

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: _____ Social Work MSW _____ **Contact Name and Email** _____ Robert Guell and Dianna Cooper-Bolinskey _____
 (Faculty participating in the preparation of this report: Cooper-Bolinskey, Ketner, Impink, VanCleave, Collins, and various field instructors who supervised clinical students.)

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
C1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior C1CBO: Values assessment in ethical and professional behavior	615 Career Long Learning Paper	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior C1ABC1: Understand and identify professional strengths, limitations, and challenges	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior C1ABC2: Apply ethical decision making skills to issues specific to clinical social work	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior C1ABCO: Exercise of judgment assessment in ethical and professional behavior with clinical clients	615 Field Case Study Paper	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior C1ABSU1: Identify opportunities for social work involvement in prevention of substance use disorders	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	85.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior C1ABSU2: Apply ethical decision making skills to the prevention of substance use disorders	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	78.6	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior C1ABSUO: Knowledge assessment in ethical and professional behavior with substance use clients	610 Ethics Presentation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.3	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2CB3: Present themselves as learners and engage clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.

C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2CB4: Apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2CBO: Knowledge assessment of engaging diversity and difference in practice	601 Cultural Competence Paper	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	94.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2ABC3: Research and apply knowledge of diverse populations to enhance client well-being	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2ABC4: Identify and use practitioner/client differences from a strengths perspective	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2ABCO: Skills assessment of engaging diversity and difference in practice with clinical clients	620 Culminating Project	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.3	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2ABSU3: Assess predictive factors competently within and across groups (gender, ethnicity/race, age, SES, sexual orientation) and across systems	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	78.6	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2ABSU4: Analyze and compare different social constructions of substance use, misuse, abuse, and dependence and their implications	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	85.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2ABSUO: Values assessment of engaging diversity and difference in practice with substance use clients	550 Addictions Case Study	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3CB5: Apply their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3CB6: Engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3CBO: Skills assessment of advancing human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	607 Policy Paper	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	71	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3ABC5: Use knowledge of the effects of oppression, discrimination, and historical trauma on client and client systems to guide treatment planning and intervention	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3ABC6: Advocate at multiple levels for mental health parity and reduction of health disparities for diverse populations	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3ABCO: Affective reactions assessment of advancing human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	615 Field Journal	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.

C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3ABSU5: Advocate at multiple levels for health promotion, for reduction of health disparities, and stigma for diverse populations affected by substances and substance use disorders	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	78.6	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3ABSU6: Use knowledge of the effects of oppression, discrimination, and historical trauma on client and client systems to guide treatment planning and intervention with clients affected by substances and substance use disorders	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	92.9	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3ABSUO: Knowledge assessment fo advancing human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	615 Field Journal	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4CB7: Use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4CB8: Use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4CBO: Critical thinking assessment in engaging practice informed research and research informed practice	611 Research Paper	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	78.6	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4ABC7: Use the evidence based practice process in clinical assessment and intervention with clients	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4ABC8: Use research methodology to evaluate clinical practice effectiveness and/or outcomes	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4ABCO: Knowledge assessment of engaging in practice informed research and research informed practice with clinical clients	606 Evidence Based Practice Paper	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	61	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4ABSU7: Identify, evaluate, and select effective substance use disorder prevention strategies	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	85.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4ABSU8: Apply foundation research skills to the evaluation of prevention of substance use disorders	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	78.6	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4ABSUO: Skills assessment of engaging in practice informed research and research informed practice with substance use clients	550 Addictions Case Study	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	68.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C5: Engage in policy practice C5CB9: Assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C5: Engage in policy practice C5CB10: Apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.

C5: Engage in policy practice C5CBO: Knowledge assessment of engaging in policy practice	607 Policy Paper	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	82.4	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C5: Engage in policy practice C5ABC9: Communicate to stakeholders the implications of policies and policy changes in the lives of clients	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C5: Engage in policy practice C5ABC10: Advocate with and inform administrators and legislators to influence policies that affect clients and service	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C5: Engage in policy practice C5ABCO: Skills assessment of engaging in policy practice for clinical clients	607 Policy Paper	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	64.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C5: Engage in policy practice C5ABSU9: Apply policy practice skills for substance use disorders prevention	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	85.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C5: Engage in policy practice C5ABSU10: Communicate to stakeholders the implications of policies and policy changes in the lives of clients affected by substances and substance use disorders	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	85.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C5: Engage in policy practice C5ABSUO: Critical thinking assessment in engaging in policy practice for substance use clients	607 Policy Paper	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	81.3	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6CB11: Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6CB12: Use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6CBO: Critical thinking assessment of engaging with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	615 Clinical Staffing Presentation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6ABC11: Attend to the interpersonal dynamics and contextual factors that both strengthen and potentially threaten the therapeutic alliance	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6ABC12: Establish a relationally based process that encourages clients to be equal participants in the establishment of treatment goals and expected outcomes	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6ABCO: Exercise of Judgement assessment in engaging with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities with clinical clients	603 Group Activity	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	83.3	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6ABSU11: Engage diverse groups (gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, age) in prevention practice	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	85.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.

C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6ABSU12: Attend to the interpersonal dynamics and contextual factors that both strengthen and potentially threaten the therapeutic alliance with clients affected by substances and substance use disorders	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	85.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6ABSUO: Affective reactions assessment in engaging with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities with substance use clients	610 Process Recording	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7CB13: Collect and organize data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7CB14: Select appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies.	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7CBO: Exercise of judgement assessment in assessing individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	620 Culminating Project	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7ABC13: Select and modify appropriate intervention strategies based on continuous clinical assessment	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	81.3	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7ABC14: Use differential diagnosis	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7ABCO: Critical thinking assessment in assessing individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities with clinical clients	600 Psychopathology Case Staffing	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7ABSU13: Adapt, modify, and use assessment tools and approaches including situations in which specific abilities and functions may be affected by substance use, misuse, abuse, and dependence – such as short and long term cognitive, affective, and physiological effects	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	92.9	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7ABSU14: Evaluate, select, and implement appropriate assessment instruments for use with target populations	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	92.9	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7ABSUO: Skills assessment in assessing individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities in working with substance use clients	606 Risk Assessment	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8CB15: Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.

C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8CB16: Negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8CBO: Affective reactions assessment of intervening with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	610 Process Recording	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8ABC15: Critically evaluate, select, and apply best practices and evidence based interventions	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8ABC16: Collaborate with other professionals to coordinate treatment interventions	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8ABCO: Values assessment in intervening with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities with clinical clients	615 Clinical Staffing Presentation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8ABSU15: Implement effective substance use disorder prevention strategies with fidelity	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	85.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8ABSU16: Identify, evaluate, and select effective substance use disorders prevention strategies	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	85.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8ABSUO: Exercise of judgement assessment in intervening with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities with substance use clients	615 Clinical Staffing Presentation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	92.9	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C9CB17: Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.5	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C9CB18: Critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate intervention and program processes and outcome	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C9CBO: Skills assessment in evaluating practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	620 Culminating Project	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.3	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8ABC17: Contribute to the theoretical knowledge base of the social work profession through practice-based research	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	81.3	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C9ABC18: Use clinical evaluation of the process and/or outcomes to develop best practice interventions for a range of biopsychosocial spiritual conditions	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.8	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C9ABCO: Critical thinking assessment in evaluating clinical practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	620 Culminating Project	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	100	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.

C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C9ABSU17: Identify and use evaluation tools for substance use disorders and prevention	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	85.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C9ABSU18: Work collaboratively with evaluators/researchers to assess intervention efficacy and effectiveness	615 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	92.9	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.
C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C9ABSU0: Values assessment in evaluating practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities with substance use clients	600 Psychopathology Case Staffing	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	64.7	Relevant Course instructor and MSW Director; Email in May discussion in August.

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).
- e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

Specific items within 2016-17 Assessment

The measures are not comparable to the department's 2015-2016 report due the changes in versions of EPAS and measures to assess each competency; however, there are some observations worth noting.

1. In the 2015-16 year, there were 3 of 13 Competency measures in the Mental Health and Addictions concentration that were not met; primary reason is problems in the substance use (not all) measures. In the 2016-17 year, all Competency measures in both concentrations were met.
2. In the 2015-16 year, 6 of the 13 Competency measures had a benchmark score of 70 or higher. In the 2016-17 year, all of the Competency benchmarks were established with a minimum score of 80 and were achieved in both concentrations.

Overall Observations

1. There were no missed measures this year, which is notable improvement from past years. Faculty have made significant process in this regard and are recognized for this effort. Measures are now integrated into courses assignment directions and grading rubrics so that it is much more clear where assessment is occurring in the MSW Program.

2. Students scored below the benchmark on 10 of 81 measures. The faculty will continue to monitor this and work toward improvement, however, this is significant improvement from previous years and faculty are recognized for this effort.

3. Analysis of the 10 items where the students scored below the benchmark are as follows:

- 2 items are in Core Behaviors and in course assignments (not field evaluations)
 - C3CBO – 607 Policy Paper (Monitor, no change)
 - C4CBO – 611 Research Paper (Monitor, no change)
- 2 items are in Advanced Clinical Behaviors and in course assignments (not field evaluations)
 - C4ABCO – 606 Evidence Based Practice Paper (Action proposed)
 - C5ABCO – 607 Policy Paper (Monitor, no change)
- 6 items are in the Substance Use Behaviors. 2 items are in course assignments and 4 items are in field evaluations
 - C4ABSUO – 550 Addictions Case Study (Action proposed)
 - C9ABSUO – 600 Case Staffing (Action proposed)

 - C1ABSU2 – 615 Field Evaluations (discuss in next field instructor's meeting)
 - C2ABSU3 – 615 Field Evaluations (discuss in next field instructor's meeting)
 - C3ABSU5 – 615 Field Evaluations (discuss in next field instructor's meeting)
 - C4ABSU8 – 615 Field Evaluations (discuss in next field instructor's meeting)
- Of the 10 items with measures below the benchmark, all will be monitored and 7 have actions plans.

4. Implicit Evaluation

The program collected 2 implicit evaluations in the 2016-17 year including an exit survey from graduating students and feedback from field instructors on student performance and their relationship to the Program.

Note: Assessment measures for licensure exams cannot be reported because students don't take the licensure exam until post graduation and we don't have data for all students from previous years.

The faculty proposes no changes in assessment measures for the 2017-18 academic year.

Detailed Observations

COMPETENCY 1

C1ABSU2 – 615 Field Evaluations

Met the mean benchmark; but 78.6% met the percentage of students benchmark when the goal was 80% (3 students scored below the benchmark).

Discussion: Since this measure comes from multiple field instructors and task supervisors, it is difficult to interpret. However, 2 of the 3 students who fell below the benchmark did so in multiple measures.

Action: Discuss with Field Instructors at the next Field Instructor meeting, monitor, and compare with future years.

COMPETENCY 2

C2ABSU3 – 615 Field Evaluations

Met the mean benchmark; but 78.6% met the percentage of students benchmark when the goal was 80% (3 students scored below the benchmark).

Discussion: Since this measure comes from multiple field instructors and task supervisors, it is difficult to interpret. However, 2 of the 3 students who fell below the benchmark did so in multiple measures.

Action: Discuss with Field Instructors at the next Field Instructor meeting, monitor, and compare with future years.

COMPETENCY 3

C3CBO – 607 Policy Paper

Met the mean benchmark; but 71% met the percentage of students benchmark when the goal was 80% (5 students scored below the benchmark).

Discussion: The instructor reports that there were at least three students whose underperformance was perhaps due to a lack of acceptance of the conclusion based on where the assignment was leading them. The questions related to social policy analysis and, therefore, politics to which they may not have wanted to respond. The performance of one of the students is likely an anomaly; the student, by all matters of assessment, should have scored well in the measure but did not demonstrate ability in the assignment.

Action: Monitor and compare with future scores.

C3ABSU5 – 615 Field Evaluations

Met the mean benchmark; but 78.6% met the percentage of students benchmark when the goal was 80% (3 students scored below the benchmark).

Discussion: Since this measure comes from multiple field instructors and task supervisors, it is difficult to interpret. However, 2 of the 3 students who fell below the benchmark did so in multiple measures.

Action: Discuss with Field Instructors at the next Field Instructor meeting, monitor, and compare with future years.

COMPETENCY 4

C4CBO – 611 Research Paper

Met the mean benchmark; but 78.6% met the percentage of students benchmark when the goal was 80% (3 students scored below the benchmark).

Discussion: Faculty indicated that the measure accurately captured students whose skill in critical thinking in research was lower. They were not drastically low, but slightly below the goal of 80%.

Action: Monitor and compare with future scores.

C4ABCO – 606 Evidence Based Practice Paper

Met the mean benchmark; but 61% met the percentage of students benchmark when the goal was 80% (7 students scored below the benchmark).

Discussion: The criteria for peer-reviewed, or even articles of any kind, was missed very badly--even from students who really should have known better (who historically are sharp in this area). A presentation and paper are not evidence based unless there is some form of evidence. Too many students relied on Corey (a text) for their back-up. This was a real rookie mistake. The grading structure did not capture the problem. The problem also goes back to the general attitude of this student group that is affecting their demonstration of learning and follow-through.

Action: The corrective strategy is simple; place “only scholarly works allowed” in the evidence-based rubric and instruction. The students, at the stage, are capable of reliance solely upon evidence-based works to support their papers. This would mean that all works that peer-reviewed would be rejected as a legitimate reference (and citation).

C4ABSU8 – 615 Field Evaluations

Met the mean benchmark; but 78.6% met the percentage of students benchmark when the goal was 80% (3 students scored below the benchmark).

Discussion: Since this measure comes from multiple field instructors and task supervisors, it is difficult to interpret. However, 2 of the 3 students who fell below the benchmark did so in multiple measures.

Action: Discuss with Field Instructors at the next Field Instructor meeting, monitor, and compare with future years.

C4ABSUO – 550 Addictions Case Study

Met the mean benchmark; but 68.8% met the percentage of students benchmark when the goal was 80% (5 students scored below the benchmark).

Discussion: Instructor evaluation of the performance of the students below the measure is as follows: (1) 2 of the students were first year part time students who have potential to perform well in the class. Interpretation is that they took the course too early in their MSW Program (before completing the 500 level curriculum). The Program, by design, schedules electives (SOWK550 is an elective) in the clinical year. Of the 3 part time students, 2 underperformed in this course. (2) 2 of the students are likely performing at level, meaning that the scores for these students are correct. (3) 1 of the students is an anomaly. The student, by all matters of assessment, should have scored well in the measure but did not demonstrate ability in the assignment. Given that 4 of the 5 student issues are accounted for in the explanation, it is likely that the course will be monitored without change to the course content at this time.

Action: (1) Consider not allowing part time students to take elective courses early, though this decision would be made only after monitoring the course to see if the issue recurs. (2) No change. (3) A curriculum change will be occurring beginning 2017-18 whereby the electives will occur in fall semester instead of spring semester (but will remain in the clinical year). Faculty perceive this change to give students in the mental health and addictions concentration the substance use content early, allowing a longer duration to practice it before graduation.

COMPETENCY 5

Advanced Clinical (C5ABC) – Met the mean benchmark; but 79.9% met the percentage of students benchmark when the goal was 80%

C5ABCO – 607 Policy Paper

The mean score was 77.5 when the goal was 80 (6 students scored below the benchmark).

64.7% of the students met the percentage of students benchmark when goal was 80% (6 students scored below the benchmark).

Discussion: The instructor reported that there were at least three students in the cohort who underperformed in the assignment. Several students did not engage in the level of literature review necessary to support the implementation section of the project. Three students severely underperformed (scores of between 0-50) in the assignment; perhaps these students understood the measure, but did not demonstrate their ability in the assignment (ie missing content vs misunderstood content).

Action: Monitor and compare with future scores.

COMPETENCY 6, 7,8

No measures below the benchmark

COMPETENCY 9

C9ABSUO – 600 Case Staffing

Met the mean benchmark; but 64.7% met the percentage of students benchmark when the goal was 80% (6 students scored below the benchmark).

Discussion: Students didn't clearly address a substance abuse case and/or didn't address the values in serving substance abuse clients. (Some completed the assignment well, but didn't include the substance abuse piece in the selected case).

Action: The directions for the assignment will be modified to more clearly indicate the substance abuse component in the case study for Mental Health and Addictions Concentration students

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: Social Work MSW Date: 01.08.18

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have

				<p>sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that</p>

				<p>this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
<p>3. Results</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p>

				<input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
<p>4. Engagement & Improvement</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the

				program website. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

The program assessed at least nine clear, important, measurable outcomes using multiple measures that include the final field evaluation, clinical staffing presentation, and culminating project. Standards are appropriately high; however, as was the case with the BSW, they appear to be based on grades (score of 80%). Please clarify that rubrics are used to calibrate performance criteria to scores as evidence that you are assessing performance, not just grading it. Results seem to indicate that students met the *overall* benchmark for all nine outcomes (again, without the Ns, it is difficult to tell); however, Part Two indicates that they did not meet standards for ten of the eighty-one measures used to assess these outcomes. It should be noted that this is an improvement over student performance in prior years, and that while Part Two offers only general observations about plans for improvement, additional reflection, analysis, and plans for action are described in the attached “Detailed Observations” document. Thank you!