 insists with the mission of this upper Midwest teaching university, and the Education Policy and Accreditation Standards (2008) of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the Minnesota State University Moorhead (MSUM), School of Social Work (SSW) educates competent entry-level social work professionals with the core knowledge, values, and skills necessary to engage in ethical and empowerment-based generalist social work practice with all people in a dynamic and diverse society. Graduates are prepared to promote planned change and advance social and economic justice, and human rights, locally, nationally, and globally.

Guided by this strategic mandate, SSW provides a competency-based education that guides students’ mastery of 41 specific practice behaviors (PBs) clustered within each of 10 CSWE social work competencies (see Insert A below of a list of CSWE competencies). Uniquely, these behaviors also serve as measurable indicators of student learning. Thus, SSW tracks anonymously, ongoing student performance in each of these behavioral areas as measures of program performance. These measures are then analyzed in aggregate format to protect student anonymity, then used to guide programmatic change as indicated in order to help future student better learn CSWE competencies.

Known as the Minnesota State University Moorhead - School of Social Work Evaluation Model (M-SSWEM II), this second generation assessment system anonymously monitors student learning attainment in each of 41 behavioral foci across all 10 competencies (see Figure A). Using M-SSWEM II data, faculty then retreat once yearly during spring semester to examine results and develop strategic programming changes to enhance student competency mastery. While these changes typically occur in the explicit curriculum (i.e., classroom materials, teaching pedagogies, etc.), they may also occur in other areas of the School (i.e., advising, student activities, and policies and procedures).

The following report first explains more fully the M-SSWEM II. Second, it outlines data collection during this past academic year and presents analyses of those data. Third, it discusses programmatic changes that will take effect next academic year as proposed by SSW faculty during this cycle’s M-SSWEM II retreat.

M-SSWEM II Multiple Measures
M-SSWEM II assesses multiple times, all behaviors in each of 10 competencies. The reader is referred to Figure A for a visual depiction of the strategy, and subsequent tables containing this cycle’s data and analyses. Further, M-SSWEM II uses 13 rubrics to promote methodological validity and reliability:

- 7 pre-field assessments (SW400W, 420, 430, 440, 450(2), and 460W);
- 3 field assessments in SW469-Field;
- 1 in SW470-Senior seminar to assess as term project grounded in SW469-Field using the field scale;
- 1 using a self assessment rubric; and

|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|

This table lists the core competencies of the M-SSWEM II.
1. Using a post graduation rubric (n=1).

M-SSWEM II also integrates ASWB pass rates to further study student post-graduation yet pre-employment competency. And M-SSWEM II examines graduates’ post graduation self-efficacy and views of how well SSW prepared them for GP. Assessment rubric’s two different Likert scales: the imbedded-formative scale \(^2\) and the field-summative scale. \(^3\)

**M-SSWEM II Benchmarks**

Imbedded rubric means: A benchmark of 2.5 is set because their scales (range: 1-3) indicate field readiness (LINK: Imbedded Assessment Scale); and “2.5” represents a reasonable midpoint between the targeted upper performance categories \([2= “continued growth” and 3= “field ready”]\). Here SSW believes that students scoring “2” will further advance their skill set in field such that their summative performance at graduation will meet GP competency standards. And students scoring “3” are field ready given this scale’s response categories. Further, SSW’s goal is to help 80% of students achieve a formative performance level “3” using the imbedded scale thus indicating they are field ready.

Field rubric means: A benchmark of 4.0 is set because their scales (range: 1-5) indicate summative field mastery of practice behaviors (LINK: Field Assessment Scale); and “4.0” represents a reasonable midpoint between targeted performance mastery \([3= “average” through 5= “exemplary”]\). Further, SSW’s goal is to help 80% of students achieve a summative field performance level “≥3” using the field scale.

**Omnibus PB means:** Omnibus PB means are the average of the imbedded and field means, and the omnibus PB means’ benchmark is set at 3.25. This benchmark was selected because the omnibus PB means average two different scales: imbedded-formative scales (range: 1-3); and field-summative scales (range: 1-5). Though each scale uses different response categories, the categories at the top end of each represent acceptable mastery. However, this poses a problem because this convergence of two different scales skews Omnibus PB mean values. Thus, 3.25 is a reasonable compromise that accommodates any tendency toward downward skewing. Moreover, their use is still instructive when their benchmark is adjusted for skewing (LINK: Means Analyses Across Competencies).

**Grand means:** Grand means is the average of all omnibus means, and their benchmark is also 3.25 for the same reasons discussed above for omnibus means (LINK: Means Analyses Across Competencies).

**Ongoing Assessment Data Collection**

Explicit Curriculum: M-SSWEM II assesses student performance across the explicit curriculum every semester (fall/spring). Then, it analyzes those data in aggregate format once yearly (spring analysis of prior fall/current spring data). These data are then compared to cumulative/aggregate (i.e., comparison group) data across all competencies/PBs and across all prior semesters via the comparison group archive (LINKS: 2011 PB 1 through 2011 PB 41). As M-SSWEM II was introduced last fall semester to accommodate assessment requirements under the CSWE 2008 EPAS, it currently reports on data from two academic semesters (1 year: fall, 2010, and spring, 2011). M-SSWEM II also examines ASWB pass rate trends, but less often. Currently M-SSWEM II contains ASWB data from 1990 through 2009 or 20 years of data. M-SSWEM II also examines post graduate assessments of self efficacy/SSW effectiveness also once yearly. For this inaugural analysis, a random sample of 100 graduates was drawn from a sampling frame of all graduates during the past 5 years and the response rate was 17%.

Implicit Curriculum: M-SSWEM II assesses SSW performance regarding the implicit curriculum every semester (fall/spring) using the advising survey (SD 16). This sample stands at 87, and data are also analyzed in aggregate format once yearly (spring) (LINK: 2011 Advising Survey).

**Analyses of M-SSWEM II Data-Explicit Curriculum**
Tabular presentation & statistical procedures: M-SSWEM II tabular presentations are arranged around CSWE competencies and requisite PBs in 41 analysis tables. Because all M-SSWEM II analyses are done in aggregate (see below), student confidentiality is always protected and results cannot be used to influence any SSW decision regarding individual students. As orientation Tables show (LINKS: Sample Table 1; Sample Table 2; & Sample Table Orientation), table presentations are clustered around each specific CSWE competency (Tab 1) where every table pertains to a specific CSWE PB (Tab 2). Further, each table presents data for all 13 rubrics for a given PB (Tab 3). Further, in each PB-specific table the reader will find three sets of data: (1) current semester data (Tabs 4-9); and (2) prior semester data (“comparison group”; Tabs 10-15). Then, each table presents rubric means (Tabs 7 & 13); and mean discordance values (Tab 16). Tables also present means across imbedded rubrics (Tabs 17 & 20); field rubrics (Tabs 18 & 21), and omnibus means (Tabs 19 & 22). Then, analyses are done in aggregate to protect student confidentiality, and assessment results never influence any individual student decisions. M-SSWEM II uses the following four statistical processes:

- **Stage 1:** simple descriptive univariate runs across PBs by rubric for the current semester and comparison group;
- **Stage 2:** across-rubric category distribution examinations to determine percentages of assessment scores ≥3 within PBs;
- **Stage 3:** calculation of all means (rubric-specific, imbedded, field, omnibus practice behavior, and grand); and
- **Stage 4:** calculation of mean discordance values to compare current semester/comparison group performance to examine trends.

**RESULTS**

**EP 2.1.1- Social Work Identity-Analysis:** Tables 2011_PB1-PB6 document findings for this competency for the current reporting cycle. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded measures show that while completing coursework, students overwhelmingly demonstrated an acceptable level of professional identity. Once in the field, data shows that site instructors consistently advanced student identity to a level acceptable for licensed professional GP (see field assessment scale). Overall analyses of aggregate assessment scores across all rubrics demonstrate that the majority of students demonstrated acceptable levels of behavioral abilities (e.g., ≥3 on both imbedded and field rubrics): advocacy ability (100%),

personal reflection skills (94.7%), boundary and role competence (94.6%), and professional demeanor (91.8%). They could also effectively use classroom-based supervision and consultation (91.9%). In every instance, SSW exceeded its student mastery benchmark of 80% across all rubrics thereby showing students’ readiness for licensed GP. Beyond this, current semester classroom/field data compared to that from prior semesters (comparison data) show ample stability in student learning for this M-SSWEM II reporting cycle regarding professional identity. Indeed regarding comparison group data, SSW uniformly exceeded its benchmark of ≥80% (PB1: 98%; PB2: 89%; PB3: 87%; PB4: 87%; PB5: 96%; & PB6: 91%). In fact, students showed modest gains this spring over comparison data in their ability to independently complete their policy advocacy project and analyze an organization. Positive results were also noted among post graduation respondents who uniformly reported social work identification.

**EP 2.1.2-Social Work Ethics Analysis:** Tables 2011_PB7-PB10 document findings for this competency for the current reporting cycle. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded measures show that while completing coursework, students overwhelmingly demonstrated an acceptable ability to apply social work ethics. And once in the field, data shows that site instructors consistently advanced student ethical skills to a level acceptable for licensed professional GP. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded and field measures combined show that through coursework and internship, students learned to effectively recognize and manage their personal values (92.5%), apply the NASW Code (90%), tolerate ambiguity when resolving ethical conflicts (91.7%), and apply strategies of ethical reasoning (85%). In every instance SSW exceeded its student mastery benchmark of 80% across imbedded and field scales thereby showing students’ readiness for licensed GP practice. As for comparison group statistics, in every instance SSW achievement goals of ≥80% were met (PB7: 92%; PB8: 87%; PB9: 82%; PB10: 82%). This
was also true of surveyed postgraduates. In short, students exceed SSW’s performance standards across the board in demonstrating their understanding of social work ethics and ability to use ethics to guide their practice.

**EP 2.1.3-Critical Thinking Analysis: Tables 2011_PB11-PB13** Document findings for this competency for the current reporting cycle. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded measures show that while completing coursework, students overwhelmingly demonstrated an acceptable ability to think critically. And once in the field, data shows that site instructors consistently advanced student critical thinking skills to a level acceptable for licensed professional GP. Current semester data analyses of imbedded and field measures show that while completing coursework and practicum, students could work effectively with research-based knowledge and practice wisdom. Generally, students could work with multiple knowledge sources (87.2%), analyze practice models (86.7%), and communicate effectively and professionally with diverse constituents (87.2%) when completing classroom assignments. As for comparison group statistics, in every instance SSW achievement goals of >80% were met (PB11: 86%; PB12: 84%; and PB13: 82%). Thus, when current semester data are compared to prior data, trends were similarly impressive.

**EP 2.1.4-Diversity and Difference Analysis: Tables 2011_PB14-PB17** Document findings for this competency for the current reporting cycle. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded measures show that while completing coursework, students overwhelmingly demonstrated an acceptable ability to engage diversity and difference in practice. And once in the field, data show that site instructors consistently advanced student skills to a level acceptable for licensed professional GP. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded and field measures combined show that students demonstrated an acceptable competence in recognizing the effects of culture’s structure and values on others (93.7%), understanding themselves enough to guard against personal bias and imposing personal values on others (91.1%), recognizing the importance of difference in shaping life experiences (91.7%), and realizing they as GPs must engage others as informants (95.8%) Comparison group data were: PB14: 91%; PB15: 92%; PB16: 91%; & PB17: 86%. Interestingly, in this last case there was improvement this semester over those in the comparison group (95% as compared to 86.6%). Overall, rubric averages were very strong and well above the program’s standard for imbedded/field competence.

**EP 2.1.5-Human Rights/Justice Analysis: Tables 2011_PB18-PB20** Document findings for this competency for the current reporting cycle. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded measures show that while completing coursework, students overwhelmingly could advance human rights and social and economic justice. And once in the field, site instructors consistently advanced student skills to a level acceptable for licensed professional GP. Analyses of current semester data from both imbedded and field measures show that from completing coursework and practicum, students understood forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination (93%), advocate for human rights and justice (98.1%), and practice to advance justice (99.2%). These semester-specific findings are similar to comparison group results where students equally demonstrated acceptable competence (>80%) thus showing learning stability (PB18: 89%; PB19: 96%; & PB20: 93%). So in every instance SSW exceeded benchmarks.

**EP 2.1.6-Research Analysis: Tables 2011_PB21-PB22** Document findings for this competency for the current reporting cycle. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded measures show that while completing coursework, students overwhelmingly demonstrated an acceptable ability to integrate research and GP. And once in the field, data shows that site instructors consistently advanced student skills to a level acceptable for licensed professional GP. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded and field measures combined show that students demonstrated competence in their integration of research and GP. Specifically, they demonstrated their ability to use practice to inform their scientific, practice-related work (93.7%), and employ research results to inform their GP (92%).
These trends also held among comparison data since all exceed the 80% threshold (PB21: 92% and PB22: 91%). In fact, spring semester’s data were slightly better than comparison data.

EP 2.1.7-HBSE knowledge Analysis: Tables 2011_PB23-PB24 document findings for this competency for the current reporting cycle. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded measures show that while completing coursework, students overwhelmingly demonstrated an acceptable ability to apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment. And once in the field, data shows that site instructors consistently advanced student skills to a level acceptable for licensed professional GP. Analyses of current semester data from both imbedded and field measures show that students could aptly use conceptual frameworks to guide their GP (95.4%), and discuss and use knowledge to understand clients in environmental context (96.7%). In addition, overall comparison group results were similarly strong (PB23: 94% and PB24: 95%). Here again, current semester data was slightly better than that from the comparison group.

EP 2.1.8- Policy practice Analysis: Tables 2011_PB25-PB26 document findings for this competency for the current reporting cycle. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded measures show that while completing coursework, students overwhelmingly demonstrated an acceptable ability to engage in policy analysis, practice, and advocacy. And once in the field, data shows that site instructors consistently advanced student skills to a level acceptable for licensed professional GP. Analyses of current semester data from both imbedded and field measures show that students could not only analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies (95.4%), but collaborated effectively with colleagues in their policy practice work (98.5%). When contrasted with comparison group results, these trends held (PB25: 95% and PB2698%).

EP 2.1.9-Practice Contexts Analysis: Tables 2011_PB27-PB28 document findings for this competency for the current reporting cycle. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded measures show that while completing coursework, students overwhelmingly demonstrated an acceptable ability to scan and respond to practice contexts. And once in the field, data shows that site instructors consistently advanced student skills to a level acceptable for licensed professional GP. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded and field measures combined show that students demonstrated their ability to work effectively with changing locales, populations, technologies, social trends while providing quality services (97.2%), and lead in service delivery and quality (95.5%). Comparison group results were as follows: PB27: 92%; and PB28: 91%.

EP 2.1.10-Generalist Practice Analysis: Tables 2011_PB29 thru PB 41 document findings for this competency for the current reporting cycle. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded measures show that while completing coursework, students overwhelmingly demonstrated an acceptable ability to engage in GP. And once in the field, data shows that site instructors consistently advanced student skills to a level acceptable for licensed professional GP. Analyses of current semester data from imbedded and field measures show that while completing coursework and practicum, students could effectively prepare for action (91.8%), use interpersonal skills (98.3%), develop work foci and select outcomes (92.6%), work with client data (90.2%), assess clients (94.7%), develop intervention goals and objectives (92.6%), select critical intervention strategies (90.2%), initiate action (94.8%), implement prevention interventions (96.3%), help resolve client problems (92.6%), negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients (98.1%), facilitate transitions and endings (90.9%), and analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions (89.4%). In each instance SSW assessment goals were exceeded in that all measures were well above the 80% threshold. These trends also were true of comparison group data: PB29: 89%; PB30: 92%; PB31: 83; PB32: 82; PB33: 80; PB34: 83; PB35: 82; PB36: 91; PB37: 93; PB38: 82; PB39: 97; PB40: 81; & PB41: 80.
SUMMARY ANALYSES OF MEANS
The link 2011 Means Analyses Across Competencies connects the reader to the table that summarizes all means analyses. Of the 41 imbedded-formative, in-class means across all practice behaviors for the current semester, only 1 (PB 18: Oppression & Discrimination) fell under the established benchmark of 2.5 by 0.03. However, after discussion, the faculty judged this amount negligible and likely due to either a cohort or implementation effects, or some combination of both. Regarding the field performance of spring, 2011 data, 19 of 41 means fell under the 4.0 benchmark but only slightly (3.76-3.99). After discussion, the faculty again felt this amount negligible and probably due to cohort or implementation effects, or both. Regarding grand means: 8 exceed competency benchmarks (3.25); one tied (research); and one was under (-0.40). Faculty believe this is likely emblematic of the general nature of course content and students’ interests.

ASWB - The link at ASWE Pass Rates: 1990-2009 connects the reader to the presentation of Board pass rates for roughly the past 20 years. As this presentation shows, there was slight change in first-time pass rates among graduates in years 2006 and 2009. However, despite these changes, other yearly rates remain extremely strong, even almost perfect, suggesting the two lower rates may be cohort effects and not indicate the need for program change. Faculty noted that SSW has an exemplary first-time pass rates that far exceeds national rates.

Analyses of M-SSWEM II Data-Implicit Curriculum
Tabular presentation & statistical procedures: Implicit curricula are assessed using the M-SSWEM II Advising Survey. At the beginning of each office visit, every SSW professor provides a brief survey to every student that contains both descriptive and satisfaction questions. Each student is told that the survey is anonymous, and that completed surveys can be returned to front desk staff. Returned surveys are then filed to help protect anonymity, and eventually passed on to the MGR for processing. While many are returned, not all are completed as participation in this assessment process is up to each student following her/his office visit. Thus, self selection likely occurs to some extent. The Link 2011 Advising Survey connects the reader to results (frequency distributions and percentages) for 1 academic year of advising survey data (fall, 2010, and spring, 2011).

RESULTS
As this table shows, 87 students were surveyed this past year, most of whom were sophomore, juniors, or seniors (69%); and most were either pre-social work or social work majors (75%). Most were seeking academic advising (58%) and half see their advisor regularly (46%). Data also show extremely high satisfaction with faculty performance in this area with all respondents scoring a overall satisfaction rate of 84% (“Good”-11%, “Excellent”-73).
Evidence-Driven Programmatic Change for this Report Cycle

The first inaugural M-SSWEM II meeting that was held on July 20th, 2011. Faculty reviewed analyses and results, and subsequently made several decisions (SD 18; see AS 4.0.3 below). Results are currently on the SSW web page and can be accessed via the M-SSWEM II assessment link. They will be presented to the Dragon SOS/Phi Alpha student organizations and program advisory committee (PAC) this fall (Table 4.0.0E); and they will be circulated to various other stakeholders (i.e., university assessment committee, university administration for required reporting, marketing, etc.) over time. Based on the above results, the faculty has elected to take the following actions:

**FACT #1:** The vast majority of students were overwhelmingly assessed >3 across all rubrics and PBs;
**FACT #2:** The vast majority of means exceeded their benchmarks;
**FACT #3:** In the relatively few instances where they did not, their distance from benchmarks was judged negligible;
**FACT #4:** Faculty felt the SSW curriculum includes ample materials on these core generalist behaviors;
**FACT #5:** They similarly believed SSW pedagogies include ample opportunities to practice core generalist behaviors; and
**FACT #6:** Individual instructors felt they adequately emphasize these topics in each of their classes.

**ACTION TO BE TAKEN:**
Act 1: Faculty will note during the next assessment cycle whether these trends remain;
Act 2: The MGR will disaggregate the post graduate survey from field mean calculations because PGS is not a field survey;
Act 3: The PGS will be reported on separately next cycle;
Act 4: The SSW will initiate moving all departmental processes, forms, etc. onto the School web page to enhance access;
Act 5: The SSW web manager will place M-SSWEM II results onto the SSW web page for broader distribution.

Implicit Curriculum

Based on the Advising Survey results noted above, the faculty has elected to take the following actions:

**FACT #1:** All advising survey results were exemplary.

**ACTION TO BE TAKEN:**
Act 1: The faculty elects not to take any action at this time.
The reader is referred to each individual table on this web page for specific practice behaviors.

*1* I.e., assesses each PB during coursework as it is forming.

*2* I.e., assesses each PB in actual practice prior to graduation.

*3* This is the cumulative percent of all students scoring ≥3 on both imbedded and field rubrics.