

## **Salish Kootenai College Social Work Department Academic Assessment Report (AY 2013-2014)**

Filed by Mary Big Bow, Department Chair  
Compiled by Eva Oruste, Assessment Coordinator  
June 30, 2014

### **Background Information**

The Social Work Program at Salish Kootenai College was granted initial accreditation by the Council of Social Work Education in February 2008. During the four years of program development, the CSWE accreditation review team evaluated management, program design, curriculum content, outcome assessment measures, and plans for continuous improvement during the review process. In June 2012 the SKC Social Work Program was granted full CSWE accreditation for eight years.

The Bachelor's Degree in Social Work is based on the foundational knowledge of the profession and offers practical experience in the professional field. The curriculum has been developed to include specific courses in addiction studies, child welfare and cultural diversity. The mission of the SKC Social Work Program follows.

The mission of the Bachelor of Social Work Program is to prepare students for generalist social work practice with diverse populations in a global context and to cultivate community leaders who will implement humane social policies and programs that restore social and economic justice. The program is built on a deep respect for indigenous knowledge and the equality, worth and dignity of all people. The cornerstone of the program is a commitment to serving at-risk children and their families, advancing personal and community well being, and preserving the cultural integrity of Native American communities.

### **Program Goals**

1. Prepare students for entry-level employment in organizations and agencies and/or graduate level education.
2. Prepare competent generalist social workers guided by professional values and ethics, person-in-environment perspective, as well as historical understanding that inform practice within contemporary structures in a rapidly changing global context.
3. Prepare community leaders committed to identifying the causes of poverty, discrimination and other forms of social injustice; formulating social change strategies; and applying those strategies to promote human rights and social and economic justice at every level.
4. Foster an inquiry-based learning environment that encourages students to investigate and incorporate effective evidence-based practices rooted in indigenous knowledge.
5. Promote cultural competence to advance respectful practice with diverse populations of all sizes with a special focus on the integration of indigenous knowledge and the preservation of the cultural integrity of Native American communities.
6. Cultivate globally aware lifelong learners who engage in scientific inquiry; critically assess, synthesize, integrate and communicate relevant information; and employ creativity and curiosity in both research and practice.

## **Learning Outcomes**

The Salish Kootenai College Social Work Program has formally adopted all core competencies and 41 specific practice behaviors that clearly provide an operational definition for each competency.

Educational Policy 2.1.1—Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.

Educational Policy 2.1.2—Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.

Educational Policy 2.1.3—Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.

Educational Policy 2.1.4—Engage diversity and difference in practice.

Educational Policy 2.1.5—Advance human rights and social and economic justice.

Educational Policy 2.1.6—Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.

Educational Policy 2.1.7—Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.

Educational Policy 2.1.8—Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well being and to deliver effective social work services.

Educational Policy 2.1.9—Respond to contexts that shape practice.

Educational Policy 2.1.10(a)–(d)—Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

## **Data Indicators**

The assessment plan developed by the Social Work faculty in 2010-2011 is designed to strategically measure student competencies based on 2008 EPAS standards developed by CSWE. The data are collected from three sources:

1. Area of Concentration Achievement Test (ACAT)
2. Internship Learning Agreement Evaluation (ILAE)
3. Practice Behavior Competency Evaluation Instrument (PBCEI)

Additionally, the program collects direct and indirect data from

1. TABE language and language mechanics pre-and post-test data to assess students' writing competency,
2. Social Work Advisory Board members,
3. BSW students, and
4. Social Work Department faculty members.

In 2013-14, the department designed a BSW exit survey in order to gather feedback from graduating seniors. Unfortunately, the response rate was so low that the survey results cannot be discussed in this report.

## **Direct Measures**

### ***Area of Concentration Achievement Test (ACAT)***

The ACAT is a national standardized selected response test comprised of items that address the general knowledge base for Social Work. The test contains items from eight major categories relevant to social work practice, providing eight sub-scores in addition to the overall score for each student. The ACAT Social Work Area test appears to have value for assessing students' knowledge of core social work content. The program has used ACAT test since 2006. Although

ACAT is currently not aligned with CSWE core competencies and practice behaviors, the program will continue to collect the data from this source in order to assess student performance and identify areas in need of programmatic improvement.

In 2012-2013, the program shifted its focus from assessing student performance in ACAT based on the one test taken during the senior year to offering a pre-and post test and assessing student growth from the beginning of the junior year to the end of the senior year. The first cohort of juniors completed the pre-test in the fall of 2013 and the post-test in the spring of this year. The results are discussed in the following section.

All BSW seniors have completed the ACAT during spring quarter of their senior year since 2006. The tests are immediately sent to PACAT, Inc. for scoring and item analysis. The report is returned to the department in June. The Assessment Coordinator enters the data, prepares a summary report, and submits the results to the Department chair.

The BSW benchmark for success on the ACAT is a group standard percentile of at least 50% in each test category.

#### *2013-2014 ACAT data*

The ACAT scores are reported in both raw scores (percentage correct of the overall, with items weighted by difficulty) and standard scores (which have been normalized so that 68% of scores fall within one standard deviation of the mean). The standard percentile is a means to compare a program's students to a nationwide sample of students who take the same test.

ACAT scores range from 200 to 800 with an average of 500 and a standard deviation of 100. A score of 600 would be 1 standard deviation above average. A score of 450 would be .5 standard deviations (50 points) below average. Nationally, 68% of the scores in any given year should fall between approximately 400 and 600. Year-to-year variations in the size of the reference groups will cause scores to fall outside these limits.

As shown in Table 1, the group standard scores have varied widely over the last nine years. Compared to last year's cohort, the group standard scores increased in seven out of eight categories. The increase was significant (>50 points) in three categories: Values and Ethics (+101), Social and Economic Justice (+72), and HBSE (+52). The only category where students scored lower (-42) compared to the last year's cohort was Policy and Services. Overall, the 2013-14 cohort improved their overall performance in ACAT quite significantly as compared to the 2012-13 cohort.

Another way to interpret the data and look at the trends is to compare the students we tested this year to a cumulative group consisting of the 34 students we have tested over the past 8 years. The last column in Table 1 summarizes how this year's cohort performed in comparison to the previous cohorts. The indicators are reported in increments of .25 standard deviations. Positive values indicate improvements in performance while negative values indicate declines. Values of less than .50 may be a result of random variation rather than a reflection of changes in performance.

Based on the change indicators, the 2013-14 cohort scored slightly higher than average in four categories: Diversity, Populations, Values and Ethics, and Social Work Practice.

Table 1. ACAT standard scores 2006-2014

Area	n=9 2006	n=8 2007	n=8 2008	n=6 2009	n=6 2010	n=4 2011	n=3 2012	n=5 2013	n=8 2014	Change from 2013	Change 2006- 2014
Diversity	397	449	404	510	477	463	473	444	484	+40	+0.25
Populations at Risk	449	495	461	507	456	490	410	426	474	+48	+0.25
Social and Economic Justice	441	539	470	486	470	537	471	380	452	+72	0.00
Values and Ethics	378	519	402	496	448	463	307	354	455	+101	+0.50
Policy and Services	481	500	428	435	467	507	402	534	492	-42	0.00
Social Work Practice	446	520	461	469	505	416	431	511	515	+4	+0.50
HBSE	544	528	460	477	491	479	480	413	465	+52	-0.50
Research Methods	441	560	487	484	544	500	402	448	463	+15	0.00
<b>Overall Performance</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>0.00</b>

The content area scores are compared with a reference group of other examinees taking the same content area. The overall performance score is compared with other examinees taking the ACAT in this discipline with the same number of content areas. The overall score is a separately determined performance appraisal rather than a numerical average of the area scores. The percentile shown on the table is the percent of students in the national reference group expected to obtain a score equal to or less than the one shown. The reference groups are composed of the examinees during the most recent 6-year period. The 2014 analysis is based on a reference group of 7187 graduating students taking an ACAT in Social Work with 8 areas.

The BSW benchmark for success on the ACAT is a group standard percentile of at least 50% in each test category. Table 2 below summarizes the 2013-14 results.

Table 2. ACAT percentile scores 2006-2014. (\* indicates categories in which the benchmark was met)

% ile	n=9 2006	n=8 2007	n=8 2008	n=6 2009	n=6 2010	n=4 2011	n=3 2012	n=5 2013	n=8 2014	Change from 2013
Diversity	15	31	17	54*	41	36	39	29	44	+15
Populations at Risk	31	48	35	53*	33	46	18	23	40	+17
Social and Economic Justice	28	65*	38	44	38	64*	39	12	32	+20
Values and Ethics	11	58*	16	48	30	36	3	7	33	+26
Policy and Services	42	50*	24	26	37	53*	16	63*	47	-16
Social Work Practice	29	58*	35	38	52*	20	25	54*	56*	+2
HBSE	67*	61*	34	41	46	42	42	19	36	+17
Research Methods	28	73*	45	44	67*	50*	16	30	36	+6
<b>Overall Performance</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>58*</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>% of students meeting benchmark</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>

As shown in Table 2, the group percentiles have varied widely over the last nine years also, with the average group percentiles ranging from 14 in 2012 to 58 in 2007 and individual scores ranging from the first percentile to the 87<sup>th</sup> percentile. This year the individual scores varied from 10<sup>th</sup> to 80<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Although the 2013-14 cohort improved their standing among the national comparison group significantly as compared to the 2011-12 and 2012-13 cohorts and two out of eight students

(25%) met individual benchmarks (52<sup>nd</sup> and 80<sup>th</sup> percentile), as a group the benchmark was met only in one category – Social Work Practice (56<sup>th</sup> percentile).

Finally, in 2012-2013 the program shifted its focus to offering a pre-and post test and assessing student growth from the beginning of the junior year to the end of the senior year. Although six out of eight this year's seniors completed the pre-test last year, ACAT reported the pre- and post-test comparison data on only three students. Disappointingly, all students improved only in three or four categories and two out of three students attained a slightly lower overall post-test score based on this analysis.

### *Analysis and next steps*

Although it is useful to examine the results of this national standardized test carefully, the ACAT group scores should be interpreted with extreme caution because of the very small sample group and wide variations in individual scores. Overall, the variations in scores, both individual and group, fluctuate widely from year to year and clear trends towards significant improvement are so far not readily apparent.

The annual variations of group standard scores are difficult to interpret due to many intersecting variables that affect student learning and test taking. For example, the positive changes may be attributed to the continuous improvement and strengthening of the course content, reflect the overall academic aptitude of individual students in a particular cohort, be a result of the students' familiarity with the test and content expectations because they completed the pre-test in the beginning of the last year, or simply the favorable random variations in the test itself. The slight decline in the Policy and Services may or may not be partly attributed to the fact that the Social Work Policy class was taught this year by an adjunct faculty member. Individual student performance can be affected by numerous other factors, including motivation and the circumstances under which the test is administered.

Again, although the incomplete pre- post test comparison data did not show the hoped for results, the program finds it more useful to continue to focus on assessing student growth from the beginning of their professional studies to the end of the senior year. To that end, we will continue to implement the pre- and post-tests and hope to collect a full set of data next year that would allow us to provide useful analysis.

### ***Internship Learning Agreement Evaluation (ILAE)***

The Internship Learning Agreement (ILAE), a contract collaboratively developed by the student and field supervisor on a quarterly basis to guide the student's internship experience, was fully implemented in the 2011-2012 academic year internships. The ILAE is used in planning and assessing student performance in each of the three quarters of the Internship field experience. The ILAE consists of various assignments, customized for each individual, that the student completes during their three quarters of internship. Students negotiate the Learning Agreement assignments collaboratively with their field supervisor and the field education director to fit their field placement and to promote their personal and professional growth. The ILAE addresses all forty one practice behaviors that operationalize the CSWE core competencies. At regular intervals throughout the quarter, students meet with their field supervisor and the field director to reflect on and receive formative feedback on their progress.

The Internship Site Supervisor completes the ILA Evaluation at the end of each quarter, providing a grade and a number that is used for the program assessment. The Field Education

Director enters the data in the Practice Behavior Competency Evaluation Instrument on SurveyMonkey.

The benchmark for success set by the SKC BSW Program is a minimum of 75% of students attaining an average score of at least 7 or higher in all practice behaviors.

#### *2013-2014 ILAE Data*

A total of nine (9) students were placed in local agencies for their internships in 2013-2014. Four (4) students completed all three quarters of the internship placement. Five (5) students completed either one or two of the three required courses. Therefore, the number of students assessed does not reflect the same group from quarter to quarter. Table 3 below summarizes the number of students assessed in 2013-14.

Table 3. Number of students assessed in the Internship course series in 2013-2014

Course	# of students assessed in 2013-2014
Internship I	7
Internship II	7
Internship III	6

Based on the reported data, our seniors as a group met the benchmark in all the practice behaviors and core competencies. 100% of the students were reported to demonstrate competency at or above 7 in 12 out of 13 core competencies and 36 out of 41 practice behaviors. Only one out of nine student was reported to have demonstrated competency below an average score of 7 in one core competency and five practice behaviors.

#### *Analysis and next steps*

Although the scores for the ILAE continue to be impressive, the assessment of student competencies in core competency areas (that are operationalized by 41 specific practice behaviors) and data collection in the internship setting continues to be problematic for the following reasons:

1. The assessment data was incomplete for all students assessed in 2013-14, resulting in the group average scores in some practice behaviors being calculated based on only two data points.
2. The assessment data was inconsistent. While it appears that some site supervisors base the ratings on deliberate, structured activities, observations, and careful, realistic appraisal of student's level of competency, other site supervisors routinely assign maximum scores for an intern in each category indicating that the assessment may be based on the convenience rather than deliberation. Moreover, the ratings in three assessments that were directly entered on the SurveyMonkey by site supervisors this year were radically different from the ratings submitted in hard copy ILEA.
3. The examination of completed ILAEs revealed that in some cases it is unclear what specific learning activity or job assignment the assessment was based on.
4. Several site supervisors voiced their concern about the time commitment required for the assessment, their lack of understanding of the practice behaviors, how to use them to

guide learning, and how to assess them, as well as the data collection instrument and process.

The following recommendations have been made to improve the practice behavior competency evaluation in the internship setting in 2014-15:

1. Discontinue using the practice behavior competency evaluation as a course grading tool.
2. Revise and re-design the ILAE instrument to be clearer and user-friendlier.
3. Instead of quarterly, assess students' competency in all practice behaviors at the end of their three-quarter internship placement.
4. Provide individual training to site supervisors in how to interpret the practice behaviors and how to use them as a guide in designing meaningful learning activities and job assignments prior to student placement in the agency.
5. Provide individual training to site supervisors about the assessment process and rating criteria.
6. Obtain complete practice behavior competency assessment data for each student at the end of their internship placement.

### ***Practice Behavior Competency Evaluation Instrument***

Additionally to the ACAT and ILEA, the BSW Program also collects student practice behavior competency data from the keystone assignments in each of the junior-senior level courses. These select assignments and their accompanying grading rubrics are designed to address and assess specific practice behaviors.

However, based on the examination of the keystone assignments and the accompanying assessment rubrics in the fall of 2013, it became evident that often there was a disconnect between the assignment content and the practice behaviors that were supposed to be assessed by the assignment, bringing into question the validity of the previously reported assessment data.

In 2013-2014, the department undertook a serious revision of the keystone assignments and the accompanying assessment rubrics to clarify and better align the assignment content and the practice behaviors and thus increase the validity of the assessment instruments. The following changes were made:

1. The Service Contract Agreement in Practice I and Pre-Decision Making Essay in SW Values and Ethics were eliminated as keystone assignments because, as introductory assignments, they do not meaningfully assess students' practice knowledge and competencies.
2. The Service Contract Agreement was replaced with the Case Management Portfolio in Technical Writing that addresses practice competencies introduced in Practice I much more in-depth.
3. The Pre-Decision Making Essay was replaced with the Post-Decision Making Essay in SW Values and Ethics.
4. Faculty members revised the assignment instructions and strengthened the accompanying rubrics by eliminating practice behaviors that were not aligned with or were not assessable by the assignment and adding relevant, assessable practice behaviors where appropriate in order to evaluate relevant competencies more meaningfully in the following assignments:
  - Post-Decision Making Essay assignment in SW Values and Ethics
  - Developmental Niche Assignment in HBSE I
  - Cultural Awareness Assignment and the accompanying rubric in HBSE II

- Family Assessment Paper in Practice II
  - Organization Digital Description in Practice III
  - Policy Analysis Assignment in Policy and Services
5. The APA assignment was revised and the title was changed to clarify assignment focus and goals; assignment instructions were strengthened to specifically align with 2.1.3. PBs; and the assignment rubric was changed to include content items aligned with assessed practice behaviors and eliminate the practice behaviors that were not directly addressed or assessed.
  6. Interviewing Assignment #2 in Practice I was added as a keystone assignment to more meaningfully assess practice behaviors relating to interpersonal communication skills, professional/ethical conduct, and practice skills.

The following keystone assignments were used in this assessment in 2013-14:

Course	Keystone assignment	Instructor	# of students assessed in 2013-2014
APA Writing Style	Evidence Based Practice: Literature Review Assignment	Julie Gravelle	8
HBSE I	Developmental Niche Assignment	Mary BigBow	7
HBSE II	Cultural Awareness Assignment	Mary BigBow	8
Practice I	Interviewing Assignment #2	Mary BigBow	8
Practice II	Family Assessment Paper	Dean Furukawa	8
Practice III	Organization Digital Description and Oral Presentation	Co Carew	4
Values and Ethics	Post Decision Making Essay	Mary BigBow	8
Welfare Policy and Services	Policy Analysis Assignment and Oral Presentation	Ann Gowen	No data
Technical Writing for SW	Case Folder	Mary BigBow	7
RGEC	Intergroup Relations Assignment	Co Carew	9
Research Practicum II	Final Research Proposal and Oral Presentation	Co Carew	8
<b>TOTAL # of students assessed</b>			<b>17</b>

In 2010-2011, SKC BSW Program developed and piloted the Practice Behavior Competency Evaluation instrument on Survey Monkey. This instrument replaced the previous system of collecting data from rubric scores and narrative feedback from keystone assignments, although the instructor's assessment of students' level of competency in each practice behavior is still based on those assignments. The direct data entry by faculty significantly reduces the possibility of subjective interpretation of the level of students' skills and knowledge in specific areas during the data entry process by the Assessment Coordinator.

The Practice Behavior Competency Evaluation instrument tool measures students' competency in each practice behavior on a 10-point scale, with 1 indicating lack of competency and 10 indicating the level of competency expected of a professional entering the field. The practice behavior competency rating for the keystone assignments is based on the following criteria:

- 1-2 Student demonstrates only rudimentary mastery of the practice behavior
- 3-4 Student demonstrates below average mastery of the practice behavior
- 5-6 Student demonstrates average mastery of the practice behavior; not yet fully developed but is making satisfactory progress as expected at a junior/senior level
- 7-8 Student demonstrates above average mastery of the practice behavior; not yet fully developed but is making great progress as expected at a junior/senior level
- 9-10 Student has fully mastered the practice behavior as expected of a professional social worker

The benchmark for success set by the SKC BSW is a minimum of 75% of students attaining an average score of 7 or higher in each of the 13 core competencies.

*2013-2014 data*

Assessment data based on keystone assignments was collected for all juniors and seniors (n=17) in 2013-14. The following table summarizes the group average scores in each core competency.

Table 4. Summary of PBCEI group average scores by core competency based on keystone assignments

Core Competency	N=	Group Average Score	% of students achieving >6	% of students achieving >7	Benchmark met
Educational Policy 2.1.1—Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.	9	6.59	78%	33%	NO
Educational Policy 2.1.2—Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.	14	7.45	86%	64%	NO
Educational Policy 2.1.3—Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.	14	7.23	71%	64%	NO
Educational Policy 2.1.4—Engage diversity and difference in practice.	14	7.33	86%	71%	NO
Educational Policy 2.1.5—Advance human rights and social and economic justice.	14	7.56	79%	71%	NO
Educational Policy 2.1.6—Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.	12	7.53	92%	75%	X
Educational Policy 2.1.7—Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.	12	7.85	100%	83%	X
Educational Policy 2.1.8—Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
Educational Policy 2.1.9—Respond to contexts that shape practice.	12	7.06	75%	67%	NO
Educational Policy 2.1.10(a)—Engagement.	13	7.84	100%	85%	X
Educational Policy 2.1.10(b)—Assessment.	9	6.95	89%	67%	NO
Educational Policy 2.1.10(c)—Intervention.	8	6.75	88%	50%	NO
Educational Policy 2.1.10(d)—Evaluation.	15	7.19	71%	53%	NO

Data, usually collected in the Policy and Services class, was missing for three out of 41 practice behaviors that operationally define the core competencies.

- 2.1.1.e. engages in career-long learning
- 2.1.8.a. analyzes, formulates, and advocates for policies that advance social well-being
- 2.1.8.b. collaborates with colleagues and clients for effective policy action

Therefore, the core competency 2.1.8, Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services, which is primarily addressed and assessed in his class is not reported here.

Based on the available keystone assignment assessment data, students met the benchmark in 3 out of 12 (25%) core competencies. Most notably, the highest group average scores and benchmark attainment were reported in EP 2.1.7, Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment (7.85/83%), and EP 2.1.10(a), Engagement (7.84/85%). It is worth noting that although the benchmark attainment per core competencies seems to be low at 25%, students did meet the benchmark in 18 out of 38 (47%), almost half, of the practice behaviors that operationalize these competencies.

Although the benchmark was not met in seven core competencies, the group average scores fell below the 7.0 target in only in three categories: EP 2.1.1, Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly (6.59); EP 2.1.10(b), Assessment (6.95); and EP 2.1.10(c), Intervention (6.74).

### *Analysis and next steps*

The seeming decline in student competencies based on reported should be interpreted with great caution. Many variables have affected the reported scores this year.

1. This is the first year the department has separated the ILEA and keystone assignment assessments in the data collection and analysis, mostly because of the inconsistent, incomplete, and over-inflated scores reported in the ILEAs that are completed by social work practitioners who are not necessarily guided by the same academic expectations as the faculty members. (The concerns and suggestions for remedying the problem were addressed in the ILEA section above.) As such, they tended to greatly increase the average group scores when combined with the scores based on the keystone assignments in the past data reports.
2. Most of the faculty members participated in a revision of the keystone assignments and the accompanying assessment rubrics to clarify and better align the assignment content and the practice behaviors and thus increase the validity of the assessment instruments. Due to various reasons, the Intergroup Relations Assignment in RGEC and the Final Research Proposal in Research Practicum II were not reviewed or revised. Consequently, the assessment became much more focused and clear as the evaluation of practice behaviors that were not explicitly addressed in the assignments were eliminated. In some cases as many as 15 practice behaviors were stated to be assessed in a 2-3 page paper. That led to an abundance of weak or meaningless data points and inflated overall group scores in the past.
3. Most of the faculty members also participated in seriously examining and clarifying the rating criteria this year. As a result, the reported scores this year much more accurately reflect the students' level of competency than in the past. By definition, majority or at least 50% of our students should be expected to demonstrate an average mastery of the practice behavior – a rating of 5-6. However, by definition, our benchmark of 7 is set with an expectation that 75% of the student demonstrate above average mastery of the practice behavior – a very admirable aspiration we should work towards but somewhat unrealistic expectation based on our own rating definitions and the definition of “average.” When analyzing the data from that vantage point (4<sup>th</sup> column in Table 4 above), 75-100% of our students demonstrated average or above average level (>6) of competency in 10 out of 12 core competencies.
4. Curiously enough, the two competency areas where fewer than 75% of the students achieved a score equal to or greater than 6 do not correspond with the three areas where the average group scores were the lowest. If the expected average score was 6, the measure for average, our student group as a whole performed very well, achieving above

average scores (>6.5) in all 12 core competencies. It may be useful to examine the group average scores in addition to the number/percentage of students where students excel.

5. Finally, it must be noted again that the small sample size (N=8 to 14, depending on the assignment) means that the successful attainment of this benchmark can hinge on a single individual's score. Therefore, definite conclusions about the performance of the BSW program or student body as a whole cannot be discerned from the presented data. Moreover, the refinement and alignment of keystone assignments and their accompanying rubrics with 2008 EPAS has been an ongoing process. With this in mind, it can be noted that the data entered may not fully and accurately reflect student performance in the assessed practice behaviors.

In an effort to more accurately and meaningfully assess and report our student learning outcomes and professional competencies next year, the department will

1. continue to segregate the keystone and ILEA data in 2014-2015;
2. focus on increasing data validity (the assignments address and assess the practice behaviors they say they are addressing and assessing);
3. consider setting a more realistic benchmark for student success next year (e.g. "a minimum of 75% of students attaining an average score of 6 or higher in or higher in each of the 13 core competencies" or "a minimum of 50% of students attaining an average score of 7 or higher in each of the 13 core competencies"; and
4. continue the process of refinement and alignment of keystone assignments and their accompanying rubrics with 2008 EPAS.

### ***Combined ILEA and PBCEI Ratings by Core Competency***

In order to even somewhat meaningfully compare assessment data over the past four years we have conducted assessments under the 2008 EPAS, it is necessary to combine ILEA and PBCEI data in 2013-14 as it was done in previous years. The results are summarized in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Summary of ILEA and PBCEI combined group average scores for all juniors and seniors (n=19) by core competency

Core Competency	N=	Group Average Rating	% of students achieving >70%	Benchmark met
Educational Policy 2.1.1—Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.	17	7.95	71%	NO
Educational Policy 2.1.2—Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.	17	7.89	76%	X
Educational Policy 2.1.3—Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.	17	7.90	71%	NO
Educational Policy 2.1.4—Engage diversity and difference in practice.	17	7.85	82%	X
Educational Policy 2.1.5—Advance human rights and social and economic justice.	17	8.02	76%	X
Educational Policy 2.1.6—Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.	15	7.85	80%	X
Educational Policy 2.1.7—Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.	15	8.46	93%	X
Educational Policy 2.1.8—Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.	9	8.79	89%	X

Educational Policy 2.1.9—Respond to contexts that shape practice.	15	7.79	<b>80%</b>	X
Educational Policy 2.1.10(a)—Engagement.	15	8.09	<b>87%</b>	X
Educational Policy 2.1.10(b)—Assessment.	14	7.70	<b>79%</b>	X
Educational Policy 2.1.10(c)—Intervention.	12	7.64	67%	NO
Educational Policy 2.1.10(d)—Evaluation.	14	7.02	43%	NO

Based on combined scores from the keystone assignments and the Internship Site Supervisors' assessment of student competency in the Internship placement, the BSW students achieved the benchmark in nine (9) out of thirteen (13) core competencies (69%) and 29 out of 41 (71%) practice behaviors in 2013-2014.

The full report of the combined scores outlines the specific results for each practice behavior assessed can be found in Appendix 1.

### *Comparison of Combined ILEA and PBCEI Ratings by Core Competency, 2010-2014*

Table 6. Comparison of Combined ILEA and PBCEI Ratings by Core Competency, 2010-2014

Core Competency	Group Average Rating					% of students achieving >70%			
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	AVER AGE	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Educational Policy 2.1.1—Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.	7.94	<b>8.26</b>	7.98	7.95	8.03	81%	95%	86%	71%
Educational Policy 2.1.2—Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.	7.76	<b>8.46</b>	<b>8.15</b>	7.89	8.06	78%	96%	92%	76%
Educational Policy 2.1.3—Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.	7.74	7.87	7.85	7.90	7.84	74%	85%	83%	71%
Educational Policy 2.1.4—Engage diversity and difference in practice.	<b>8.07</b>	7.91	<b>8.23</b>	7.85	8.02	86%	88%	94%	82%
Educational Policy 2.1.5—Advance human rights and social and economic justice.	7.71	<b>8.12</b>	<b>8.40</b>	<b>8.02</b>	<b>8.06</b>	82%	93%	98%	76%
Educational Policy 2.1.6—Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.	7.63	<b>8.16</b>	7.83	7.85	7.87	78%	83%	75%	80%
Educational Policy 2.1.7—Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.	<b>8.34</b>	7.74	<b>8.03</b>	<b>8.46</b>	<b>8.14</b>	86%	82%	83%	93%
Educational Policy 2.1.8—Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.	<b>9.02</b>	<b>8.13</b>	<b>8.28</b>	<b>8.79</b>	<b>8.55</b>	87%	95%	84%	89%
Educational Policy 2.1.9—Respond to contexts that shape practice.	7.81	<b>8.50</b>	<b>8.06</b>	7.79	8.04	61%	95%	87%	80%
Educational Policy 2.1.10(a)—Engagement.	<b>8.17</b>	<b>8.36</b>	<b>8.39</b>	<b>8.09</b>	<b>8.25</b>	84%	94%	93%	87%

Educational Policy 2.1.10(b)—Assessment.	7.64		<b>8.18</b>	7.70	7.84	71%		91%	79%
Educational Policy 2.1.10(c)—Intervention.	8.89		<b>8.20</b>	7.64	8.24	100%		84%	67%
Educational Policy 2.1.10(d)—Evaluation.	7.83		<b>8.78</b>	7.02	7.88	81%		84%	43%

The analysis of PBCEI data does not readily offer clear patterns in student performance over the years. However, it can be observed that the highest overall group average scores (>8.0 3 or 4 years) can consistently be found in four categories:

- EP 2.1.5, Advance human rights and social and economic justice. (8.06)
- EP 2.1.7, Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment. (8.14)
- EP 2.1.8, Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services. (8.55)
- EP 2.1.10(a), Engagement. (8.25)

### ***TABE and Writing Improvement Assessment***

Since student writing improvement was articulated as an SKC Social Work program goal in 2005, the junior cohort’s pre and post-test TABE scores have been used as one indicator of writing achievement. TABE exams are administered on campus at no cost to students. Social Work junior applicants are required to achieve a score of 588 in both Language and Language Mechanics tests at the D9 level (D stands for “difficult” and is the third of four levels of difficulty) as part of their program entrance requirement. This exam score is also the freshman entrance requirement in order to be placed in college-level courses; those freshmen who score below 588 in either exam are required to take remedial writing courses whose credits do not count toward their degree. Prospective Social Work juniors who do not score a 588 on either writing TABE are required to complete one or more on-line Skills Tutor computer modules that target areas in need of improvement.

In the Social Work Program, a one-year Writing Foundations series was created to help improve performance in writing areas identified in both the TABE exams and in student writing samples from the Social Work application essay and other freshman and sophomore writing courses – English Comp I, Comp II, and Writing Research Papers.

The TABE Language and Language Mechanics exams are divided into several writing categories (e.g. usage, paragraph development and punctuation) in which numbers of correct answers are tallied at a level labeled proficient, partially proficient or lacking proficiency. By examining areas of partial or incomplete mastery, the course instructor then designed Foundations lessons in areas in which most students need targeted practice. During the year, students also practice these skills in their research writing and Social Work courses, which are edited by both Social Work and Writing Foundations instructors. At the end of the year, the same TABE exams are administered as a post-test.

A goal for Foundations students is an increase of 30 points on the Language Mechanics exam since mechanics categories such as usage, punctuation and writing conventions are emphasized. The benchmark for success is at least 75% of students achieving a score of 620 or higher in both language and language mechanics sections. This score represents college level ability, as opposed to the 588 score, which is represents a 9<sup>th</sup> grade level competency.

The table below summarizes the pre-and post-test results for the last three academic years.

Table 7. Social Work junior TABE language and language mechanics pre and post test scores 2012-2014

Student	Language Pre	Language post	Language change	Mechanics pre	Mechanics post	Mechanics change
<b>2011/2012 juniors</b>						
David Barnett	555	542	- 13	546	633	+ 87
Neill McGill	650	583	- 67	605	622	+ 17
Elizabeth Swope	588	621	+ 33	546	602	+ 56
Shelley Schenderline	610	647	+ 37	565	786	+ 221
<b>Group average</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>- 3</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>661</b>	<b>+ 95</b>
<b>2012/2013 juniors</b>						
Maria DuMontier	583	604	+ 21	584	559	- 25
Betty LaFountain	643	826	+ 183	603	612	+ 9
Elizabeth Hawkins	647	625	- 22	648	693	+ 45
Jacqueline McElderry	650	617	- 33	605	630	+ 25
Crystal Williams	610	656	+ 46	602	648	+ 46
<b>Group average</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>666</b>	<b>+ 39</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>+ 20</b>
<b>2013/2014 juniors</b>						
Carla DeVoe	656	621	- 35	622	644	+ 22
Allen Felix	542	586	+ 44	602	546	- 56
Arlene Manuel	583	602	+ 19	692	644	- 48
Teresa Nightingale	602	586	- 16	603	584	- 19
Xavier Old Chief	542	558	+ 16	584	603	+ 19
Chaniel Running Crane	621	621	0	672	672	0
Karissa Trahan	602	572	- 30	786	786	0
<b>Group average</b>	<b>593</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>652</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>-12</b>

### *Analysis and next steps*

Based on the 2013-14 post-test scores, only two out of seven students (29%) met the benchmark of 620 post-test score in the TABE language section. However, neither of those students demonstrated an increase in writing competency. More than half of the students (57%) achieved the desired 620 score in the language mechanics post-test. Whereas only one of those students demonstrated a 22-point increase in the TABE score, the scores of the other three remained the same or decreased.

It must be noted that in the 2013-14 academic year, students were post tested at a higher TABE level than the pre test. The pre-test, which is D9, is a third level of difficulty, and the post-test was given at the A9 level, which is the fourth and highest level of difficulty. So those students who scored lower on the Language Mechanics post-test may have actually displayed an increase in skills.

Based on the presented data, it is, again, difficult to see any clear patterns in writing improvement for the group as a whole as the scores and level of improvement varies widely from year to year and individual to individual.

While the TABE is useful for targeting skill areas that need attention, it is not a valid instrument for assessing student growth; for example, one missed question in the Language Mechanics section can result in a 75% score. Student scores can drop in the post-test for a variety of reasons: burnout at the end of the school year; lack of reinforcement for doing well (e.g.

admission and stipend awards aren't based on post test scores) and multiple choice exams as a less than ideal measure of student achievement.

Next year the plan is to abandon TABE as an instrument for assessing student learning and adopt a pre and post grammar test in the Foundations class instead; students will take the pre test at the beginning of Winter Quarter and the post test at the end of Spring Quarter. The exams contain questions that require either short answers or demonstration of editing skills.

Finally, Social Work faculty training in assessing mechanics will resume next year. Currently mechanics are assessed largely in Writing Foundations and APA Writing courses. Because this trait is often unaddressed in other Social Work course writing, students don't receive consistent feedback and practice. More consistent mechanics assessment, including mechanics being weighted in the overall writing grades, should help reinforce the importance of this competency for students.

## **Indirect Measures**

### ***Social Work Program Advisory Board Feedback***

In order to continue to receive valuable feedback and guidance from the social work practitioners, the department revitalized the Social Work Advisory Board in 2013-14. We held three meetings, one in each quarter. Fruitful conversations were held about new trends and challenges in social work, strengthening the collaborative partnerships between the academia and the field, students' professional preparation, and internships. Among many other suggestions, the Advisory Board noted the following:

1. As most social work programs and agencies are grant funded, it is imperative that students understand the grant process as well as acquire grant writing and data reporting skills.
2. Increasing the level of writing proficiency among our graduates remains a great priority.
3. Students need to be better prepared for internship experience.
4. Internship Learning Agreement is too cumbersome and confusing.
5. There is a need for training for site supervisors so they can understand the practice behaviors, how to use them as guides in designing learning activities and job assignments, and how to assess them.

### ***Social Work Department Faculty Feedback***

Based on the discussions held during the weekly department meetings, retention, academic preparation of our incoming juniors, writing proficiency, critical thinking, and research literacy among our juniors and seniors, and internship placements remain areas in need of improvement.

As just one example, six (6) out of eight (8) BSW applicants did not meet the minimum 588 TABE language and language mechanics score requirement this year. As mentioned in the TABE section, this is the level of proficiency expected from incoming freshmen. Examination of their writing samples further revealed serious deficiencies in writing proficiency, ability to integrate sources, and critical thinking. Although the department employs a full time Writing Specialist and offers extensive support and further instruction in writing to students throughout the junior and senior years, the inadequate pre-BSW preparation continues to pose a significant challenge to students as they move into 300-level professional social work courses.

Moreover, the faculty members continue to be concerned about the level of academic preparation of students transferring from other tribal colleges. For example, AA in Human Services graduates from BFCC are only required to take one writing course. SKC does not require those students to take the TABE writing assessment and waives their requirement for English Comp I. However, all transfer students consistently demonstrate below SKC entrance-level writing skills. Per SKC policy, we cannot require that students repeat English Comp classes here at SKC or, in some cases, enroll in the DVSP-level courses to gain the necessary level of skills. Consequently, the program must continuously find resources to provide remedial services within the department. Not surprisingly, student learning outcomes are much lower than expected as many students are struggling to catch up on basic skills rather than engage in higher level learning.

Along with conversations about students' performance, the department discussed the need for consistent academic expectations and grading criteria across all social work classes. These inconsistencies have led to confusion and often resentment in students towards faculty members who have set high but clear and appropriate standards for student learning.

Finally, the faculty members are also very concerned about the level of support services currently offered to students with learning disabilities, low academic skills, and mental or emotional challenges. Based on the analysis of the retention data, the department lost 8 out of 20 or almost half of the pre-BSW students this year. Six of those withdrawals were related to the issues mentioned above.

### ***BSW Student Feedback***

Several re-occurring themes have emerged from informal student feedback sessions over the past years. Some of the most common concerns are summarized here.

1. The research-related vocabulary, content expectations, writing standards, and grading criteria are often conflicting and inconsistent between two instructors teaching three key research classes: APA Writing Style, Research series, and Professional Presentation Skills. Students have expressed that because the Research Practicum II and Professional Presentation Skills, both of which assist students with completing and presenting their Senior Capstone projects during the last quarter of studies, have such diverging expectations that perhaps those two classes should not be taken at the same time.
2. A 5-credit research class that combines basic research methods overview and the capstone presentation preparation at the same time is too overwhelming, especially when taken simultaneously with the first quarter of the internship placement.
3. There is a need for consistent on-campus, in-person support for online social work classes.
4. There is a need for clear and coherent assignment instructions.
5. There is a need for stronger support in securing academic accommodations for students with disabilities and counseling services for students struggling with mental and emotional stress.

### ***Next steps***

In response to the Advisory Board concerns and recommendations and student and faculty feedback, the following curriculum changes will be implemented in 2014-15 in order to more effectively assist students in gaining the necessary knowledge and desired level of competency. (The improvements in the ILAE instrument and practice behavior evaluation in the internship setting were addressed in the Internship section above.)

1. A new 100-level social work class is being developed to assist in retention efforts. The course will focus on career exploration, individual mentoring, and cohort building. All incoming freshmen will be advised to enroll in this class in 2014-15.
2. Grant writing was added to the BSW curriculum as a required class. It was previously offered as an elective.
3. Two psychology classes – PSYC 120, Research Methods in Psychology and PSYC 210, Psychological Literature, were added to the sophomore year requirements in order to improve students' research and critical thinking skills, better prepare them for the senior level research and capstone classes, as well as retention efforts.
4. The senior research course series continues to pose serious challenges for our students. Following many discussions about both the layout and content of the courses leading to the Senior Capstone Presentation, the whole series was re-designed. Instead of SCWK 415, SW Research (5 cr), SCWK 416, Research Practicum I (1cr) and SCWK 417, Research Practicum II (1cr), the department will offer SCWK 420, Advanced Research Methods in SW (3cr); SCWK 421, Social Work Capstone I (3 cr); and SCWK 422, Social Work Capstone II (3 cr) starting 2014-15.
5. In order to create one set of clear standards for the Capstone Project and eliminate the confusion, the same instructor will teach the Social Work Capstone and Professional Presentation Skills classes starting in 2014-15.
6. In order to more effectively prepare students for the internship placement and incorporate more information about inter-agency politics and workplace challenges, we increased the credit count for Internship Seminar from 2 to 3. SCWK 351 (2cr) will be redesigned as SCWK 352.
7. In order to provide even stronger writing support to our juniors, the 100-level Writing Foundations series (3 X 1 credits) was replaced by three 2-credit, 300-level SW Writing Labs: SCWK 307, SW Writing Lab I (2cr); SCWK 308, SW Writing Lab II (2cr); and SCWK 309, SW Writing Lab III (2cr).
8. The department will continue to enhance the assignments to align with the 2008 EPAS, clarify the assignment instructions, and revise the grading rubrics to clearly communicate academic expectations in all social work classes.

Additionally, the department is in the process of hiring a full-time social work instructor who will offer on-campus instruction and will be available to assist students in-person as necessary. The department will also continue to work with the Liberal Arts Department to increase students' writing proficiency and with the Student Support Services to improve the services to disabled and struggling students.

## **Summary**

Although the program continues its data collection and analysis efforts and examines the results carefully, the usefulness of these efforts in guiding programmatic improvements remains limited. Data collected from all instruments must be interpreted with extreme caution because of the very small sample group and wide variations in individual level of achievement. Overall, the variations in scores, both individual and group, fluctuate widely from year to year and clear trends towards significant improvement or specific areas in need of improvement are so far not readily apparent.

In 2014-2015, the program will continue to address the questions of instrument and data reliability and validity in an effort to collect more meaningful and realistic student learning outcomes information. As discussed in the *Analysis and Next Steps* under each section above, the

program will also continue to improve its curriculum based on both direct and indirect outcome measures.

### **Implications for College Strategic Planning and Budgeting**

Below is a summary of our department's recommendations for SKC's consideration:

1. A majority of our entering freshmen require intensive remedial assistance in writing, reading, and/or mathematics. In order to increase the retention rate as well as more effectively assist those students in gaining solid foundational skills for academic success, the department would like to recommend that the college make it a strategic priority to critically evaluate the current delivery and content of the DVSP classes and take necessary steps to improve the remedial program. Offering intensive summer and break "bootcamps", for example, could be considered.
2. SKC continues to provide extraordinary opportunities for students to succeed. Open enrollment is a testament to this institutional commitment to serving the community. However, many remedial students may not be able to fully take advantage of the educational opportunities provided at SKC due to limitations like lack of life skills, low academic aptitude, or learning disabilities. In order to increase retention and more effectively assist those students, the department would like to recommend the following:
  - a. Provide extensive mentoring, learning disability testing services, and targeted career counseling to students in order to assist them in setting realistic educational goals, choosing an appropriate academic program, and seeking necessary accommodations.
  - b. Provide a mandatory, specialized life, study, financial literacy, and metacognitive skills course to all remedial students.
  - c. Provide intensive cohort and community building opportunities to remedial students who often feel isolated and disconnected from their prospective chosen academic programs.
  - d. Design and offer additional vocational and/or certificate programs.
  - e. Design and offer more effective retention services.
3. Although the Liberal Arts Department has made remarkable progress in providing quality writing preparation and support to students, increasing writing proficiency among the freshmen and sophomores remains a high priority for the Social Work Department. High quality writing instruction is very labor-intensive yet SKC instructors are expected to provide necessary individual attention and guidance to up to 25 students in each class. The department would like to recommend that SKC find the means to allocate additional resources to the Liberal Arts Department for hiring another full time writing instructor and decreasing class sizes in writing courses to a maximum of 15 students.
4. Although many students have benefitted from peer tutoring services at the Writing Center, the department is concerned about the level of writing proficiency of students offering those services. To that end, the department would like to suggest that resources be allocated to employ an additional highly trained, competent writing tutor to serve students in need of assistance.
5. In order to more effectively work with and retain transfer students, the department would like to recommend that the college consider requiring them to complete the writing proficiency test regardless of how many credits they have completed. Conversely, departments should be allowed to require that students who do not meet SKC's standards repeat the 100- and 200-level writing courses if necessary.
6. Considering the consistently low level of writing proficiency among our incoming juniors, the department would like to suggest that SKC consider implementing a college-wide writing

proficiency test at the end of the sophomore year for students aspiring to pursue a bachelor's degree and offer additional remedial opportunities to those who do not meet the expected standards.

7. Inadequate support services to students with disabilities and/or mental and emotional issues remain problematic. Many students are placed at SKC by the Vocational Rehabilitation Services. Whereas the agency generally acknowledges and supports students based on an identified physical disability, the testing or support services for cognitive or learning disabilities are usually not provided. In order to increase retention and more effectively assist students, the department would like to recommend the following:
  - a. Allocate more resources to Student Support Services in order to hire another counselor to adequately meet the need for counseling services.
  - b. Provide extensive learning disability testing services to students.
  - c. Further clarify the procedures for requesting and receiving accommodations, increase students' awareness of and access to needed counseling services, as well as provide more customized and useful accommodations based on students' needs.
  - d. As in the case of remedial students, consider providing extensive mentoring and targeted career counseling to disabled students in order to assist them in setting realistic educational goals, choosing an appropriate academic program, and seeking necessary accommodations.
  - e. Work with the Vocational Rehabilitation Services to coordinate testing, placement, and support service delivery to disabled students placed at SKC by the agency.
8. Housing and the related financial burden it puts on students who often come from other communities continues to be problematic and contribute to retention challenges. The department would like to recommend that SKC consider allocating resources to offering more affordable, dormitory-style housing options to students.
9. SKC has built an impressive at-distance educational program. However, due to technicalities, the online learning is still not an option for students who have not attended SKC on-campus classes. In order to increase enrollment, assist in retention efforts, fully take advantage of the available opportunities, and more effectively serve at-distance students, the department would like to recommend that SKC review and revise its on-line course enrollment policies.
10. Based on student feedback, the college enrollment and registration processes continue to be overwhelming and inefficient. Meanwhile, the online registration module on JICS remains under-utilized and technically problematic. It is our recommendation that in order to reduce the frustration and stress related to enrollment and registration, SKC revise its enrollment and registration procedures, repair the JICS module to take full advantage of the features it offers, and devise a simpler and more streamlined process for enrollment and registration, including an option for fully on-line completion of necessary documentation.
11. Offer intensive follow-up support and mentoring to incoming freshmen after the new student orientation.
12. In order to attract and retain qualified instructors, SKC should consider allowing departments the flexibility to determine and offer fair compensation to both prospective and current employees who have demonstrated high level of competence and exceptional service to students and the college.

## APPENDIX 1

Summary of ILEA and PBCEI combined group average scores for all juniors and seniors (n=19)  
by core competency and practice behavior, 2013-2014

<b>Educational Policy 2.1.1—Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly. Social workers serve as representatives of the profession, its mission, and its core values. They know the profession’s history. Social workers commit themselves to the profession’s enhancement and to their own professional conduct and growth. Social workers</b>				
Practice Behavior	N=	Group average rating	% of students achieving >70%	Benchmark met
a. advocate for client access to the services of social work;	15	7.98	73%	NO
b. practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development;	16	7.67	69%	NO
c. attend to professional roles and boundaries;	15	7.31	53%	NO
d. demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication;	15	8.44	93%	X
e. engage in career-long learning; and	5	9.78	100%	X
f. use supervision and consultation.	16	7.63	63%	NO
<b>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7.95</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>Educational Policy 2.1.2—Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice. Social workers have an obligation to conduct themselves ethically and to engage in ethical decision- making. Social workers are knowledgeable about the value base of the profession, its ethical standards, and relevant law. Social workers</b>				
Practice Behavior	N=	Group average rating	% of students achieving >70%	Benchmark met
a. recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice;	16	8.02	75%	X
b. make ethical decisions by applying standards of the NASW Code of Ethics and, as applicable, of the IFSW/IASSW Ethics in Social Work, Statement of Principles;	17	7.48	71%	NO
c. tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts; and	10	9.08	90%	X
d. apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions.	15	7.98	80%	X
<b>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7.89</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Educational Policy 2.1.3—Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments. Social workers are knowledgeable about the principles of logic, scientific inquiry, and reasoned discernment. They use critical thinking augmented by creativity and curiosity. Critical thinking also requires the synthesis and communication of relevant information. Social workers</b>				
Practice Behavior	N=	Group average rating	% of students achieving >70%	Benchmark met
a. distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom;	17	7.71	65%	NO
b. analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation; and	16	8.03	75%	X
c. demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues.	15	8.31	71%	NO
<b>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7.90</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>NO</b>

<p><b>Educational Policy 2.1.4—Engage diversity and difference in practice. Social workers understand how diversity characterizes and shapes the human experience and is critical to the formation of identity. The dimensions of diversity are understood as the intersectionality of multiple factors including age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, political ideology, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation. Social workers appreciate that, as a consequence of difference, a person’s life experiences may include oppression, poverty, marginalization, and alienation as well as privilege, power, and acclaim. Social workers</b></p>				
Practice Behavior	N=	Group average rating	% of students achieving >70%	Benchmark met
a. recognize the extent to which a culture’s structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create or enhance privilege and power;	12	8.81	92%	X
b. gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups;	17	7.59	65%	NO
c. recognize and communicate their understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences; and	16	8.18	88%	X
d. view themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants.	7	7.75	86%	X
<b>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7.85</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>X</b>
<p><b>Educational Policy 2.1.5—Advance human rights and social and economic justice. Each person, regardless of position in society, has basic human rights, such as freedom, safety, privacy, an adequate standard of living, health care, and education. Social workers recognize the global interconnections of oppression and are knowledgeable about theories of justice and strategies to promote human and civil rights. Social work incorporates social justice practices in organizations, institutions, and society to ensure that these basic human rights are distributed equitably and without prejudice. Social workers</b></p>				
Practice Behavior	N=	Group average rating	% of students achieving >70%	Benchmark met
a. understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination;	17	8.16	82%	X
b. advocate for human rights and social and economic justice; and	12	8.43	83%	X
c. engage in practices that advance social and economic justice.	12	8.51	83%	X
<b>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8.02</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>X</b>
<p><b>Educational Policy 2.1.6—Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research. Social workers use practice experience to inform research, employ evidence-based interventions, evaluate their own practice, and use research findings to improve practice, policy, and social service delivery. Social workers comprehend quantitative and qualitative research and understand scientific and ethical approaches to building knowledge. Social workers</b></p>				
Practice Behavior	N=	Group average rating	% of students achieving >70%	Benchmark met
a. use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry and	10	8.65	90%	X
b. use research evidence to inform practice.	15	7.74	80%	X
<b>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7.85</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>X</b>
<p><b>Educational Policy 2.1.7—Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment. Social workers are knowledgeable about human behavior across the life course; the range of social systems in which people live; and the ways social systems promote or deter people in maintaining or achieving health and well-being. Social workers apply theories and knowledge from the liberal arts to understand biological, social, cultural, psychological, and spiritual development. Social workers</b></p>				
Practice Behavior	N=	Group average rating	% of students achieving >70%	Benchmark met

a. utilize conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation; and	15	8.33	93%	X
b. critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.	15	8.59	93%	X
<b>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8.46</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Educational Policy 2.1.8—Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services. Social work practitioners understand that policy affects service delivery, and they actively engage in policy practice. Social workers know the history and current structures of social policies and services; the role of policy in service delivery; and the role of practice in policy development. Social workers</b>				
<b>Practice Behavior</b>	<b>N=</b>	<b>Group average rating</b>	<b>% of students achieving &gt;70%</b>	<b>Benchmark met</b>
a. analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being; and	9	8.71	89%	X
b. collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action.	9	8.87	89%	X
<b>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8.79</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Educational Policy 2.1.9—Respond to contexts that shape practice. Social workers are informed, resourceful, and proactive in responding to evolving organizational, community, and societal contexts at all levels of practice. Social workers recognize that the context of practice is dynamic, and use knowledge and skill to respond proactively. Social workers</b>				
<b>Practice Behavior</b>	<b>N=</b>	<b>Group average rating</b>	<b>% of students achieving &gt;70%</b>	<b>Benchmark met</b>
a. continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services; and	15	7.84	80%	X
b. provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services.	10	8.42	80%	X
<b>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7.79</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Educational Policy 2.1.10(a)—Engagement. Social workers</b>				
<b>Practice Behavior</b>	<b>N=</b>	<b>Group average rating</b>	<b>% of students achieving &gt;70%</b>	<b>Benchmark met</b>
a. substantively and affectively prepare for action with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities;	14	8.28	93%	X
b. use empathy and other interpersonal skills; and	13	8.20	85%	X
c. develop a mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes.	14	7.99	79%	X
<b>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8.09</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Educational Policy 2.1.10(b)—Assessment. Social workers</b>				
<b>Practice Behavior</b>	<b>N=</b>	<b>Group average rating</b>	<b>% of students achieving &gt;70%</b>	<b>Benchmark met</b>
a. collect, organize, and interpret client data;	14	7.81	79%	X
b. assess client strengths and limitations;	14	8.18	86%	X
c. develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives; and	14	7.49	79%	X
d. select appropriate intervention strategies.	13	7.13	54%	NO
<b>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>7.70</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Educational Policy 2.1.10(c)—Intervention. Social workers</b>				

Practice Behavior	N=	Group average rating	% of students achieving >70%	Benchmark met
a. initiate actions to achieve organizational goals;	11	7.39	55%	NO
b. implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities;	11	8.12	91%	X
c. help clients resolve problems;	12	7.69	67%	NO
d. negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients; and	11	8.04	82%	X
e. facilitate transitions and endings.	12	7.42	75%	X
<b><i>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</i></b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7.64</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>Educational Policy 2.1.10(d)—Evaluation. Social workers</b>				
Practice Behavior	N=	Group average rating	% of students achieving >70%	Benchmark met
a. Social workers critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions.	15	7.11	47%	NO
<b><i>TOTAL/GROUP AVERAGE</i></b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7.11</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>NO</b>