W. and M.S.W.). The Outcome Study and Job Placement Survey are conducted annually, field grades are given each semester, and the Licensure passage rates are collected quinquennially.

1.a. Outcome Study

In this section, we first examine the 15 foundation objectives, presenting our method of measuring the extent to which they are being achieved. When there are multiple objectives related to the same construct (e.g., two professional foundation values and ethics objectives), we discuss them together. We then present measurement strategies and assessment results for each of the 10 concentration objectives.

In each case, we use results from the Outcome Study and, in selected cases, we also use results from student evaluations. While we consider multiple factors in our assessment of whether we are achieving an objective, we have general benchmarks. We generally consider that we have done a very good job in meeting a program objective when student ratings of a course on two items, "Achieving the course objectives" and "Expanding your knowledge and understanding of the subject matter," are at least 4.0 on a five-point scale. A rating below 2.5 would signal a serious concern. When we examine the Outcome Study results, we assess both student rankings at exit and the growth between entry and exit. Our benchmark for very good performance is an exit score of at least 4.0 on a five-point scale, with a score below 2.5 again signaling a serious concern. Our benchmark for success on the growth between entry and exit is whether there was a statistically significant difference.

a) Overall Assessment of Entry to Exit Change 2006-2007

Table 4 presents summary statistics for changes between entry and exit on each of these scales. Exit scores ranged from 3.69 (Program Satisfaction) to 4.07 (Concentration Objectives) on a 5 point scale. In general, exit scores showed improvement over baseline in all areas.

Table 4. Outcome Study 06-07 Time Series Analysis of Scale Totals

Scales	N	Exit Mean/Item	Baseline Mean/Item	Difference
Program Satisfaction	143	3.69	3.33	.369*
Foundation Objectives (B.S.W.)	27	3.77	2.72	1.053*
Foundation Objectives (M.S.W.)	37	3.93	2.91	1.019*
Concentration Objectives	83	4.07	3.51	.564*

* p < .05

b) Assessment of Entry to Exit Change: Program Satisfaction

Analyses of individual items on the Program Satisfaction scale are presented on Table 5. The range of exit scores show there has been significant improvement in program satisfaction since our last assessment report in 2004. Exit scores for each group ranged from 3.55 to 4.48 for PF(B) students (compared with 2.72 to 4.19 in 2004); 3.32 to 4.41 for PF(M) students (compared with 2.88 to 3.98 in 2004); and 3.39 to 4.37 for Concentration students (compared with 3.06 to 4.01 in 2004). That said, there are relatively few items that are at or above benchmark (availability of advisors and courses, choice of field unit and accessibility of faculty for PF[B]); accessibility of faculty for PF [M]); and choice of field unit, and accessibility of faculty for Concentration students. By and large undergraduates are more satisfied with our program than graduate students. There were very few significant changes from entry to exit. PF(B) reported increased satisfaction with availability of courses and choices of field units. In contrast, PF(M) reported decreased satisfaction with availability of courses. Concentration students reported increased satisfaction with the social work library hours. Broadly, these results suggest that undergraduate student satisfaction is greater than graduate students satisfaction, improvements could be considered in many aspects of the program, and students do not report significant dissatisfaction in any area.

Table 5. 2006-07 Time Series Analysis of Program Satisfaction Scale

	PF (B)			PF (M)			Concentrations		
	N	E	D	N	E	D	N	E	D
1. Overall quality of advising.	29	3.97	.17	40	3.50	.06	85	3.48	.03
2. Availability of advisors.	29	4.48	.24	40	3.93	.25	85	3.84	.14
3. Times the social work courses are offered.	29	3.76	.31	41	3.46	-.02	86	3.39	-.13
4. Availability of courses.	29	4.31	.31*	41	3.34	-.44*	86	3.73	-.04
5. Social work library hours.	29	3.63	.09	40	3.40	.23	85	3.54	.24*
6. Relevance of coursework to your field practice experience.	29	3.55	.34	41	3.32	-.18	86	3.73	-.006
7. Choices available to you for field units.	29	4.03	.38*	41	3.85	-.29	85	4.01	.03
8. Process used to assign students to field units.	29	3.55	.10	41	3.68	-.09	83	3.57	.02
9. Accessibility of faculty you approach for help.	27	4.33	.04	41	4.41	.02	86	4.37	.11

PF(B)=B.S.W. students; PF(M)=M.S.W. students (first year); Concentrations=M.S.W. students in concentration (second) year. N= number of observations; E=mean score on exit survey; D=Difference in mean score from entry (exit-entry); * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

b) Assessment of Entry to Exit Change: Foundation Program Objectives

Table 6 presents mean statistics, as well the difference in these means from entry, for the individual items in the Foundation Objectives Scale for both M.S.W. (PF[M]) and B.S.W. (PF[B]) students. We find that all items are rated above 3.0 at exit, and many meet the 4.0 benchmark; in addition there are statistically significant increases between baseline and exit on each of the 36 items for each group. These results suggest considerable progress toward meeting foundation year objectives.

Table 6. 2006-07 Time Series Analysis on Professional Foundation Objectives Scale

	PF (B)			PF (M)		
	E	N	D	E	N	D
1. Understand the generalist social work perspective.	4.17	29	1.10***	4.37	41	1.19***
2. Understand how to apply the generalist social work perspective to practice with and on behalf of individuals, families, and groups.	3.90	29	1.28***	4.05	41	1.37***
3. Understand how to apply the generalist social work perspective to practice with and on behalf of organizations and communities.	3.59	29	1.24***	3.88	41	1.44***
4. Demonstrate the skills of generalist social work practice with and on behalf of individuals, families, and groups.	3.93	29	1.24***	3.95	40	1.20***
5. Demonstrate the skills of generalist social work practice with and on behalf of organizations and communities.	3.34	29	1.03***	3.51	41	1.19***
6. Understand theoretical frameworks on individual development and behavior across the life course.	3.45	29	.76**	3.98	41	.90***
7. Understand theoretical frameworks on the interactions among and between individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	3.38	29	.69**	3.66	41	.59**
8. Use knowledge of normal human behavior and development in the assessment of client functioning.	3.76	29	.79***	4.05	41	.88***
9. Apply knowledge of social problems and issues to immediate entry level practice situations.	4.11	28	1.18***	4.17	41	1.02***
10. Assess client needs and resources and choose the appropriate interventions in helping clients meet needs.	3.79	29	1.28***	4.10	40	1.35***
11. Use community resources for the benefit of clients and their communities.	3.79	29	1.17***	3.95	41	1.15***
12. Develop community resources for the benefit of clients and their communities.	3.10	29	1.03***	3.27	41	.83***
13. Communicate across client populations, colleagues, and communities.	3.93	29	1.10***	4.07	41	1.12***
14. Develop constructive professional relationships with clients, service personnel and target systems.	4.17	29	1.21***	4.34	41	1.02***
15. Work within an organization.	4.34	29	1.07***	4.49	41	.79***
16. Facilitate organizational changes.	3.18	28	1.18***	3.44	41	.95***
17. Provide leadership in working with social agencies and the community.	3.59	29	1.14***	3.56	41	.85***
18. Understand social work history and current issues in the profession.	3.93	28	.71**	3.95	41	1.0***
19. Assess the impact of social policies on individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	3.68	28	1.0***	4.07	41	1.4***
20. Understand and be aware of your personal values and attitudes that affect social work practice.	4.52	29	.76***	4.37	41	.81***
21. Understand the values and ethics of the profession and of ethical decision making principles.	4.19	29	.78***	4.22	41	1.87***
22. Apply and promote social work values.	4.41	29	1.07***	4.20	41	.88***
23. Apply values, principles of ethical decision making, and the NASW Code of Ethics to ethical dilemmas in social work practice.	4.10	29	1.21***	4.07	41	1.33***

24. Apply critical thinking skills within social work practice contexts.	4.07	29	.97***	4.20	41	.82***
25. Use the expertise of supervisors and other colleagues for ideas, feedback, and support.	4.48	29	1.07***	4.46	41	.85***
26. Formulate and apply intervention strategies that address the cultural and special needs of diverse social work clientele at individual, family, and group levels.	3.69	29	1.28***	3.83	41	1.23***
27. Formulate and apply intervention strategies that address the cultural and special needs of diverse social work clientele at community and organizational levels.	3.50	28	1.40***	3.56	41	1.16***
28. Understand intersecting oppressions linked to race, gender, class, sexual orientation, and other marginalized statuses.	4.16	29	.81***	4.22	41	.74***
29. Understand strategies to assist at-risk populations.	3.41	29	1.0***	3.41	41	.65***
30. Identify and understand strategies to combat discrimination, oppression, and economic deprivation.	3.52	29	.86***	3.61	41	.79***
31. Identify and understand strategies to promote social and economic justice.	3.55	29	1.05***	3.71	41	.96***
32. Design and implement strategies to combat discrimination, oppression, and economic deprivation.	3.05	29	.95***	3.46	41	1.12***
33. Design and implement strategies to promote social and economic justice.	3.16	29	1.12***	3.39	41	1.15***
34. Understand research methods so that you are a critical consumer of research.	3.66	29	.83***	3.67	41	.69***
35. Understand research methods so that you can evaluate your own practice.	3.41	29	.76**	3.70	40	.79***
36. Overall, how well have you been prepared for [BPF work in the field of social work], or [MPF further social work education in an area of concentration]?	3.66	29	.91***	3.83	41	.88***

PF(B)=B.A./B.S. Social Work Major students; PF(M)=M.S.W. students (first year); N= number of observations; E=mean score on exit survey; D=Difference in mean score from entry (exit-entry); * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

c) Assessment of Entry to Exit Change: Concentration Objectives

Table 7 presents mean statistics, as well the difference in these means from entry, for the individual items in the Foundation Objectives Scale for the CYWF, HAD, and MHSA concentrations. We find statistically significant increases between baseline and exit on 26 of the 27 items for CYWF, 22 of the 27 items for HAD and 23 of the 27 items for MHSA. Furthermore, we note that for item #27, “Overall, how well have you been prepared for social work practice in your concentration?,” we see high scores at exit with statistically significant increases from baseline to exit for all 3 groups. Given a considerable number of items with significant improvements for the three concentrations, as well as the relatively high exit scores on most items, we interpret these results to suggest substantial success in meeting concentration objectives.

Table 7. 2006-07 Time Series Analysis on Concentration Objectives Scale

	CYFW			HAD			MHSA		
	N	E	D	N	E	D	N	E	D
1. Apply knowledge of human behavior relevant to your concentration.	30	4.20	.50**	18	4.17	.50**	38	4.03	.21
2. Apply knowledge of social problems relevant to your concentration.	30	4.37	.56***	18	4.44	.61*	38	4.37	.58***
3. Apply practice knowledge relevant to the populations and/or problems addressed in your concentration.	30	4.10	.70***	18	4.33	.89**	38	4.11	.66***
4. Apply knowledge of social services, policies, and programs relevant to your concentration, including the identification of gaps, barriers, and alternatives.	30	4.10	.80***	18	4.08	.92***	38	3.71	.61***
5. Assess client needs and resources and choose the appropriate interventions in helping clients meet needs.	30	4.10	.70**	18	4.28	1.22***	38	4.21	.76***
6. Intervene in complex direct practice situations involving individuals, families, and groups (e.g. as a case manager, counselor, advocate, etc.).	30	4.27	.97***	18	3.83	.72***	38	4.13	.92***
7. Intervene in complex direct practice situations involving organizations and communities (e.g. as a case manager, resource developer, advocate, etc).	30	3.83	.70**	18	3.61	.61**	38	3.55	.55***
8. Demonstrate the ability to conduct organizational assessment and analysis in order to modify policy and programs and improve service delivery.	30	3.67	.73***	18	3.72	.83**	37	3.57	.84***
9. Provide leadership in working with social agencies and the community.	30	4.07	.63***	18	3.67	.44*	38	3.82	.76***
10. Practice as an autonomous social worker.	29	4.28	.83***	18	4.28	.83**	38	4.34	.84***
11. Understand and be aware of your personal values and attitudes that affect social work practice.	30	4.67	.50***	18	4.83	.50*	38	4.61	.47**
12. Understand the values and ethics of the profession and of ethical decision making principles.	30	4.47	.48**	18	4.72	.39*	38	4.53	.32*
13. Apply and promote social work values.	30	4.60	.55***	18	4.78	.44*	38	4.50	.21
14. Apply values, principles of ethical decision making, and the NASW Code of Ethics to ethical dilemmas in social work practice.	30	4.32	.52**	18	4.61	.39*	38	4.24	.24
15. Articulate mission of social work to others, e.g., interdisciplinary team members, volunteers, the broader community, the news media, and political leaders.	30	4.23	.73***	18	4.33	.44*	38	4.21	.39**
16. Formulate and apply intervention strategies that address the cultural and special needs of diverse social work clientele at individual, family, and	30	3.93	.67***	18	4.22	.44*	38	4.05	.66***

group levels.									
17. Formulate and apply intervention strategies that address the cultural and special needs of diverse social work clientele at community and organizational levels.	30	3.87	.63***	18	3.94	.44*	38	3.74	.57**
18. Understand intersecting oppressions linked to race, gender, class, sexual orientation, and other marginalized statuses.	30	4.37	.50**	18	4.56	.22	38	4.21	.39*
19. Understand strategies to assist at-risk populations.	29	3.93	.62**	18	3.89	.33*	38	3.61	.42**
20. Identify and understand strategies to combat discrimination, oppression, and economic deprivation.	29	3.83	.72***	18	3.72	.22	38	3.76	.47**
21. Identify and understand strategies to promote social and economic justice.	29	3.93	.76***	18	3.72	.06	38	3.87	.55**
22. Design and implement strategies to combat discrimination, oppression, and economic deprivation.	29	3.62	.69**	18	3.56	.50**	38	3.45	.53**
23. Design and implement strategies to promote social and economic justice.	29	3.72	.86***	18	3.50	.39*	38	3.53	.50**
24. Evaluate and utilize theoretical and empirical research relevant to the problems and/or populations addressed in your concentration.	29	3.86	.67**	18	3.67	.11	38	4.13	.53***
25. Evaluate your practice utilizing research methods.	29	3.69	.62**	18	3.50	.11	38	3.82	.34*
26. Evaluate your practice utilizing feedback from supervisors and colleagues.	29	4.41	.45	18	4.61	.50*	38	4.42	.29
27. Overall, how well have you been prepared for social work practice in your concentration?	29	4.09	.57***	18	4.22	.67***	38	4.09	.47**

CYFW=Child, Youth, and Family Welfare; HAD=Health, Aging, and Disability; MHSA=Mental Health and Substance Abuse;); N= number of observations; E=mean score on exit survey; D=Difference in mean score from entry (exit-entry); * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

1.b. Employer Survey Component

Our target group for this first survey effort is our 2006 graduates. The Employer Survey pilot is truly a work in progress. A total of 125 alumni were asked for permission to contact their employers (32 baccalaureate and 93 masters' graduates). Despite our preference for contacting alumni via email we only had 34 current email addresses. Therefore, 91 alumni were contacted via traditional mail. The School received a total of 22 responses (a 17.6% response rate). Of those returned responses, 2 were not applicable because the alumni were not working in the field of social work. A third email respondent did not include their employer's email address and subsequent follow-up did not elicit this information. Of those alumni who returned employer contact information, 3 were from baccalaureate graduates and 19 were from masters' graduates. Following the original email and regular mail alumni contacts, two addition follow-up emails were sent. The first wave of employer surveys was mailed in the middle of April, 2008 and a follow-up email was sent to employers in the first week of June, 2008.

Data is continuing to be collected. Currently, a total of 11 completed surveys have been returned from employers of alumni (a 58% response rate). Eight employers completed the MSW survey and 3 employers completed the BSW survey. Because this represents a very small number of respondents for MSW graduates (and an even smaller number of BSW graduates), we report only a few selected results for MSW graduates with the caveat that they are clearly not representative of all employers of our 2006 graduates. The main part of the survey is the employers' assessment of the extent to which our graduates are prepared in several areas (with rankings from "not prepared" to "well prepared.") The two items with the lowest ratings so far are: "Intervenes in complex direct practice situations involving organizations and communities" (one out of eight responses being "well prepared") and "evaluates his/her practice utilizing research methods" (none out of three responses being "well prepared"). (On the latter question, most responders marked that they were "unable to rate" our graduate.) The two areas with the highest scores are: "applies and promotes social work values" (seven out of eight responses being "well prepared") and "evaluates his/her practice utilizing feedback from supervisors and colleagues" (five out of seven responses being "well prepared").

If we do not achieve a higher responses rate from the most recent wave of surveys, we will need to review our procedures and revisit whether this type of assessment tool can be useful.

2. Job Placement Survey

Each year we mail a Placement Survey to our new alumni in the fall immediately following graduation. We have had return rates of 59-65% among our M.S.W. graduates. Our return rates among our undergraduate Social Work majors ranged from a low of 14% in 2000 to a high of 45% in 2004. With such a small undergraduate program, developing strategies to encourage higher return rates is especially important if this survey is to provide us with meaningful feedback. Table 8 shows the key results. It is difficult to draw many conclusions about the undergraduate program with a small response rate. Nonetheless, almost all of the students who responded were either in graduate school or employed in social work, a highly positive outcome. The overwhelming majority of our M.S.W. graduates are employed as social workers. Moreover, across all years of data, on average 84% are employed in their area of concentration.

Table 8. Job Market Placement Survey Results, 2000-2006

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<i>B.S.W. Graduates</i>							
% Response Rate	15.6	21.9	32.4	31	45.5	7.4	14.7
% Employed in SW	75	29	36	44	40	-0-	60
% In Grad School	25	71	55	56	60	100	40
% Other	-0-	-0-	9	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
<i>M.S.W. Graduates</i>							
% Response Rate	60	60.3	64.8	59.5	60	49.5	60.2
% Employed in SW	96	98	99	97	100	85	90
Of those employed in SW, % with Position in Concentration Area	87	75	88	91	81	90	89

Our M.S.W. graduates were also asked in what job functions they were employed. Like the national profile, most reported working in direct practice positions: (case management: crisis intervention, counseling, referral, advocacy; clinical practice; and 50/50 case management and clinical practice). Our graduates are more likely to report the job function of case management (which on the survey is listed as including crisis intervention, counseling, referral, and advocacy) than graduates nationally. This suggests that we have achieved a major goal of our concentration year, that is, to provide students with advanced generalist social work practice knowledge and skills in an area of concentration.

3. Licensure Exams

Licensure exams are another measure of the strength of our overall program. Our students do very well on these exams. The rate at which our graduates pass these exams is consistently better than the national rate. In the past our graduates have scored particularly highly on the Basic Exam (for graduating Baccalaureate students) and the Intermediate Exam (for graduating M.S.W.s). This provides additional evidence that our graduates are prepared for practice within the field. In our 2004 Assessment Report we presented a table that compared national passage rates with those of our graduates (1997-2003), and our graduates have substantially higher rates of passage. More current data (2004-2008) will not be available until next year. We shall provide an updated table in our next report.

4. Field and Integrative Seminar Assessments

The Field and Integrative Seminar is like a capstone course. The objectives for the course reflect the program objectives, and in the seminars students are expected to integrate content across their coursework with their experiences in the social work practice setting. Seminar grades reflect the extent to which students have achieved program objectives. Table 9 presents the average grade performances (A = 4.0, AB = 3.5, etc.) for students in field and integrative seminar in 2006-07.

Table 9. Integrative Seminar Performances 2006-07

Seminar	Level	Average Grade
SW 400/401 Field & Integrative Seminars I & II	B.S.W.	3.94
SW 400/401 Field & Integrative Seminars I & II	M.S.W.	3.81
SW 800/801 Field & Integrative Seminars III & IV	M.S.W.	3.94

Summary

In summary, the three indirect measures (outcome study, job placement survey, and scores on licensure exams) show that we are achieving our objectives. There are few areas in which students report they have limited knowledge or skills on the outcome study, many of our students find work within the field, and we have very high scores on the national licensure exam. Finally, the direct measure of knowledge and skills, grades in our capstone course, show very high levels of success in meeting our program objectives.

B. Undergraduate Social Welfare Major

Currently, our Undergraduate Social Welfare Major is evaluated solely via teaching/course evaluations (see D. Other, below). It is not possible to separate Social Welfare students' evaluations from B.S.W. students' evaluations as they are anonymously completed and both groups of students participate in the same courses (although they are subject to different degree requirements and Social Work Majors take additional courses).

C. Ph.D. Program

As noted above, the Ph.D. program is evaluated with two indirect measures (placement rates and time to completion) and direct measures (evaluation of student performance). In terms of placement, since 2005 we have graduated 12 students. Nine of these graduates currently hold faculty positions and three are in prestigious Post Doc positions. Six of these institutions are top tier. In terms of time to completion, for those students who graduated between 2000 and 2006, the mean time from entry to course work completion was 2.9 years; these students also took, on average, 3.5 years from entry to complete the preliminary examination proposal, 4.3 years from entry to complete the preliminary examination, 5.5 years from entry to complete the dissertation proposal, and 7.6 years from entry to complete the dissertation. In our view, this takes substantially longer than it should. We discuss recent changes to try to decrease the time to graduation below.

Our main direct mechanism for evaluating student achievement of objectives is through an individualized annual progress report, which we see as a proxy measure that aligns with program goals. Individual students and their faculty advisers complete yearly progress reports that are then reviewed by the full Ph.D. faculty in its annual spring meeting. The progress reports assesses the extent to which students have completed critical program benchmarks: required coursework; progress toward, or completion of, the preliminary exam proposal and exam; dissertation proposal and dissertation.

Finally, Ph.D. students also complete teaching/course evaluations (described below).

D. Other: Course/Teaching Evaluations

In the above section, we discussed our use of selected questions in course evaluation forms to measure program objectives. In this section, we provide a brief discussion of broader uses of the teaching evaluations using the most current data.

In Table 10, we present the results of teaching evaluations for 2007-2008, focusing on two items, whether the course met course objectives and whether the course expanded knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. Several of our courses meet multiple objectives and are available to students across the curriculum. As a result, in Table 10, we divide courses into three types, those taken primarily by professional program students, those taken primarily by undergraduate students (who may be either Social Welfare or Social Work majors), and those taken primarily by Ph.D. students.

Table 10. Teaching Evaluation Summary, 2007-2008

	<i>Course Meets Course Objectives</i>	<i>Course Expands Knowledge and Understanding of the Subject Matter</i>
	Mean Rating (1 = Poor; 5 = Excellent)	Mean Rating (1 = Poor; 5 = Excellent)
Courses Primarily for Undergraduates (both BSW and Social Welfare) (n=664)	4.33	4.31
Courses Primarily for those in the Professional Program (BSW or MSW) (n = 1010)	4.19	4.16
Courses in the PhD Program (n=19)	4.58	4.79

Table 10 shows that students in each of the three course types report that courses are performing quite highly in meeting course objectives and report that their knowledge of the subject matter has been greatly expanded.

IV. Impact of Assessment Efforts

We close with examples of how assessment information has been used for program improvement. In the **Professional Programs**, Outcome study data revealed low scores in the area of macro-level social work practice. As a result, the curriculum committee revised the professional foundation practice course sequence to include a discrete course in practice at the organization and community levels along the field committee assuring there were concomitant reinforcing objectives in the field and integrative seminars. At the same time, a required advanced macro level practice course was created for the concentration year of the master's program.

Another issue that emerged from our assessment stems from course evaluation data. Course evaluations suggested there was an issue of content overlap in professional foundation the social work practice course sequence (a three-course sequence). Under the auspices of the curriculum committee, practice course instructors conducted an "overlap" survey students completing the three courses and the field course. From a curriculum point of view, some amount of overlap is good because it reinforces critical concepts. However, survey data suggest that there are more serious overlap concerns between content of the Practice I and Practice II courses. Faculty who teach these specific courses plan to meet regularly over the summer to determine the nature of the content overlap between their courses and to reduce the redundancy. More broadly, the Curriculum Committee will continue to monitor where and how foundation content is being taught and to solicit feedback from students to assess our progress in eliminating redundancy.

As noted in our last assessment report , **Ph.D. Program** faculty discovered through our student progress monitoring, that students were averaging 2.9 years from entry to their complete their course work, 3.5 years from entry to complete their prelim proposal and 4.3 years from entry to complete their preliminary exam. Focus groups with students at different phases of the program were conducted to learn about their experiences and to seek general feedback about the program. One of the things we discovered was that students were often waiting to start the prelim process, until after they had a clear idea for their dissertation, that they were anxious about beginning the process, and they did not feel pressure to move through more quickly because deadlines were not specified. As a result, the PhD faculty decided to implement two changes to address these issues:

- A new policy to explicate deadlines for submitting and completing the preliminary examination; all new students are provided with information with the expected timeline and policy regarding extensions.
- A new assignment that first and second year students are required to complete in the SW 947 (Student Research Seminar) in which they develop and present a mock prelim proposal. They also are asked to share and review the proposal with their advisor to demystify the process and encourage students to be thinking about their substantive area, and relevant methodological and theoretical issues.

We also discovered that 50% of the students enrolled in the joint M.S.W./PHD program, dropped out after completing the M.S.W. program and joint program students faced extreme challenges in managing the course load, field, and TA responsibilities. To address these problems we initiated the following changes in policy:

- Joint program students will not be offered a Teaching Assistantship.
- Financial support will be provided after joint program students have completed the M.S.W. requirements and have made a commitment to continue their education..

Other essential feedback obtained in the focus groups with students included: difficulty registering for qualitative methods courses on campus (i.e., they filled quickly), limited opportunity for students in RA positions to teaching experience, limited opportunity for students to gain hands on experience with data analysis in course work, challenges associated with cancelled classes due to low enrollments, and lack of financial support to provide travel reimbursement for conferences.

Based on this input from students we have initiated the following changes:

- This past year the PhD faculty approved a curriculum redesign. We are now requiring and will regularly offer a qualitative research methods course. We will also offer a variety of research methods courses that students can choose from (e.g., hands on data analysis, proposal development),
- We developed a teaching practicum for students who were seeking teaching experience and are inviting DELTA representatives to come discuss teaching learning opportunities for graduate students.

An aspect of our mission is to prepare culturally competent practitioners. The value we place on this facet of our mission is such that on our **Course/Teaching Evaluations** we ask students to rate our courses in four areas of diversity as follows: “rate the course with regard to expanding students knowledge and understanding” of the following four content areas: “people who experience social and economic justice”; “people of color”; “women’s issues”; “gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered persons.” With few exceptions, course evaluation data are quite below benchmark on three of these four items (social and economic justice is rated above benchmark). In the spring of 2007, the Curriculum Committee was asked to evaluate whether we were indeed performing poorly in this area or whether the evaluation mechanism was not measuring what we were hoping it would measure. After gathering data from students, reviewing syllabi, and observing courses, the committee felt that the questions were not capturing the extent to which we were incorporating content on diversity. Using an experimental design, new and revised questions were administered to half our students and the old versions to the other half. As a result, the wording of the three diversity questions has been revised for both classroom and field courses and two new items have been added to the evaluation. One asks about the instructor facilitating an environment that encourages thought and discussion of cultural competence, and the other asks about the overall infusion of cultural diversity issues in the course. Results from spring semester 2008 show moderate levels of success. Across all courses, the average student rating of whether the instructor had an “ability to facilitate an environment that encouraged thought and discussion of cultural competence” was 4.30 on a five-point scale, and the average rating on “the overall infusion of cultural diversity issues into this course” was 3.97 on a five-point scale.

V. Future Assessment Agenda

In April 2008 the Council on Social Work Education adopted a new set of accreditation standards grounded in competency-based education which is characterized as “an outcome performance approach to curriculum design. Competencies are measurable practice behaviors that are comprised of knowledge, values, and skills. The goal of the outcome approach is to demonstrate the integration and application of the competencies in practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.”⁷ There are 10 core competencies around which Social Work programs are expected to operationally define for their curriculum design and for program assessment. In addition, field education in the standards has been elevation as the social work profession’s “signature pedagogy.” Signature pedagogy represents the central form of instruction and learning in which a profession socializes its students to perform the role of practitioner. Professionals have pedagogical norms with which they connect and integrate theory and practice.⁸

Our next accreditation review will take place in 2013 with the self-study document being prepared in 2012. It will be expected that a minimum of one year of assessment data will be presented in the report. Consequently, this means that revision of our professional programs assessment tools will have to be a high priority for the faculty. For the next few years a

⁷ EPAS II (April, 2008), Council on Social Work Education

⁸ Shulman, L. S. (2005, Summer). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 52-59.

concerted effort will need to take place to convert our measures that are currently based on program objectives to program competencies for outcomes assessment.

In another area, the employer survey will continue to need attention. Low response rates mean that more work will be needed to refine the Employer Survey methodology if this measure is to become a viable way of assessing program outcomes. In addition, our Professional Programs' Curriculum Committee has ongoing monitoring work to assess improvements in the areas of macro practice, overlap in foundation practice courses and improvements in teaching evaluation scores in diversity and cultural competence.

In Fall 2008, the Ph.D. program launches its new curriculum. The Program's next task will be to assess the utility of this new curriculum design. And, as with the professional program, the Ph.D. Committee will continue to monitor the critical benchmarks of time to complete required coursework; progress toward, or completion of, the preliminary exam proposal and exam; dissertation proposal and dissertation.

VI. Summary

The School employs multiple formal mechanisms to measure program outcomes on an ongoing basis. Formal mechanisms include the Outcome Study, student evaluation of courses, the Job Placement Survey, and licensure pass rates employed in the professional programs. There are also informal mechanisms as well which are especially employed in the Ph.D. Program. Students, staff, instructors, and community professionals all provide feedback on the extent to which we are achieving our program objectives. Results of these efforts are reported back to these vital program constituents. We believe we have an effective and ongoing process through which we recognize the strengths of our programs, analyze areas that require attention, and continuously affirm and improve our educational program.