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School of Social Work

Consistent 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, advance social/economic justice, and human rights, locally, nationally, and globally.

MSUM-School of Social Work Evaluation Model (M-SSWEM II)

M-SSWEM II Rubrics

Guided by its strategic mandate, SSW mentors student mastery of the 10 CSWE-mandated core social work practice competencies (C) and their requisite 41 practice behaviors (PB) (Insert A). Then, using M-SSWEM II, the School

### Insert A

#### 10 Core CSWE Practice Competencies: 41 Practice Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Competencies</th>
<th>C7: Human Behavior and the Social Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 23: Conceptual frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 24: HBSE knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C8: Policy Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 25: Policy for well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 26: Collaborative policy action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C9: Practice Contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 27: Attend to changing locales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 28: Leadership in service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10(a): Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 29: Prepare for action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 30: Empathy and other skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 31: Work &amp; outcome focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10(b): Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 32: Use client data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 33: Client assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 34: Develop intervention goals/objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 35: Select appropriate strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10(c): Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 36: Initiate actions: Organizational Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 37: Initiate action: Client enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 38: Problem resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 39: Negotiate, mediate, advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 40: Transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10(d): Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB 41: Monitor interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Insert B

#### Assessment Rubrics (Tabular Acronyms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imbedded Classroom</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SW400: Research Proposal Assignment .......... (RP)</td>
<td>8. SW469: Organization Analysis ......................... (OAProject)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SW420: Individual Video Assignment ............ (VA)</td>
<td>9. SW469: Policy Advocacy Project .......................... (PAProject)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SW 440: Growth Group Assignment ................ (GGA)</td>
<td>11. SW470: Evidence-Based Practice Project ............... (EBPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SW450: Community Needs Assessment .......... (ComNA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SW450: Program Proposal .......................... (ProgPro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SW460: Policy Advocacy Proposal ................ (PAProposal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

formatively, summatively, consistently, and manifoldly assesses student ability to engage in PBs. Practice aptitude is tracked through 11 rubrics differentiated by purpose to produce semester-specific cohort (CO) and comparison group (CG) data on behavioral mastery. Insert B clusters all rubrics by purpose and lists their report acronyms.
Ongoing Data Collection
Imbedded Classroom Data
Coordinated by the M-SSWEM II manager, faculty use M-SSWEM II architecture to formatively assess student classroom performance every semester across the explicit curriculum. Once collected, faculty use DIARY to enter raw imbedded data directly into the M-SSWEM II archive.  

Field Data
Each term, field instructors summatively evaluate student interns across the explicit curriculum (FBPE). Internship liaisons then enter raw field data directly into DIARY.

Composition of the Current Data Archive
Since M-SSWEM I was revised to accommodate 2008 CSWE-EPAS evaluation requirements, the current M-SSWEM II DIARY repository contains 2.5 academic years of data. This report analyzes fall 2012 data relative to all archived comparison group information from all prior semesters:

- **AY1**: fall-2010/spring-2011;
- **AY2**: fall-2011/spring-2012;
- **AY3**: fall-2012-partial.

ASWB Data Archive
M-SSWEM II also manages over 20 years of ASWB pass rate data to study biennially post-graduation competency. This provides an external longitudinal and summative perspective of program effectiveness.

Analyses & Benchmarks
Consistent with new CSWE summary reporting standards, M-SSWEM II now examines percentages of students meeting or exceeding benchmarks established collectively during the last self-study by all faculty. At the core of this analysis strategy are 41 individual PB Excel tables. PB-level results are then aggregated within competencies to provide a more global perspective on program effectiveness to CSWE and stakeholders. Then, each biennium, the manager analyzes all data, and coordinates subsequent program improvement and reporting functions (see below).

Tables PB1-PB41 - Core Analyses Series
Tables in this series contain aggregate raw student-level information integral to M-SSWEM II. Tables also contain initial aggregate statistical analyses of student performance that are transferred to Table D for more global assessments of program performance across PBs and at the competency level. The following are specific structural details about Tables PB1-PB41:

- There is one table for each of 41 practice behaviors;
- Tables are organized around the 11 rubrics (imbedded 1-7; field 8-11, see Insert B above);  
- Tables present raw CO_F12 data used to calculate percentages;
- Tables present raw CG data from all prior assessment data archived in M-SSWEM II;
- Tables present row percentages for each assessment rubric of students meeting benchmarks:
  - Imbedded scale benchmark = 3 [range: 1-3];
  - Field scale benchmark = 4/5 [range: 1-5];
- Tables present row benchmark attainment percentages which are averaged as follows:  
  - “Imbedded Pct.”: average percent of all classroom students attaining benchmark;
  - “Field Pct.”: average percent of all field students attaining benchmarks; and
- These two average percentages are combined into a summary omnibus average percent for each PB.

Table D: Percent Analysis Detail
As the second analytical phase, this table is pivotal to more comprehensive analyses of competency-level performance:

- Table PB1-PB41 summary percentages are migrated to this table for CSWE-required competency-level benchmark analyses:
  - "Imbedded Pct.": Benchmark = 0.80 (see Table D footnote 1);
  - "Field Pct.": Benchmark = 0.80 (see Table D footnote 2);
  - "Omnibus PB Pct.": Benchmark = 0.80 (see Table D footnote 3);
- Grand competency percentages are calculated by averaging all omnibus PB percentages;
- CO-specific grand competency percentages are moved onto the required CSWE AS4 (B) form; and
- CO/CG group differences are calculated for PB rubrics/competency grand percentages.
The Dashboards
As the third layer of analyses, dashboards foster visual analyses of program performance:
• Term-specific grand competency percentages are moved to Dashboard 1: Competency Dashboard;
• Difference measures are moved onto Dashboard 2: Difference Dashboard; and
• Graphic 1: Summary Percent Analyses Across Competencies.

Tables E & E1-E16: Curricular Change Decisions
As the culminating step, faculty use the Faculty Change Curricular Worksheet to modify SSW curricula and enhance future student behavioral performance. Changes presented in Tables E1-E16 are presented below, and will be implemented in the fall 2013 term. Once applied, the M-SSWEM II evaluation sequence starts anew so that fall curricular changes will be examined in subsequent biennial reports (e.g., 2015).

ANALYSES

ASWB Results
Table A presents over 20 years of pass-rate data for MSUM SSW graduates (1990-2011). As this presentation shows, there was a 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 overall first-time pass rates that far exceeds national rates.

Practice Behavior & Competency-Level Performance Across-Competency Summary
Table D shows strong overall program performance. For example, the number students demonstrating an adequate level of social work identity exceeded benchmarks (CO_C1: 86%; CG_C1: 86%).20 This was also true of their ability to apply social work ethics (CO_C2: 85%; CG_C2: 85%). Critical thinking assessment statistics showed a slightly lower level of attainment (CO_C3: 82.5%; CG_C3: 82.3%), though it too was above benchmark. This pattern held for assessed competency in diversity and difference (CO_C4: 85.6%; CG_C4: 82.5%) and policy practice (CO_C8: 86.5%; CG_C8: 89.5%). But most impressive was the number of students who exceeded benchmarks across the generalist practice competency composites. Indeed, more cohort members met benchmark than students in the comparison group [CO_C10(a): Engagement-91.2%; CO_C10(b): Assessment-94.1%; CO_C10(c): Intervention-89.7; & CO_C10(d): Evaluation-91].

Table D also reveals that various combinations of imbedded/field percentages for the fall, 2012 cohort fell under the 80% benchmark in fifteen PBs.21 Of these, nine still had corresponding omnibus percentages above, while six had omnibus percentages below the 80% benchmark. Nonetheless, all but one (C9: Practice Context) had competency-level percentages that exceeded the 80% threshold; and of these, one exceeded it by only 1.25 percentage points (C6: Research), and two did so by less than 0.5 percentage points (C5: Human Rights/Social Justice; C7: HBSE).

Table D highlights the role of field training in advancing social work competency beyond the classroom. Across the 41 practice behaviors, there were 22 instances22 (53%) where CO students improved their practice competence by the end of their field experience beyond their classroom training. In these instances, assessed PB abilities of CO students were higher at the conclusion of their field experience than they were during their classroom experience. In 17 instances23 (41%) the opposite was true: assessed CO student performance was assessed lower in the field than it previously was in the classroom. And in one instance (PB 11) there was no change, while in another (PB 5) no imbedded measure was assessed. Similar mixed results occurred across the CG sample; and the reader is reminded that grand competency percentages still exceeded benchmark in all but one instance (CO_C9: Practice Contexts).

Competency-Specific Findings

Competency 1-Identity
Data show that the CO formed its social work identity before field, and certainly by graduation across all practice behaviors. While classroom assessments revealed that 80-86% of students demonstrated acceptable levels of professional identity development in each PB (1-6), percentages strengthened in practicums (Grand Competency percent: 86%). And cohort patterns were generally reflected in comparison group data (Omnibus differences range: ±2%).
Competency 2—Ethics

Managing personal/professional values (PB 7) were assessed in the classroom under benchmark (72%) for the fall cohort, but students meet the program target in the field (94%). This pattern was not evident among comparison group members, however. In addition, where other fall, 2012 term PB omnibus percentages improved over comparison group percentages, PB 7 omnibus percentages reflected a between-group decline (10 percentage points: fall cohort omnibus percentage-83; comparison group omnibus percentage-93). While this demonstrates the clarity that field instruction brings to managing personal/professional values, the decline warrants attention. The reverse was true for applying ethical strategies (PB 10): students had confidence in how to address ethical issues going into the field (89% of fall students exceeded benchmark in the classroom), but eventually felt less practice confidence in applying ethical strategies while in field (79% of fall students exceeded benchmark in field). Nonetheless, all four omnibus percentages met benchmarks.24

Competency 3—Critical Thinking

In only one instance did the fall cohort not attain benchmark (PB13: Imbedded measures of verbal and written communication-79%); but they eventually mastered this skill in the field (84%) (Grand Competency percent: 82.5%). And this same pattern was seen among comparison group members (imbedded-77%; field-85%) since the CO/CJ difference measure was 1%. This suggests that students consistently gained additional technical writing/verbal communication competence in the field, thereby highlighting the importance of field training in professional social work education.25

Competency 4—Engage Diversity & Difference

While CO performance met benchmarks in the majority of PBs in this competency, self-awareness (PB 15) was challenging for cohort members in the classroom (56% surpassed benchmark), but significant learning occurred in the field (92% of students exceeded benchmark by graduation). Despite this gain, the fall cohort omnibus percentage was 74% which is below the 80% benchmark, while their overall competency performance met benchmark (85.6%). This same pattern existed among comparison group members (imbedded PB15: 70%; field: 90%; omnibus: 80%); and both groups’ competency percentages (85.63%, 82.25% respectively) exceeded benchmark (80%).26

Competency 5—Human Rights/Social Justice

This competency showed more divergent results. Regarding oppression/discrimination (PB18) and Social/economic justice (PB20), cohort students were assessed in the classroom under benchmark by large margins (69% and 53%, respectively). Even though field measures were better (87% and 90%, respectively), classroom performance prohibited omnibus percentages from reaching the 80% threshold; and the grand competency percentage just passed the 80% benchmark (80.5%). Though less extreme, this same pattern was seen among comparison group members.27

Competency 6—Research

While cohort members performed quite well in the classroom regarding research and practice (PB21 & PB 22), their field performance was under target, thus muting omnibus and grand competency measures similarly. Moreover, this same pattern was seen among comparison group members. In both instances, however, overall competency percentages (81.25%, 83.75% respectively) marginally exceed benchmark (80%).28

Competency 7—HBSE

The same pattern emerged in this competency as seen in C6 except that omnibus HBSE knowledge PB percentages were below the 80% standard. Moreover, difference measures show that the current cohort performance was below that of the overall comparison group by as much as 9 percentage points.29

Competency 8—Policy Practice

All PBs and competency percentages meet benchmarks. This was also true for comparison group members.

Competency 9—Practice Contexts

Cohort members were assessed almost uniformly inadequate in this area. This was also seen among comparison group members although by slightly less margins.30

Generalist Practice

Competency 10a—Generalist Practice: Engagement

Regarding engagement, cohort students did not perform up to expectation in the classroom in their ability to prepare for action. They did, however, excel in their preparation ability by the end of their field setting.31

Competency 10b—Generalist Practice: Assessment

All PBs and competency percentages meet benchmarks. This was also true for comparison group members.
Although CO performance was very strong in this composite, in two instances (PB 36 & PB 37), cohort members did not reach benchmarks in their classroom assessments, but did later in their field assessment by a considerable amount. 

Although all PBs and competency percentages meet benchmarks, when CO/CG PB percentages were compared, some important patterns emerged. For example, there was minimal between-groups difference in comparative analyses of competencies 1, 2, & 3. There was modest improvement of current cohort members over past students in the DIARY data archive in competency 4, and much greater improvements across the generalist practice composites 10(a), 10(b), 10(c), & 10(d). In competencies 6, 7, 8, & 9, fall cohort student performance was assessed at slightly lower levels than their predecessors. However and perhaps most importantly, only competency 9 current term results fell below the established program benchmark of 80%. Analyzing between-group differences was also performed in Dashboard 2, and results closely mirror the above. Current cohort members performed slightly better than past students in Competencies 2, 3, 4, & 5, considerably better that past colleagues among the practice composites (10a-10d); but worse in identity, research, HBSE, policy practice, and practice context. But in all but one instance (practice context), performance measures were above the 80% benchmarks.

**EVIDENCE-DRIVEN PROGRAMMATIC CHANGE FOR THIS REPORT CYCLE**

Based on deficiencies noted during this 2013 report cycle, the faculty will implement several explicit curricular changes for the fall, 2013 semester in order to maximize student learning and by extension program effectiveness.

**Imbedded Classroom Curricular Changes**

- Table E1-C1, PB 7: Imbedded-Recognize and manage personal values
- Table E3-C3, PB 13: Imbedded-Demonstrate Effective communication
- Table E4-C4, PB 15: Imbedded-Self awareness
- Table E5-C5, PB 18: Imbedded-Oppression and discrimination
- Table E6-C3, PB 20: Imbedded-Social & economic justice
- Table E11-C9, PB 27: Imbedded-Changing locales
- Table E12-C9, PB 28(a): Imbedded-leadership in service delivery/practice
- Table E14-C10(a), PB 29: Imbedded-Prepare for action
- Table E15-C10(c), PB 36: Imbedded-Initiate action
- Table E16-C10(d), PB 37: Imbedded-Implement interventions

**Field Curricular Changes**

- Table E2-C2, PB 10: Field-Ethical reasoning strategies
- Table E7-C6, PB 21: Field-Practice to inform inquiry
- Table E8-C6, PB 22: Field-research to inform practice
- Table E9-C7, PB 23: Field-Conceptual frameworks
- Table E10-C7, PB 24: Field-Critique/apply HBSE knowledge
- Table E13-C9, PB 28(b): Field-Leadership in service delivery/practice

**Summary of Curricular Changes**

The above changes reflect SSW’s aim to ensure that classroom mastery is extended in field settings in order to attain maximum competency by graduation. Therefore, SSW hypothesizes that outlined changes will strengthen linear cohesiveness between classroom and field experiences and increase achieved post-field competency by graduation. As examples, changes in Table E2 are designed to extend ethical reasoning abilities in the field that were successfully inculcated in the classroom. Additionally, research and HBSE competency levels that were acceptable in the classroom context, but assessed under benchmark for this cohort in the field, will be strengthen even more in the field. Thus, changes outlined in Tables E7 & E8, and E9 & E10 reflect strengthening actions. In some instances, changes are designed to boost overall achievement that fell short in both the classroom and in field (E12 & E13).

**REFLECTIONS ON THE M-SSWEM II ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**

The M-SSWEM II system has proven its ability to generate a deep understanding of SSW’s performance relative to student learning. To improve this system, in the 2015 reporting cycle SSW will employ data visualization methodologies currently evolving the larger evaluation field. Not only will such visual analytic approaches make findings more accessible, they will allow SSW to analyze multiple cohorts in the 2015 report cycle to examine trends more thoroughly.
Endnotes

1. See Figure A.
2. See http://web.mnstate.edu/socialwork/MSSWEMIIAssessment/2013AssessmentReport/
3. Comparison group data consists of all prior student assessment data collected under M-SSWEM II for all previous semesters.
4. Rubrics 1-7 are imbedded formative classroom assessments that use a 3-point scale to evaluate field readiness (Table B).
5. Rubrics 8-11 are summative field evaluations that use a 5-point scale to assess final behavioral mastery (Table C).
6. These acronyms are used in all reporting tabulation.
7. DIARY is an web-based data management interface built specifically for M-SSWEM II.
8. See TABLE A.
9. See CSWE AS 4(B) Form.
10. Column labeled “M-SWEMM II Tool”.
11. The area at the center of this table series within the light gray-shaded cluster of cells.
13. The area to the far right of this table series within the dark gray-shaded cluster of cells.
14. The bright green-shaded columns in each table segment.
15. The light brown-shaded boxes toward the bottom of this table series.
16. Imbedded, field, and omnibus percentages that fall short of the 80% threshold along with their PBs.
17. Imbedded, field, and omnibus percentages that fall short of the 80% threshold are shaded purple in this table.
18. The dark-green shaded column on the right side of this table.
20. See Tables PB 1-PB 41 for raw data distributions and rubric-specific percentages.
21. These shortfalls are highlighted purple in Table D.
22. PB 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, & 41.
23. PB 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 33, 38, & 40.
24. See Tables E, E1, & E2 for fall 2013 curricular changes.
25. See Table E3 for fall 2013 curricular changes.
26. See Table E4 for fall 2013 curricular changes.
27. See Table E5 & E6 for fall 2013 curricular changes.
28. See Tables E7 & E8 for fall 2013 curricular changes.
29. See Tables E9 & E10 for fall 2013 curricular changes.
30. See Tables E11, E12, & E13 for fall 2013 curricular changes.
31. See Table E14 for fall 2013 curricular changes.
32. See Tables E15 & E16 for fall 2013 curricular changes.
33. See Dashboard 1: Competency Analysis.
34. See Tables E, E1-E16.