

**Final Assessment Report for BSW Program**

**Educational Outcomes**

**2011-2012 Academic Year**

**Florida Atlantic University**

**School of Social Work**

## **Program Assessment and Continuous Improvement**

**8.0** The program has an assessment plan and procedures for evaluating the outcome of each Program objective. The plan specifies the measurement procedures and methods used to evaluate the outcome of each program objective

**8.1** The program implements its plan to evaluate the outcome of each program objective and shows evidence that the analysis is used continuously to affirm and improve the educational program.

**8.0** The program has an assessment plan and procedures for evaluating the outcome of each program objective. The plan specifies the measurement procedures and methods used to evaluate the outcome of each program objective.

## **The Assessment Plan & Procedure of FAU's BSW Program**

As in previous years, FAU's BSW program has relied primarily on the field supervisor's assessment of student performance and student exit surveys to determine whether the programs have met their program objectives. These have been sufficient to ensure that the programs are effectively meeting their program goals. The exit surveys had quantitative components to evaluate the BSW program's objectives. Data for measurement are received from field supervisors (not employed by FAU), and FAU students from the School of Social Work. The measures for 2012 include the Field Instructor Evaluations (BSW) described in detail.

**Outcome Data and Analysis:**

1. Seven items were used from the Field Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors. Mean score for the group of 7 items = 4.0352 (N= 44). This outcome measure asked field instructors to rate their students' ability to (21a) protect clients' confidentiality and self-determination, (21b) preserve human dignity and the clients' individuality, (21c) identify social work values and ethics in work with colleagues and clients and in other professional relationships, (21d) prevents personal values and biases from interfering with practice decisions in the best interests of the client, (21e) fully meets attendance requirements of the agency and the school of social work, the social work code of ethics, along with other regulations, (21f) understands the history of the social work profession and its current structure and issues, and (21g) recognizes and controls own verbal and non-verbal communication of biases and feelings in an interview. Again, the mean scores for these seven items = 4.01, SD = .75, Mode = 3.0 and Median= 4.0. This scale, as noted above, ranks a score of 1.0 as failing, a score of 3.0 as at an expected level, and a score of 5 at an outstanding level. This outcome data indicates that the program is well above the required score of 3.0 and meets program criteria.

B2. Demonstrate the knowledge & skills necessary for brokerage and advocacy on behalf of client systems of all sizes and with diverse populations, including populations at risk, groups that have experienced social and economic injustice, including women and children, new immigrant groups, migrant farm workers, gay, lesbian, Haitian, Latino, African & Caribbean American, & aging populations in south Florida.

**Method of Measurement:**

B3. Identify & demonstrate knowledge of strategies to reduce discrimination, oppression, and economic deprivation and to promote social & economic justice with populations at risk

**Method of Measurement:**

1. Evaluation of student performance in field by field supervisor - Using 4 items, no individual item scores (B3) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

**Outcome Data and Analysis**

1. Four outcome items were used from the Field Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors. The mean score for this outcome measure using a group of 4 items was 3.9492. This outcome measure asked field instructors to rate their students' ability to (23a) identify populations served by the agency at risk of discrimination and oppression, (23b) advocate for change on behalf of client populations at risk, (23c) demonstrate an understanding of how social, political, and economic factors impact client functioning, and (23d) demonstrate awareness of, and ability to address special issues resulting from client race, ethnicity, class, disability, gender and/or sexual orientation. Mean score for 4 items = 3.88, SD = .76, Mode = 3.0 and Median = 3.75 (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding). In this outcome measure, field instructors observed that students had demonstrated criteria expectation.

B4. Understand & apply theories & knowledge concerning the reciprocal relationships between human behavior and the social environment, in order to promote health and social well-being

**Method of Measurement:**

1. Evaluation of student performance in field by field supervisor - Using 5 items, no individual item scores (B4) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)



knowledge of group dynamics to help clients build a positive group culture, (26o) reduce larger problems into manageable parts, (26p) consider the focus of an intervention within the client system [individual, family, group], (26q) recognize and handle client resistance to seeking help, (26r) set priorities in plans for intervention, monitor the implementation plan, (26s) develop and revise mutually agreeable contract/treatment plan, (26t) model, rehearse, and imparts coping and interaction, (26u) demonstrates crisis intervention skills, (26v) make appropriate termination decisions, (26w) evaluate with the client/group the extent to which the objectives of the intervention plan have been achieved, (26x) demonstrate an understanding of how macro issues and policies impact clients, and (26y) effectively and accurately represent the agency in interaction with individuals, groups, and community organizations. The mean score for 25 items = 3.88, SD = .64, Mode = 3.50 and Median = 3.60. No individual item scores (B5) were less than 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding).

B7. Demonstrate beginning skills necessary for scientific evaluation of one's practice and critical appraisal of the findings of social work research.

**Method of Measurement:**

1. Evaluation of student performance in field by field supervisor - Using 2 items, no individual item scores (B7) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

**Outcome Data & Analysis**

1. Two outcome items were used from the Field Evaluation of Student Performance by Field Instructors. This outcome measure asked field instructors to rate their students' ability to (27a) demonstrate an ability to analyze and apply learning from practice experience and supervisory feedback, and evaluation of one's practice, and (27b) appropriately utilize research data gathering and intervention with community based clients. The mean score for 2 items was 3.91, SD = .74, Mode = 3.50 and Median = 3.50 (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding).

B8. Demonstrate practice competence within an ecological framework, integrating knowledge, skills, values, and social work theories/models of social justice, empowerment, strengths, and systems theory.

**Method of Measurement:**

1. Evaluation of student performance in field by field supervisor - Using 2 items, no individual item scores (B8) will be less than 3.0. A mean score for all items will be above 3.0. (1 = fail, 2 = below expected level, 3 = expected level, 4 = above expected level, 5 = outstanding)

