

## **The Mission, Goals, and Objectives of the Social Work Major/Program**

The mission of the Anderson University Social Work Program is to prepare competent, compassionate, and effective entry-level social workers who

- Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and values needed for professional generalist practice
- Are committed to do good, seek justice, rebuke and rectify the hearts of oppressors, defend orphans and widows, and help those in need (based on Isaiah 1:17)
- Will be servant leaders in their world to empower disenfranchised and diverse populations (rev. 2016)

The program's four goals and accompanying objectives are assessed and reviewed after a discussion of methodology. It should be noted that Goal 1 contains 9 "objectives" or "competencies" required for accreditation by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). The other three goals are unique to the Anderson University Social Work Program.

## **Assessment Methodology**

The last major assessment report for the AU SWP was submitted in 2013. After that report, a change in program leadership and an impending reaccreditation review through CSWE resulted in revision to program goals and objectives and tools for methodology. One significant required change from CSWE was movement from knowledge-based objectives to competencies. AU SWP faculty submitted the self-study for reaffirmation, including a new assessment plan, in August 2016. The Council on Accreditation (COA) issued a request for clarifying information on the assessment plan. That clarifying report was submitted December 1, 2017.

The AU SWP assessment process continues to evolve, particularly as the move was made to adopt the 2015 CSWE Educational Policies and Standards (EPAS). During the 2008 self-study, which was written to the 2000 EPAS, the Program moved toward using the ACAT (national standardized testing tool), the Practicum Evaluation, and the Baccalaureate Social Work Education Assessment Package (BEAP) as the primary assessment tools. We believed the ACAT would be a valuable tool for tracking our own students' outcomes as compared to other social work students throughout the country. We had been tracking the BEAP data (since 2000), course evaluations, and Practicum Evaluations, as well as holding focus group sessions with graduating seniors and discussions with each Practicum field instructor at the end of the Practicum semester.

As these instruments were used and data were collected, several concerns arose regarding use of these tools. The Practicum Evaluation tool served as a helpful indicator of knowledge, values, and skills acquired by students but did not have a strong competency focus, particularly because it was guided by the knowledge-based 2000 EPAS. In addition, the information gained from the ACAT was clouded at best and only focused on the dimension of knowledge. Although cohorts generally scored a bit above average (2016 scores ranged from 57<sup>th</sup> to 78<sup>th</sup> percentile), individual students who struggle in test-taking could easily bring scores down in small cohorts. For example, one student in the 2016 cohort who was diagnosed with dyslexia scored in the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile. One area that typically was negatively impacted by this unidimensional approach was engagement in policy practice. The AU SW Program uses a practice-based approach to the Social Welfare Policy course, focusing heavily on development of policy analysis and advocacy skills. From students' description, the ACAT questions focus heavily on knowledge of specific federal policy. These concerns, along with the overall move by CSWE to develop multidimensional measurements, led Program faculty to discontinue use of the ACAT.

Another ongoing concern regarding the assessment process was the low return of the BEAP surveys from alumni and their employers. The Program had enclosed coupons for a free conference registration, provided a Program update, sent pictures from the target class' graduation and e-mailed personalized requests. Such efforts did not increase the response rate. As a result, Program faculty elected to not use the BEAP survey in the current assessment plan.

This plan assesses generalist practice by using real practice situations to evaluate all competencies. Although CSWE uses the language of "competency," for this report we will use the term "objective" instead. The assessment plan was developed and implemented by three social work program faculty members in 2015-16. Due to the resignation of one faculty member, 2016-17 data was reviewed by the remaining two faculty members. Although all faculty members have some responsibility in data collection and analysis, the social work program director oversees the assessment process.

### Measurement Tools:

CSWE requires 2 measurements of each objective, one of which must measure real or simulated practice behavior. The *practicum evaluation* (**Appendix A- Practicum Evaluation**) serves as one of the two primary measurements of objectives and fulfills the requirement to measure real practice behavior. Agency field instructors, therefore, have a role in assessing competence. Practicum evaluations are provided to field instructors at the beginning of the practicum semester and reviewed in field instructor's training. Field instructors are trained in the concept of multiple dimensions of competency (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive/affective processes). Along with the practicum evaluation, field instructors are provided with a table highlighting what specific dimensions are to be measured for each specific objective. Field instructor training also includes an interactive session in which participants provide examples of the multiple dimensions for specific objectives and practice behaviors (e.g. asked "What might indicate to you that a student has knowledge of and utilizes skills for using technology ethically and appropriately?").

The learning contract assignment aligns with the practicum evaluation. With guidance from field instructors and faculty field liaisons, students develop their learning contract early in the semester and revise it as the semester proceeds. Learning contract assignments offer tangible means for field instructors to evaluate multiple dimensions of a specific objective. Field instructors review the learning contract with the student and faculty field liaison at each of the three joint meetings that take place during the course of the semester. Field instructors are also encouraged to provide an informal midterm evaluation based on the practicum evaluation. At the end of practicum semester, the field instructor scores each practice behavior in the practicum evaluation, provides written comments, and discusses it with the student and faculty field liaison. The practicum evaluation provides quantitative data through Likert-type scaling of objectives (seen below). Written comments are then used to triangulate quantitative data.

**Practicum Performance Rating Scale:** Apply a rating number to each item to indicate as closely as possible the assessment made.

- N/A Student had no experience; no opportunity provided. Not applicable.**
- 5 Extraordinary, unusual, and superior performance.**
- 4 Very good, consistent, competent performance; minimum limitations but can benefit from continued improvement.**
- 3 Good, solid, competent performance, with some unevenness and some limitations seen; need for continued working for improvement.**
- 2 Poor, performance is below expectations, needs focused work for improvement.**
- 1 Unsatisfactory, performance unacceptable, definite problems evident; specific changes needed**

According to CSWE, the second measure of objectives does not need to cover all four dimensions. Therefore, faculty use a variety of assessment tools, most of which are embedded in activities related to the Senior Social Work Conference and are largely knowledge-based. Each year during the practicum semester, seniors plan and execute a professional conference that takes place at the end of the semester. As a group, students decide on a relevant conference topic, determine keynote and breakout sessions, develop objectives for the conference and individual sessions, plan and deliver oral presentations, evaluate the conference, as well as cover logistics of

conference planning (e.g. advertisement, brochures, etc.). The conference provides a real mezzo level multidimensional practice situation in which students demonstrate generalist social work competencies.

All but two of the AU SW Program objectives (4a and 4b) were able to be assessed utilizing the social work conference. One competency (1i) is related to the conference and was assessed before the conference, during one of the on-campus seminar days, as students were required to individually provide written suggestions for development of a conference evaluation tool (**Appendix B- Competency 1i Prompt and Scale**). These written responses were then evaluated by two Program faculty members. Six objectives (1a, 1b, 1d, and 2a-2c) were assessed by Program faculty members during the student oral presentations at the conference (**Appendix C- Rubrics**). Seven objectives (1c, 1e, 1f-h, 3a, and 3b) were measured after the conference as students were required to individually provide written responses to questions requiring analysis of the conference planning and implementation (**Appendix D- Measure 2 Questions and Scale**). Two Program faculty members reviewed and scored these items.

Lastly, program objectives 4a and 4b relate to demonstration of servant leadership in both students and alumni of the program. To measure objective 4a regarding students, information from the following practicum application question was utilized as the second measure:

*List any organization memberships, committee activities and/or leadership experiences you have had during university years. (Examples. church, community, campus life, committees, boards, etc.)*

To measure objective 4b in alumni, a simple survey regarding servant leadership activities was given to alumni, through a Facebook group, one year and two years after they had graduated. The survey consisted of the following question:

*In how many service activities (e.g. volunteer work, church leadership, board membership, etc.) are you currently engaged?*

The scale below was used to score responses for both 4a and 4b:

Superior= 5	Very Good= 4	Good/ Solid= 3	Poor= 2	Unsatisfactory= 1
≥ 4 activities	3 activities	2 activities	1 activity	0 activities

Benchmarks were set at a performance level of 3 or above on a 5 point Likert-type scale. Using Practicum Evaluation terminology cited above, a score of 3 is considered to be “solid, competent performance.” Program faculty believe the competency expectation for entry level generalist BSW practitioners should be strong enough to consistently perform as a professional. At the same, however, it is also not expected students have the necessary experience to perform at the level of 4 or 5. The percentage of students expected to achieve a score of 3 or above is set at 80. This percentage mark challenges the Program to consistently meet goals, yet also recognizes variables such as individual student challenges and cohort composition can influence outcomes.

The tables below detail the assessment plan and outcomes for the years 2016 and 2017. For CSWE purposes, the real or simulated measure (Measurement 1) must assess each individual practice behavior that makes up the objective. Therefore, the first measure provides raw data and benchmark results for each sub-objective or “demonstrating behavior,” along with the primary objective. The second measure includes raw data and benchmark results only for the primary objective as is sufficient for CSWE purposes. The benchmark percentages and group mean scores of Measure 1 and Measure 2 were averaged together to create a final score for each competency/objective. These final results are displayed in the Comparison Table of 2016 and 2017 Data (p.19).

**2016 Data:**

**Goal 1: Upon completion of the Anderson University Social Work Program, students will demonstrate core social work competencies needed for practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities in order to secure employment in entry-level generalist social work practice.**

Specific Curriculum Objectives for this goal:

AU Objective	Demonstrating Behaviors	Outcome Measurement 1 Raw Data (2015-2016)	Outcome Measurement 2 Raw Data (2015-2016)
a. Students will demonstrate ethical and professional behavior	<i>Makes ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.41</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Oral Presentation: See Rubric <i>Demonstration of Ethical and Professional Behavior</i> (Appendix C).
	<i>Uses reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.44</b>	
	<i>Demonstrates professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.39</b>	
	<i>Uses technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.33</b>	
	<i>Uses supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.56</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b>  <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.43</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 96%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.02</b>

b. Students will engage diversity and difference in practice.	<i>Applies and communicates understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.44</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Oral Presentation: See Rubric <i>Engages Diversity and Difference in Practice</i> (Appendix C).
	<i>Presents themselves as learners and engages clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.50</b>	
	<i>Applies self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.56</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.50</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 96%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.00</b>
c. Students will advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.	<i>Applies their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.25</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis:  Response to question “During conference planning and implementation, what decisions were made that attempted to advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice? (Scale in Appendix D)
	<i>Engages in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.13</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.19</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.24</b>
d. Students will engage in practice-informed research and research-	<i>Uses practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.8</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Oral Presentation: See Rubric <i>Demonstration of Knowledge and Skills Needed to Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice</i> (Appendix C).

informed practice.	<i>Applies critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative and qualitative research methods and research findings.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.12</b>	
	<i>Uses and translates research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.06</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.02</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 88%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.20</b>
e. Students will engage in policy practice.	<i>Identifies social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.12</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis:  Response to question “During conference planning and implementation, what decisions were made that attempted to engage in policy practice?” (Scale in Appendix D)
	<i>Assesses how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.24</b>	
	<i>Applies critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.12</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.16</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.76</b>
f. Students will engage with individuals, families, groups,	<i>Applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis:  Response to question “During conference planning and implementation, what decisions were made that attempted to engage with

organizations, and communities.		<b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.59</b>	individuals, families, groups, organizations, or communities?" (Scale in Appendix D)
	<i>Uses empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.59</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.59</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.18</b>
g. Students will assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	<i>Collects and organizes data, and applies critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.50</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis:  Response to question "During conference planning and implementation, what decisions were made that attempted to assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, or communities?" (Scale in Appendix D)
	<i>Applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.33</b>	
	<i>Develops mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.33</b>	
	<i>Selects appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.28</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.36</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.18</b>
h. Students will intervene with	<i>Critically chooses and implements interventions to achieve practice goals and</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance	Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis

individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	<i>enhance capacities of clients and constituencies.</i>	-Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.30</b>	Response to question “During conference planning and implementation, what decisions were made that attempted to intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, or communities?” (Scale in Appendix D)
	<i>Applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.44</b>	
	<i>Uses inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to achieve beneficial practice outcomes.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.18</b>	
	<i>Negotiates, mediates, and advocates with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.31</b>	
	<i>Facilitates effective transitions and endings that advance mutually agreed-on goals.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.19</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b>  <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.28</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 73%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 2.70</b>
i. Students will evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	<i>Selects and uses appropriate methods for evaluation of outcomes.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.35</b>	Written Exercise before Senior Social Work Conference:  Response to prompt, “Provide several questions for the conference evaluation that are clear, well-designed, and relevant.” (Scale in Appendix B)
	<i>Applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance	



	<i>multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes.</i>	-Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.44</b>	
	<i>Critically analyzes, monitors, and evaluates intervention and program processes and outcomes.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.35</b>	
	<i>Applies evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.41</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b>  <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.39</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 87.5%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.24</b>

**Goal 2: Upon completion of the Anderson University Social Work Program, students will demonstrate knowledge and skills needed to gain admission to graduate studies in social work or a related field.**

Specific Curriculum Objectives for this goal:

<b>AU Objective</b>	<b>Outcome Measurement 1 Raw Data (2015-2016)</b>	<b>Outcome Measurement 2 Raw Data (2015-2016)</b>
a. Uses theoretical frameworks supported by empirical evidence to demonstrate knowledge of individual development and behavior across the life span and the interactions among individuals and between individuals and families, groups, organizations, and communities.	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.39</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Oral Presentation: See Rubric <i>Demonstration of Knowledge and Skills Needed to Gain Admission to Graduate School</i> (Appendix C).
b. Demonstrates research and statistical skills that are pertinent to evaluating social work practice.	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.18</b>	

c. Demonstrates writing skills necessary for graduate level coursework.	<p>Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance</p> <p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.33</b></p>	
	<p><b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b></p> <p><b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.30</b></p>	<p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 88%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.40</b></p>

**Goal 3: Upon completion of the Anderson University Social Work Program, students will demonstrate the ability to uphold the values and ethics of the social work profession in the context of their personal faith.**

<b>AU Objective</b>	<b>Outcome Measurement 1 Raw Data (2015-2016)</b>	<b>Outcome Measurement 2 Raw Data (2015-2016)</b>
a. Adheres to the National Association of Social Worker’s and International Federation of Social Workers Codes of Ethics and provides values sensitive services to consumers.	<p>Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance</p> <p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.78</b></p>	<p>Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis</p> <p>Response to question “During conference planning and implementation, what decisions were made that attempted to uphold values and ethics of the social work profession in the context of your faith?” (Scale in Appendix D)</p>
b. Integrates the spiritual and religious aspects of life in a professionally responsible manner	<p>Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance</p> <p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.89</b></p>	
	<p><b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b></p> <p><b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.83</b></p>	<p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.94</b></p>

**Goal 4: Anderson University Social Work Program students and alumni will demonstrate a commitment to provide servant leadership in their personal and professional lives.**

<b>AU Objective</b>	<b>Outcome Measurement 1 Raw Data (2015-2016)</b>	<b>Outcome Measurement 2 Raw Data (2015-2016)</b>
a. Students will engage in servant leadership opportunities while at Anderson University.	<p>Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance</p> <p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.56</b></p>	<p>Practicum Application (same scale used as below in Measure 1 Obj. 4b):</p> <p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 17)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 82%</b></p>

b. Anderson University Social Work Program alumni will be engaged in servant leadership experiences.	One year post-grad survey using the following question: “In how many service activities (e.g. volunteer work, church leadership, board membership, etc.) are you currently engaged?” Scale:	Two year post-grad survey (same as measure 1):				
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Superior=5 ≥ 4 activities</td> <td>Very Good=4 3 activities</td> <td>Good/Solid=3 2 activities</td> <td>Poor=2 1 activity</td> <td>Unsatisfactory=1 0 activities</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 12)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 58%</b></p>	Superior=5 ≥ 4 activities	Very Good=4 3 activities	Good/Solid=3 2 activities	Poor=2 1 activity	Unsatisfactory=1 0 activities
Superior=5 ≥ 4 activities	Very Good=4 3 activities	Good/Solid=3 2 activities	Poor=2 1 activity	Unsatisfactory=1 0 activities		

**2017 Data:**

**Goal 1: Upon completion of the Anderson University Social Work Program, students will demonstrate core social work competencies needed for practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities in order to secure employment in entry-level generalist social work practice.**

Specific Curriculum Objectives for this goal:

AU Objective	Demonstrating Behaviors	Outcome Measurement 1 Raw Data (2015-2016)	Outcome Measurement 2 Raw Data (2015-2016)
a. Students will demonstrate ethical and professional behavior	<i>Makes ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.80</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Oral Presentation: See Rubric <i>Demonstration of Ethical and Professional Behavior</i> (Appendix C).
	<i>Uses reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.00</b>	
	<i>Demonstrates professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.20</b>	
	<i>Uses technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance	

		<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.80</b>	
	<i>Uses supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.80</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b>  <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.92</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.08</b>
b. Students will engage diversity and difference in practice.	<i>Applies and communicates understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.70</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Oral Presentation: See Rubric <i>Engages Diversity and Difference in Practice</i> (Appendix C).
	<i>Presents themselves as learners and engages clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.10</b>	
	<i>Applies self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.00</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b>  <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.93</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 90%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.93</b>
c. Students will advance human rights and social, economic, and	<i>Applies their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance	Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis:  Response to question “During conference planning and implementation, what decisions

environmental justice.		<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.60</b>	were made that attempted to advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice? (Scale in Appendix D)
	<i>Engages in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.50</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.55</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 90%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.80</b>
d. Students will engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice.	<i>Uses practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 9)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.38</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Oral Presentation: See Rubric <i>Demonstration of Knowledge and Skills Needed to Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice</i> (Appendix C).
	<i>Applies critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative and qualitative research methods and research findings.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 9)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.89</b>	
	<i>Uses and translates research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 9)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.67</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.64</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 90%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.15</b>
e. Students will engage in policy practice.	<i>Identifies social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance	Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis:  Response to question “During conference planning and implementation, what decisions were made that attempted to

		<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.90</b>	engage in policy practice?" (Scale in Appendix D)
	<i>Assesses how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.60</b>	
	<i>Applies critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.70</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.73</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 70%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.70</b>
f. Students will engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	<i>Applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.70</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis:  Response to question "During conference planning and implementation, what decisions were made that attempted to engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, or communities?" (Scale in Appendix D)
	<i>Uses empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.10</b>	
		<b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.90</b>	<b>Measurement inadvertently missed on Senior Evaluation Day</b>
g. Students will assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	<i>Collects and organizes data, and applies critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 9)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.00</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis:  Response to question "During conference planning and implementation, what decisions were made that attempted to assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, or

			communities?" (Scale in Appendix D)
	<i>Applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies.</i>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance</p> <p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 9)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.00</b></p>	
	<i>Develops mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies.</i>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance</p> <p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.70</b></p>	
	<i>Selects appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies.</i>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance</p> <p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.80</b></p>	
		<p><b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.88</b></p>	<p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N=10)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 70%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.60</b></p>
h. Students will intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	<i>Critically chooses and implements interventions to achieve practice goals and enhance capacities of clients and constituencies.</i>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance</p> <p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.50</b></p>	<p>Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis</p> <p>Response to question "During conference planning and implementation, what decisions were made that attempted to intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, or communities?" (Scale in Appendix D)</p>
	<i>Applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies.</i>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance</p> <p><b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.90</b></p>	
	<i>Uses inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to</i>	Practicum Evaluation:	

	<i>achieve beneficial practice outcomes.</i>	-Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.60</b>	
	<i>Negotiates, mediates, and advocates with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.80</b>	
	<i>Facilitates effective transitions and endings that advance mutually agreed-on goals.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.90</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b>  <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.74</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 70%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.50</b>
i. Students will evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	<i>Selects and uses appropriate methods for evaluation of outcomes.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.60</b>	Written Exercise before Senior Social Work Conference:  Response to prompt, "Provide several questions for the conference evaluation that are clear, well-designed, and relevant." (Scale in Appendix B)
	<i>Applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.80</b>	
	<i>Critically analyzes, monitors, and evaluates intervention and program processes and outcomes.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b>	



		<b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.60</b>	
	<i>Applies evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.</i>	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.40</b>	
		<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b>  <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.60</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N=10)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.70</b>

**Goal 2: Upon completion of the Anderson University Social Work Program, students will demonstrate knowledge and skills needed to gain admission to graduate studies in social work or a related field.**

Specific Curriculum Objectives for this goal:

<b>AU Objective</b>	<b>Outcome Measurement 1 Raw Data (2015-2016)</b>	<b>Outcome Measurement 2 Raw Data (2015-2016)</b>
a. Uses theoretical frameworks supported by empirical evidence to demonstrate knowledge of individual development and behavior across the life span and the interactions among individuals and between individuals and families, groups, organizations, and communities.	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.90</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Oral Presentation: <i>See Rubric Demonstration of Knowledge and Skills Needed to Gain Admission to Graduate School (Appendix C).</i>
b. Demonstrates research and statistical skills that are pertinent to evaluating social work practice.	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 8)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 3.88</b>	
c. Demonstrates writing skills necessary for graduate level coursework.	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.10</b>	
	<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b>  <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.96</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N=10)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 100%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.13</b>

**Goal 3: Upon completion of the Anderson University Social Work Program, students will demonstrate the ability to uphold the values and ethics of the social work profession in the context of their personal faith.**

AU Objective	Outcome Measurement 1 Raw Data (2015-2016)	Outcome Measurement 2 Raw Data (2015-2016)
a. Adheres to the National Association of Social Worker’s and International Federation of Social Workers Codes of Ethics and provides values sensitive services to consumers.	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.50</b>	Senior Social Work Conference Post-analysis  Response to question “During conference planning and implementation, what decisions were made that attempted to uphold values and ethics of the social work profession in the context of your faith?” (Scale in Appendix D)
b. Integrates the spiritual and religious aspects of life in a professionally responsible manner	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 9)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.33</b>	
	<b>Average Benchmark= 100%</b>  <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 4.42</b>	<b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark Result: 80%</b> <b>Composite Group Mean Score: 3.70</b>

**Goal 4: Anderson University Social Work Program students and alumni will demonstrate a commitment to provide servant leadership in their personal and professional lives.**

AU Objective	Outcome Measurement 1 Raw Data (2015-2016)	Outcome Measurement 2 Raw Data (2015-2016)					
a. Students will engage in servant leadership opportunities while at Anderson University.	Practicum Evaluation: -Individual mean scores of behavior performance -Group mean score of behavior performance  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 100%</b> <b>Group Mean Score: 4.40</b>	Practicum Application (same scale used as below in Measure 1 Obj. 4b):  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 10)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 50%</b>					
b. Anderson University Social Work Program alumni will be engaged in servant leadership experiences.	One year post-grad survey using the following question: “In how many service activities (e.g. volunteer work, church leadership, board membership, etc.) are you currently engaged?” Scale: <table border="1" data-bbox="407 1591 1068 1717"> <tr> <td>Superior=5 ≥ 4 activities</td> <td>Very Good=4 3 activities</td> <td>Good/Solid=3 2 activities</td> <td>Poor=2 1 activity</td> <td>Unsatisfactory=1 0 activities</td> </tr> </table> <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 4)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 0%</b>	Superior=5 ≥ 4 activities	Very Good=4 3 activities	Good/Solid=3 2 activities	Poor=2 1 activity	Unsatisfactory=1 0 activities	Two year post-grad survey (same as measure 1):  <b>Benchmark: 80% at 3 or above (N= 14)</b> <b>Benchmark result: 50%</b>
Superior=5 ≥ 4 activities	Very Good=4 3 activities	Good/Solid=3 2 activities	Poor=2 1 activity	Unsatisfactory=1 0 activities			

Comparison Table of 2016 and 2017 Data

Competency/Objective	Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark		Group Mean Score	
	2016	2017	2016	2017
#1a Demonstrate ethical & professional behavior	97	100	4.23	4.0
#1b Engage diversity & difference in practice	98	95	4.25	3.93
#1c Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	100	95	3.71	3.68
#1d Engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice	94	95	3.61	3.40
#1e Engage in policy practice	100	85	3.96	3.72
#1f Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	100	100*	4.39	3.9*
#1g Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	100	85	4.27	3.74
#1h Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	86.5	85	3.49	3.62
#1i Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	93.75	100	3.82	3.65
#2 Demonstrate knowledge and skills needed to gain admission to graduate studies in social work or a related field	94	100	3.85	4.05
#3 Demonstrate the ability to uphold the values and ethics of the social work profession in the context of their personal faith	100	90	4.39	4.06
#4 Demonstrate a commitment to provide servant leadership in their personal and professional lives	Students:91 Alumni:48	Students:75 Alumni:25	4.56	4.40

\*Measure 2 not collected. Numbers reflect Measure 1 alone.

### **Analysis and Interventions:**

The newly revised Assessment Plan, constructed to align with the 2015 EPAS, was created, implemented, and analyzed by the Program faculty. Results, implications, and interventions related to 2016 data are discussed first. Comparison to 2017 data is then offered along with further intervention plans.

**All 2016 benchmarks were met.** Even though all benchmarks were met, faculty reviewed group mean scores and separate benchmark percentages for Measure 1 and Measure 2 for potentially “weak” areas. Faculty then closely examined the three lowest group mean scores which were: 1) advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice; 2) engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice; and 3) intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

In regard to advancing human rights, Program faculty have observed that some Field Instructors whose primary practice is in micro-level roles seem to have difficulty providing macro level experiences for practicum students. Some Field Instructors will even make comments to the effect, “We just don’t do that here.” Because

the macro aspect of the Program has been strengthened considerably internally, faculty plan to direct improvement efforts toward Field Instructors. At the 2017 Field Instructor Training, Prof. Pay allotted time for discussion on the importance of and methods for constructing more macro level practice opportunities in practicum settings. In addition, Faculty Field Liaisons have been more intentional in addressing this point at each practicum meeting. Finally, faculty have also placed more emphasis on “learning how to see the macro level” with students. Two years ago, a nursing faculty member with an undergraduate social work degree and expertise in public health took over the course BIOL 2040 Personal and Community Health. Anecdotal evidence from students suggest high levels of interest and engagement that it is hoped will result in students more readily recognizing the need for advocacy at the community level. Faculty field liaisons have also been working with students and field instructors during the learning contract process to assure opportunities for advocacy are searched for or created in the practicum.

Program faculty did not find the lower score in research competencies particularly surprising as this seems to be an area in which many students and social work programs struggle. The lowest scored sub-objective in the research competency was connecting practice to research. This area is one in which AU SW students may actually perform stronger at the macro level than the micro level. Students have two policy analysis papers, a mezzo/macro project, and a community profile project in their last three semesters that push students to utilize research skills in order to better understand problems and interventions. Students seem to make less of a connection between the need for Evidence-based Practice (EBP) at the micro level. One reason for this may be the tendency to view the self as already having some informal experience and ability in micro practice. As a result, students may not take as seriously the need to use interventions that have been researched. To further strengthen this competency, faculty looked to the practicum experience. Often students do use reading resource material as a task within the Learning Contract to understand more about the target population and commonly used interventions. Typically these resources are books recommended by Field Instructors that provide a solid foundation of knowledge but may not be current in regard to EBP. Therefore, Faculty added a requirement to the Learning Contract that one of the tasks related to this competency is to read and summarize at least three peer reviewed journal articles focused on intervention with the target population served by the host agency. In addition, faculty added a refresher tutorial during the practicum semester on effectively utilizing electronic databases to locate EBP research articles. This tutorial is provided by Nicholson Library faculty.

Although scores on the Practicum Evaluation were high, the Outcome Measure 2 score for intervening with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities was the lowest of any mean score (2.70) and did not hit the benchmark percentage (73%). The Measure 2 assessment tool was a question students wrote to after completion of the Senior Social Work Conference. The question essentially asked them to consider how they had intervened with various constituencies in the planning and implementation of the conference. Analysis of the written responses highlighted a narrow view among students of what constitutes an “intervention.” Faculty surmised students struggled to label interventions used in preparation and implementation of the Senior Social Work Conference because they tend to associate “intervention” with micro level practice. The instructor for SOWK Social Welfare Policy and SOWK 4730 Social Work Practice with Communities and Organizations worked to use more direct intervention language in class discussion and assignments, as well as require students to identify specific macro level interventions in the case study assignment “Jim’s License to Drive.”

One other competency in which students underperformed on Outcome Measure 2 was evaluating practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities (3.24). Some written responses indicated students were not adequately skilled in forming clear evaluation questions. This weakness is being addressed in SOWK 4730 *Social Work Practice with Communities and Organizations*. This course takes place one semester before the practicum semester. The instructor provides the conference evaluation data from the previous cohort’s conference and has students analyze data and question formation. It is hoped this preparation will better equip them to form clear evaluative questions.

It also should be noted the benchmark for Goal 4b (Anderson University Social Work Program alumni will be engaged in servant leadership experiences) did not come close to meeting the benchmark (48%). Response rates varied widely between the two graduating classes. The cohort that graduated in 2015 showed an 80% response rate while the 2014 graduating class had a response rate of 25%. The difference in response is a bit perplexing. Facebook was used as the means of contacting students. Although the response rate was low for one class, we will continue to use Facebook as it seems to still be the best way to communicate with students post-graduation. This evaluation will continued to be used but monitored in regard to response rates. The graduating class with a higher response rate did show a higher rate of engaging in service activities. It is possible the scale created to measure servant leadership is unrealistic. The desired score of 3 requires the alumnus to be engaging in 2 service activities (e.g. volunteer work, church leadership, board membership, etc.) outside of their primary work. Most AU SWP graduates have service careers. Therefore, anticipating 2 additional volunteer activities outside of primary work may be an unreasonable expectation, particularly just 1 to 2 years after graduation. If alumni who reported even 1 service activity were included, the benchmark would have been met. Faculty decided to keep the scale as is and monitor results in the next year.

**As for the 2017 data, all benchmarks were met with the exception of #4: demonstration of commitment to provide servant leadership.** In regard to #4a, the benchmark percentage was met for Measure 1 but the Measure 2 percentage was only 50%. It is unclear if students understood the range of activities that might be included as leadership activities. In addition, the scale used requires two such activities to score a 3. Faculty question whether report of one such activity may be sufficient to score a 3. Because of changes requested by CSWE, this objective will be evaluated in the future with a written assignment.

In regard to #4b, alumni response rates proved to be very similar to 2016. The majority of respondents did report at least one service activity outside of their primary work. Between the two graduating classes, however, only 25% reported two or more such activities. Upon further consideration, faculty have decided to adjust the scale so that one volunteer activity outside of an alumnus' social service work satisfactorily demonstrates a commitment to provide servant leadership. This change seems justified in light of new graduates attempting to establish new work lives, as well as make major life transitions such as marriage or relocation. In these circumstances, engaging in one service activity outside of a social work job would seem to indicate demonstration of a "life of faith and service to church and society."

In regard to the other competencies/objectives, when compared to 2016 data, four increased in benchmark percentage (1a, 1d, 1i, and 2), six decreased (1b, 1c, 1e, 1g, 1h, and 3), and one stayed the same (1f). In addition, ten of the twelve group mean scores decreased. These decreases can be attributed to two primary factors. One factor was more realistic scoring on the practicum evaluation by field instructors. Program faculty had observed an inflation in practicum evaluation scoring with some field instructors giving the highest possible scores on most practice behaviors. In the field instructors' training, social work faculty stressed the need for field instructors to provide scores that meaningfully showed the student's areas of strength and challenge. Both field instructors and students were advised that a score of 3 suggests a basic level of competency and scores of 4 or 5 should only be used when the field instructor believes student performance to be unusually strong. The field instructors appeared to take these instructions seriously and we did see a greater variety of scoring which decreased group mean scores. Therefore, we do not see the decrease in scores as an indicator of lower performance but as an indicator of more accurate competency measurement. The second significant factor in percentage differences between 2016 and 2017 was the difference in class size. The 2016 class was comprised of 17 students while the 2017 class was comprised of just 10 students. The consistent underperformance on Measure 2 of 1-2 students in the 2017 cohort significantly altered benchmark percentages. Interventions described earlier will continue to be used with future cohort data analyzed for effectiveness of interventions.

Several Program strengths were noted when examining the data. First, both cohorts performed very well in the competency of engagement with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Program faculty

believe this may be due to the high number of internships and, therefore, client contact hours that students get in this Program. Social work students at AU already have 76 hours of internship experience before entering practicum. Students and graduates consistently provide positive feedback regarding this aspect of the curriculum. They also displayed high scores in demonstrating ethical and professional behavior. This outcome fits with the consistent feedback we have received from Field Instructors who state AU students generally display a higher level of professionalism in field education than do students from other area programs. The highest scores were in Goal 3: demonstrating the ability to uphold the values and ethics of the social work profession within the context of personal faith. AU social work students are given significant opportunities to wrestle with any internal conflict they may have related to integration of faith and profession. They are also given opportunity to reflect on the commonalities. These opportunities which come in the form of class discussion and self-reflection papers assist students in moving toward non-dualistic thinking and being able to empathize with others despite ideological or value differences.

#### Future Assessment

Since the 2016 and 2017 data was collected, the accreditation review process revealed the Commission on Accreditation (COA) questioned some of the assessment tools being utilized for Measure 2. As a result, some tools have been changed or revised which will be reflected in the 2017-18 assessment process. The COA decided at their most recent meeting that the AU SWP's accreditation is reaffirmed for eight years based on revisions to the assessment plan.

Submitted 2-15-18 by the Anderson University Social Work Faculty

Dr. Lolly Bargerstock  
Prof. Lisa Pay