Mission / Purpose
The University of Alabama School of Social Work seeks to solve biopsychosocial problems, improve individual and social conditions, and promote justice and human dignity through teaching, research, and service. Teaching: The School awards the Bachelor of Social Work degree, which prepares graduates for generalist social work practice; the Master of Social Work degree, which prepares graduates for advanced social work practice; and the Doctor of Philosophy degree, which prepares graduates for careers in research. The School works to increase the number of competent social workers in the state and in the region. Research: The School develops research-based knowledge of social problems and their solutions. Service: The School provides resources and leadership by partnering with individuals, families, groups, community agencies, and organizations at all levels. In addition, the School improves the delivery of social services, with an emphasis on public social services contexts and underserved and disenfranchised populations. As a diverse community of teachers, researchers, learners, and support persons with shared values and aspirations, the School promotes lifelong learning, research, and service initiatives to individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge: Apply knowledge of HBSE
Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 1: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Connected Document
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

M 2: Case Studies
Students develop two written case studies that require students' application of knowledge of human development and identification of risks and supports to healthy/normal development.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on each case study in accordance with rubrics.

SLO 2: Skills/Abilities in research
Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 3: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4)
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Connected Document
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

M 4: Research Proposal
Students develop a well-documented (via reference citation), well-organized research proposal written research proposal that details plans for the evaluation of a hypothetical social program relevant to social work practice.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% of the students will earn a score of at least 80% in accordance with a rubric

SLO 3: An Improvement Outcome: Advanced practice outcomes
Students' abilities to conduct social work practice at an advanced-level of competency will increase. (An Improvement Outcome derived from the 2010-11 Assessment Findings)

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

SLO 4: Identify as a professional
Identify as a social worker and conduct self accordingly.

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 5: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Average rating of field education instructors for this competency will be at least 2 (meets requirements) on a scale from 0-4.

M 6: Role-plays
Students conduct interviews in role play situations in which the goal will be to complete a psychosocial assessment (gaining appropriate written permission), including a social history, an assessment, a genogram, and an intervention and evaluation plan.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their interviews according to rubric elements regarding identifying as social worker and conducting themselves accordingly.

M 7: Reflection Papers
Students will write brief reflection papers on their readings. Readings will cover a variety of possible client encounters, some that challenge students' values and ethics. They are instructed to explain in their papers how they will conduct themselves as social work professionals.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their papers according to rubric elements regarding identifying as social worker and conducting themselves accordingly.

SLO 5: Apply social work ethical principles
Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 8: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

M 9: Casework demonstration role plays
The role-plays give students an opportunity to work together at the task of decision-making about group treatment and mutual support needs of particular client populations. Issues of diversity and ethical practice will be demonstrated.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their role plays according to the relevant rubric elements.

M 10: Journal entries
Students will reflect on the NASW Code of Ethics and other relevant ethics for group work, such as those developed by ASGW, regarding how those ethical standards relate to their group work both in class and in the “real world” practice.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their journal entries according to the relevant rubric elements.

**SLO 6: Use critical thinking to make professional judgments**
Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.

**Connected Documents**
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Related Measures**

**M 11: Field Education Instructor's ratings**
Measure 6.1 MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 for this outcome.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Target:**
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

**M 12: Case Analyses**
Students will analyze selected de-identified cases taken from social work practice. The cases are complex and involve several family members. Students will be asked to take on the role of a social worker as they review the cases, and share their professional judgment and critical analysis of the social workers' findings, interventions, and evaluation plans.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their case analyses according to the relevant rubric elements.

**SLO 7: Engage diversity in social work practice**
Engage diversity and difference in practice.

**Connected Documents**
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Related Measures**

**M 13: Field Education Instructor's ratings**
MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Document**
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Target:**
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

**M 14: Case Study**
Students will read the story of a woman whose rights have been violated. In light of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and what they learn from the narrative, students will develop a case study that addresses how her rights were respected and/or violated at different points along her journey. The woman in the story is from a cultural background different from that of our students.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their case studies according to the relevant rubric elements.

**SLO 8: Advance human rights and justice in practice**
Advance human rights and social and economic justice.

**Connected Documents**
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Related Measures**

**M 15: Field Education Instructor's ratings**
MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Target:**
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

**M 16: Policy Advocacy Background Document**
Students will review case materials regarding individuals whose human rights have been violated and who have suffered social and economic injustices. They will prepare an advocacy plan for the individuals, beginning with a
policy advocacy background document.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their policy advocacy background documents according to the relevant rubric elements.

SLO 9: Engage in policy practice
Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver reflective social work services.

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 17: Field Education Instructor’s ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Documents
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
Although the benchmark in policy practice was met in 2012-2013, our field instructors’ ratings of student performance in this area was lower than in other areas. The MSW Program Committee reviewed field instructor ratings and comments, the interns’ comments about policy practice, and the course-embedded assessment results and discussed strategies for improving student ratings in this area.

Results of the field education assessment (completed in the spring) will be reported in the next cycle, as will conclusions regarding the impact of the revised policy course.

The field education instructor survey results indicate that policy practice rarely is a focus in student field education placements. This is likely the best explanation for our students achieving satisfactory ratings, but not outstanding ratings, regarding the policy student learning outcome.

The MSW Program Committee, of which the Field Education Coordinator is a member, will explore ways to ensure that more students have more experiences with policy practice.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Improve student skills in policy practice
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Although the benchmark in policy practice was met, our field instructors’ ratings of student performance in this area was lower...

Program Committee to review data and develop improvement plans
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The program committee will continue to review data and develop a plan for improving student outcomes in the area of policy pract...

M 18: Policy analysis
Students will identify a contemporary (social welfare) policy and create a power point presentation analyzing the policy.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their policy analysis in accordance with rubrics.

M 19: Policy Proposal
Students will develop policy proposals to address gaps in social work services that leave social work clients suffering social and economic injustices.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their policy proposal in accordance with rubrics.

SLO 10: Respond to contexts that shape practice
Respond to contexts that shape practice.

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 20: Field Education Instructor’s ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

M 21: Community Analysis
Students spend time in an identified community assessing community needs and developing plans to help the community meet those needs. An important part is the students’ analysis of environmental systems that affect the community. This measure is the instructor’s assessment of the student’s ability to identify important contextual factors and to analyze their impact on the community.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their community analysis in accordance with rubrics.

SLO 11: Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate
Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 22: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

M 23: Community analysis
Students spend time in an identified community assessing community needs and developing plans to help the community meet those needs. An important part is the proposal that details how they have engaged with the community, assessed needs, planned an intervention, and planned an evaluation of the intervention. This measure is the instructor’s assessment of the student's ability engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with organizations and communities.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their community proposal in accordance with rubrics.

M 24: Role play
Students will role play an interview situation and they will write “SOAP” notes on the “clients” they interview. As they role play a social worker, students will have the opportunity to engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate a variety of clients (individuals, and families (groups).

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% of the students will earn a score of at least 85% based on the quality of the SOAP notes they write following their role plays.

M 25: Journal Entry
Journal assignments will show integration of learning (through reading assignments, classroom role-plays, didactic lectures, and video examples) that demonstrate the student’s ability to engage with, assess accurately, intervene appropriately, and evaluate the outcome of group work with the individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities with whom the student will be working.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their journal entries in accordance with rubric components addressing engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with their assigned group clients.

M 26: Clinical Issue Presentations
Students will develop presentations that focus on diagnosis/assessment, methods of intervention, and critique of different assessment and intervention methods. The presentations will focus on a clinical issue. In their presentation, students will address issues of group membership, especially in relationship to issues of socio-economic status, race, ethnicity, sex, age, and sexual orientation.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their clinical issue presentations in accordance with rubrics.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtm 12: Recognized quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality

Connected Documents
Related Measures

**M 27: Disciplinary Accreditation**
The MSW program will have its accreditation reaffirmed by the Council on Social Work Education every 8 years and will remain in good standing.
Source of Evidence: External report

**M 27: Disciplinary Accreditation**
Reaffirmation of accreditation by the Council on Social Work Education
Source of Evidence: External report
Target:
The MSW Program's accreditation will be reaffirmed every 8 years by the Council on Social Work Education and the program will remain in good standing.

**M 28: Program Inquiries**
Number of inquiries from potential applicants to the MSW program
Source of Evidence: Document Analysis
Target:
The number of applications for admission, from qualified candidates will be greater than the number in the previous year.

**OthOtcn 13: Optimal level**
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion

**Connected Documents**
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1

Related Measures

**M 29: MSW Enrollment**
Number of MSW students enrolled
Source of Evidence: Existing data
Target:
The number of MSW students enrolled each year will equal or exceed the number enrolled in the previous year.

**M 30: Degrees conferred**
Percentage of MSW students who earn their MSW degree within 4 years of enrollment
Source of Evidence: Existing data
Target:
At least 90% of MSW students will earn their degree within four years of their enrollment.

**OthOtcn 14: Program Value**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves

**Connected Documents**
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1

Related Measures

**M 31: Internships in Alabama**
Percentage of our MSW students will complete their field education (internship) within the state of Alabama.
Source of Evidence: Existing data
Target:
At least 75% of our MSW students will complete their internships within the state of Alabama.

**M 32: Field Education Agency Agreements**
Number of field education agency agreements relative to number of students to be placed.
Source of Evidence: Existing data
Target:
The number of field education agency agreements will be sufficient for the number of students to be placed.

**M 33: Exit Surveys**
Program ratings by graduating MSW students.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations
Target:
Eighty-five percent of graduating MSW students who complete an exit survey will rate the program at least a 3 on a scale from 0-5.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Improve student skills in policy practice**
Although the benchmark in policy practice was met, our field instructors' ratings of student performance in this area was lower than in other areas. The MSW Program Committee will review field instructor ratings and comments, the interns' comments about policy practice, and the course-embedded assessment results and discuss strategies for improving student ratings in this area. They will then develop and implement a plan for improvement.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Field Education Instructor's ratings | Outcome/Objective: Engage in policy practice

Implementation Description: The program committee will review data and develop a plan for improving student outcomes in the area of policy practice. They will then implement the plan.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2013  
Responsible Person/Group: The MSW Program Committee, under the leadership of the MSW Program Chair; faculty who teach policy courses, field instructors.

Additional Resources: none

Program Committee to review data and develop improvement plans  
The program committee will continue to review data and develop a plan for improving student outcomes in the area of policy practice. They will then implement the plan.  
An electronic version of the tool field instructors use to report their assessment of MSW student attainment of competencies will be inaugurated in Spring 2014. The committee hopes that with the new tool, field instructors will provide more detail regarding their assessments.

Teams have been formed to revise the online versions of a policy course (SW578); revisions are expected to have a ripple effect on all master's level policy courses.

A field instructor survey on policy practice will be administered. It is hoped that the instructors will provide information useful for revising instructional activities and/or assessments.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Field Education Instructor's ratings | Outcome/Objective: Engage in policy practice
Detailed Assessment Report
2012-2013 Social Work M.S.W.
As of: 7/18/2014 02:26 PM CENTRAL

Mission / Purpose
The University of Alabama School of Social Work seeks to solve biopsychosocial problems, improve individual and social conditions, and promote justice and human dignity through teaching, research, and service. Teaching: The School awards the Bachelor of Social Work degree, which prepares graduates for generalist social work practice; the Master of Social Work degree, which prepares graduates for advanced social work practice; and the Doctor of Philosophy degree, which prepares graduates for careers in research. The School works to increase the number of competent social workers in the state and in the region. Research: The School develops research-based knowledge of social problems and their solutions. Service: The School provides resources and leadership by partnering with individuals, families, groups, community agencies, and organizations at all levels. In addition, the School improves the delivery of social services, with an emphasis on public social services contexts and underserved and disenfranchised populations. As a diverse community of teachers, researchers, learners, and support persons with shared values and aspirations, the School promotes lifelong learning, research, and service initiatives to individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge: Apply knowledge of HBSE
Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 1: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.6 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they applied their knowledge of human behavior in the social environment to their social work practice with clients. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome. The field instructor rating form is attached.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met

M 2: Case Studies
Students develop two written case studies that require students' application of knowledge of human development and identification of risks and supports to healthy/normal development.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on each case study in accordance with rubrics.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students earned at least an 80% score on the interview report and 96% of students achieved an 80% or better on the final paper in SW 511. This indicates that students applied their knowledge of human behavior in the social environment when they conducted and documented an interview or when they wrote a paper in which they were instructed to demonstrate how they would apply, in a social work practice setting, their knowledge of human behavior in the social environment. We conclude that improvement in this outcome is not required at this time.

SLO 2: Skills/Ailities in research
Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 3: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.
**Source of Evidence:** Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**

MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Target:**
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.5 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they could use research to inform practice and that they could design and conduct a practice-relevant research project. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome. The field instructor rating form is attached.

**M 4: Research Proposal**
Students develop a well-documented (via reference citation), well-organized research proposal written research proposal that details plans for the evaluation of a hypothetical social program relevant to social work practice.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of the students will earn a score of at least 80% in accordance with a rubric

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
In two course sections, 84% of the students achieved a score of at least 80%, indicating that the benchmark was met. A passing score (70%) on their proposal indicates that they are minimally competent at identifying a practice-relevant research question, reviewing the literature, identifying the current best practices and knowledge gaps, and designing and conducting research to address the gaps. Because our students exceeded the benchmark, we conclude there is no need for improvement in this outcome at this time.

**SLO 3: An Improvement Outcome: Advanced practice outcomes**
Students' abilities to conduct social work practice at an advanced-level of competency will increase. (An Improvement Outcome derived from the 2010-11 Assessment Findings)

**Connected Documents**

MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**SLO 4: Identify as a professional**
Identify as a social worker and conduct self accordingly.

**Connected Documents**

MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Field Education Instructor’s ratings**
MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Document**

MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Target:**
Average rating of field education instructors for this competency will be at least 2 (meets requirements) on a scale from 0-4.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.7 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they identify as a professional social worker and conduct themselves accordingly. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome. The field instructor rating form is attached.

**M 6: Role-plays**
Students conduct interviews in role play situations in which the goal will be to complete a psychosocial assessment (gaining appropriate written permission), including a social history, an assessment, a genogram, and an intervention and evaluation plan.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their interviews according to rubric elements regarding identifying as social worker and conducting themselves accordingly.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
96% of students earned at least 80% on their policy analysis papers. One of the more complex aspects of identifying as a professional social worker and conducting oneself as a professional social worker is the ability to analyze social welfare policies and to propose feasible methods for revising inadequate policies. Because 100% of our students achieved a grade of B or better on their policy analysis assignment, we conclude that there is no need at this time for improvement in this outcome.

**M 7: Reflection Papers**
Students will write brief reflection papers on their readings. Readings will cover a variety of possible client encounters, some that challenge students' values and ethics. They are instructed to explain in their papers how they will conduct
themselves as social work professionals.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their papers according to rubric elements regarding identifying as social worker and conducting themselves accordingly.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

SLO 5: Apply social work ethical principles

Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 8: Field Education Instructor’s ratings

MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met

The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.6 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they applied ethical principles to their social work practice. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome. The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 9: Casework demonstration role plays

The role-plays give students an opportunity to work together at the task of decision-making about group treatment and mutual support needs of particular client populations. Issues of diversity and ethical practice will be demonstrated.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their role plays according to the relevant rubric elements.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

M 10: Journal entries

Students will reflect on the NASW Code of Ethics and other relevant ethics for group work, such as those developed by ASGW, regarding how those ethical standards relate to their group work both in class and in the “real world” practice.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their journal entries according to the relevant rubric elements.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met

100% of the students in one section of the class (25 students) achieved a score of at least 80% on their journal entries relevant to applying social work ethical principles. This high achievement in one class indicates the benchmark was met and there is no need for improvement in this outcome at this time.

SLO 6: Use critical thinking to make professional judgments

Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 11: Field Education Instructor’s ratings

Measure 6.1 MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 for this outcome.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met

The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.6 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they used critical thinking skills in making
M 12: Case Analyses
Students will analyze selected de-identified cases taken from social work practice. The cases are complex and involve several family members. Students will be asked to take on the role of a social worker as they review the cases, and share their professional judgment and critical analysis of the social workers' findings, interventions, and evaluation plans.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their case analyses according to the relevant rubric elements.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students earned at least an 80% score on their clinical analysis presentation or case analysis paper. This indicates that our students use critical thinking when they analyze client needs and when they discuss, orally or in writing, their analyses. We conclude, therefore, that at this time no improvements are necessary for this outcome.

SLO 7: Engage diversity in social work practice
Engage diversity and difference in practice.

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 13: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.7 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they acknowledged diversity and difference in their social work practice and that they acted with cultural competence in situations when diversity or difference might be an issue. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome. The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 14: Case Study
Students will read the story of a woman whose rights have been violated. In light of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and what they learn from the narrative, students will develop a case study that addresses how her rights were respected and/or violated at different points along her journey. The woman in the story is from a cultural background different from that of our students.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their case studies according to the relevant rubric elements.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
2012-2013 Assessment Summary / Findings
This year, 90% of students scored at least 80% on their case studies, according to the rubric elements addressing engaging diversity in social work practice. This indicates the benchmark is met and we no longer need to monitor this outcome more closely than usual.

SLO 8: Advance human rights and justice in practice
Advance human rights and social and economic justice.

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 15: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.6 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students
demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they act to advance human rights and social and economic justice. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome at this time. The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 16: Policy Advocacy Background Document
Students will review case materials regarding individuals whose human rights have been violated and who have suffered social and economic injustices. They will prepare an advocacy plan for the individuals, beginning with a policy advocacy background document.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will score at least 80% on their policy advocacy background documents according to the relevant rubric elements.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a score of 80% or better on their community analysis paper. This indicates that all the students demonstrated a more than minimally competent ability to recognize the need to advocate for human rights and social and economic justice and to develop and implement a plan to meet that need. We therefore conclude that at this time there is no need for improvement in this outcome.

SLO 9: Engage in policy practice
Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver reflective social work services.

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 17: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.6 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they could analyze social welfare policies and plan and implement activities to revise policies as needed. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome. Still, this is one of the lower ratings students earned from field education instructors and so we will develop a plan for improvement. The field instructor rating form is attached.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Improve student skills in policy practice
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Although the benchmark in policy practice was met, our field instructors' ratings of student performance in this area was lower...

M 18: Policy analysis
Students will identify a contemporary (social welfare) policy and create a power point presentation analyzing the policy.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their policy analysis in accordance with rubrics.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This course-embedded assessment was not reported in this cycle; another one identified for this outcome, however, was reported.

M 19: Policy Proposal
Students will develop policy proposals to address gaps in social work services that leave social work clients suffering social and economic injustices.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their policy proposal in accordance with rubrics.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of the students earned at least 75% on the policy practice elements of the rubric applied to their policy proposals. This indicates that the benchmark was met and no need for improvement is perceived at this time.

SLO 10: Respond to contexts that shape practice
Respond to contexts that shape practice.

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
Related Measures

M 20: Field Education Instructor’s ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.6 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they could identify and respond to contexts that were relevant to their social work practice with their clients. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome. The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 21: Community Analysis
Students spend time in an identified community assessing community needs and developing plans to help the community meet those needs. An important part is the students’ analysis of environmental systems that affect the community. This measure is the instructor’s assessment of the student’s ability to identify important contextual factors and to analyze their impact on the community.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their community analysis in accordance with rubrics.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of the students enrolled in SW 542 earned an 80% or better on their community analysis paper. This indicates that they were able to identify the contextual elements that helped them to identify the needs in their assigned community. We conclude there is no need at this time for improvement in this outcome.

SLO 11: Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate
Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 22: Field Education Instructor’s ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.6 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they could engage with their clients, assess their needs, identify/design and implement appropriate interventions, and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome. The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 23: Community analysis
Students spend time in an identified community assessing community needs and developing plans to help the community meet those needs. An important part is the proposal that details how they have engaged with the community, assessed needs, planned an intervention, and planned an evaluation of the intervention. This measure is the instructor’s assessment of the student’s ability engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with organizations and communities.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their community proposal in accordance with rubrics.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of the students earned at least a 75% on their community proposal. This indicates that the students are able to engage their clients, assess their needs, identify an appropriate intervention, and evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention. We conclude that no improvement in this outcome is necessary at this time.

M 24: Role play
Students will role play an interview situation and they will write “SOAP” notes on the “clients” they interview. As they role play a social worker, students will have the opportunity to engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate a variety of clients (individuals, and families (groups).

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
Target:
80% of the students will earn a score of at least 85% based on the quality of the SOAP notes they write following their role plays.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Eighty percent of the students scored at least 85% on the relevant aspects of the rubric applied to the SOAP notes they wrote following their role plays. This indicates that the students demonstrated their abilities to engage, assess, interview, and evaluate during their practice with clients. We conclude that there is no need for improvement in this outcome at this time.

M 25: Journal Entry
Journal assignments will show integration of learning (through reading assignments, classroom role-plays, didactic lectures, and video examples) that demonstrate the student’s ability to engage with, assess accurately, intervene appropriately, and evaluate the outcome of group work with the individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities with whom the student will be working.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their journal entries in accordance with rubric components addressing engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with their assigned group clients.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of the students scored 80% or higher on the rubric elements regarding engaging, assessing, intervening, and evaluating their group-work clients. This indicates that no improvement is needed in this outcome at this time.

M 26: Clinical Issue Presentations
Students will develop presentations that focus on diagnosis/assessment, methods of intervention, and critique of different assessment and intervention methods. The presentations will focus on a clinical issue. In their presentation, students will address issues of group membership, especially in relationship to issues of socio-economic status, race, ethnicity, sex, age, and sexual orientation.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
80% of the students will earn at least 75% on their clinical issue presentations in accordance with rubrics.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not reported in this cycle

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 12: Recognized quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1

Related Measures

M 27: Disciplinary Accreditation
Reaffirmation of accreditation by the Council on Social Work Education

Source of Evidence: External report

Target:
The MSW Program’s accreditation will be reaffirmed every 8 years by the Council on Social Work Education and the program will remain in good standing.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The MSW program remains in good standing with the Council on Social Work Education. There are no indications that improvement is needed in this area.

M 28: Admissions Applications
Number of eligible applicants to the MSW program

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

Target:
The number of applications for admission, from qualified candidates will be greater than the number in the previous year.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The numbers of applications for admission to our MSW program in 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 were as follows, respectively: 393, 474, 612, 714. The numbers are increasing. We believe this is a result of our positive recruiting strategies and the regard in which our program is held. We therefore see no need for improvement in this area.

OthOtcm 13: Optimal level
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1

Related Measures

M 29: MSW Enrollment
Number of MSW students enrolled

Source of Evidence: Existing data
Target:
The number of MSW students enrolled each year will equal or exceed the number enrolled in the previous year.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
In the fall of 2010, 2011, and 2012, our MSW enrollments were as follows: 252, 325, and 330. The number each year exceeded the number in the previous year. The last year’s growth is not as big as the previous year’s because we have placed limits on the numbers we admit. We have two major reasons for limiting enrollment. One is the instructor to student ratio we must maintain to meet our disciplinary accreditation standards—in addition to the ratio, we must also ensure that students in all cohorts are receiving a comparable education and therefore we must maintain a balance in full-time and adjunct faculty. The other reason is that our students must complete a semester long field education placement in each year of the program. We are limited in the number of field education placements we can support and we must not admit more students than we can place. Given all these factors, we see no need for improvement in this outcome, although we are in the process of discussing ways to expand our field education placement possibilities.

M 30: Degrees conferred
Percentage of MSW students who earn their MSW degree within 4 years of enrollment
Source of Evidence: Existing data
Target:
We have not established a firm target for this outcome. We will review data before establishing a target. We expect our graduation rate to be at least 85%.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Four year graduation rates from 2008-2012, respectively are 82%, 90%, 83%, 87%, and 87%. We are trending between 85-90%, which we believe is adequate for a graduate program. We will explore the issue further before we decide whether an improvement plan is warranted.

OthOtcn 14: Program Value
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1

Related Measures

M 31: Internships in Alabama.
Percentage of our MSW students will complete their field education (internship) within the state of Alabama.
Source of Evidence: Existing data
Target:
At least 75% of our MSW students will complete their internships within the state of Alabama.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Eighty-three percent (265/320) of our MSW students completed their field education placements (internships) within the state of Alabama. Although our program was founded to serve the needs of the state, we recognize that we also have a duty to maintain a diverse program. Our Alabama natives benefit from sharing classes with students from across the country and the world. We do not guarantee field education placements outside of the state, but we attempt to make arrangements for students who prefer to complete their field education elsewhere. In addition, we have a longstanding field education program in Washington, DC, where several of our second-year MSW students complete their placements. We view our ability to place most of our students within Alabama and our longstanding placements in Washington, DC as evidence of the perceived value of our MSW program and so we see no need for improvement in this area.

M 32: Field Education Agency Agreements
Number of field education agency agreements relative to number of students to be placed.
Source of Evidence: Existing data
Target:
The number of field education agency agreements will be sufficient for the number of students to be placed.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students needing to be placed were placed in an agency with an established agreement with our field education office, indicating the agencies’ positive view of our program. No need for improvement in this area is suggested.

M 33: Exit Surveys
Program ratings by graduating MSW students.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations
Target:
Eighty-five percent of graduating MSW students who complete an exit survey will rate the program at least a 3 on a scale from 0-5.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
An exit survey was not administered in this cycle.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Improve student skills in policy practice
Although the benchmark in policy practice was met, our field instructors’ ratings of student performance in this area was lower than in other areas. The MSW Program Committee will continue to review field instructor ratings and comments, the interns’ comments about policy practice, and the course-embedded assessment results and discuss strategies for improving student ratings in this area. They will develop and implement a plan for improvement during the fall and spring semesters of 2013-2014.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
| Priority: | High |
| Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): |
| Measure: Field Education Instructor's ratings | Outcome/Objective: Engage in policy practice |
| Implementation Description: The program committee will review data and develop a plan for improving student outcomes in the area of policy practice. They will then implement the plan. |
| Projected Completion Date: | 04/2014 |
| Responsible Person/Group: The MSW Program Committee, under the leadership of the MSW Program Chair; faculty who teach policy courses, field instructors. |
| Additional Resources: | none |
Mission / Purpose
The University of Alabama School of Social Work seeks to solve biopsychosocial problems, improve individual and social conditions, and promote justice and human dignity through teaching, research, and service. Teaching: The School awards the Bachelor of Social Work degree, which prepares graduates for generalist social work practice; the Master of Social Work degree, which prepares graduates for advanced social work practice; and the Doctor of Philosophy degree, which prepares graduates for careers in research. The School works to increase the number of competent social workers in the state and in the region. Research: The School develops research-based knowledge of social problems and their solutions. Service: The School provides resources and leadership by partnering with individuals, families, groups, community agencies, and organizations at all levels. In addition, the School improves the delivery of social services, with an emphasis on public social services contexts and underserved and disenfranchised populations. As a diverse community of teachers, researchers, learners, and support persons with shared values and aspirations, the School promotes lifelong learning, research, and service initiatives to individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge: Apply knowledge of HBSE
Discipline Knowledge) Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 1: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4)
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.6 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they applied their knowledge of human behavior in the social environment to their social work practice with clients. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome.

The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 2: interview or final paper- SW 511
Students demonstrate their ability to apply knowledge of human behavior in the social environment by conducting an interview and writing a report or by preparing a final paper. In each case, they apply their knowledge to a case. The measure is the instructor's rating of the students' ability to apply knowledge (Course-embedded assessment in SW 511 Human Behavior in the Social Environment).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
Benchmark set at 80% of students earning at least 80% on an interview report or a final paper in SW 511.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
100% of students earned at least an 80% score on the interview report and 96% of students achieved an 80% or better on the final paper in SW 511. This indicates that students applied their knowledge of human behavior in the social environment when they conducted and documented an interview or when they wrote a paper in which they were instructed to demonstrate how they would apply, in a social work practice setting, their knowledge of human behavior in the social environment. We conclude that improvement in this outcome is not required at this time.

SLO 2: Skills/Abilities in research
(Skills/Abilities) Engage in research informed practice and practice informed research.

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures
M 3: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.5 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they could use research to inform practice and that they could design and conduct a practice-relevant research project. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome.

The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 4: Research proposal--SW 525
This measure is the instructor's rating of the students' demonstration, in a proposal they write, of their ability to design a research project to answer a practice-relevant question that they have posed. This allows the instructor to assess their ability to engage in both research-informed practice and practice-informed research (Course-embedded assessment in SW 525 Evaluation Research).
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
The benchmark is that 80% or more of the students will achieve a score of at least 80% on the research proposal they submit for SW 525, a required class.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In two course sections, 78% and 92% of the students achieved a score of at least 80%, indicating that overall, the benchmark was met (the sections were of equal size). A passing score (70%) on their proposal indicates that they are minimally competent at identifying a practice-relevant research question, reviewing the literature, identifying the current best practices and knowledge gaps, and designing and conducting research to address the gaps. Because our students exceeded the benchmark, we conclude there is no need for improvement in this outcome at this time.

SLO 3: An Improvement Outcome: Advanced practice outcomes
Students' abilities to conduct social work practice at an advanced-level of competency will increase. (An Improvement Outcome derived from the 2010-11 Assessment Findings)

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

SLO 4: Identify as a professional
Students will demonstrate their ability to identify as a professional social worker and conduct themselves accordingly.

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 5: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.7 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they identify as a professional social worker and conduct themselves accordingly. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome.

The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 6: Policy analysis paper--SW 500
Policy analysis is one of the first foundation courses in the curriculum. Students learn to conduct a policy analysis, a professional skill required of social workers. Their policy analysis paper demonstrates their ability to identify as a professional social worker and conduct themselves accordingly. This measure is the instructor's rating of the students' demonstration of their ability to identify with the profession and to conduct themselves accordingly (Course-embedded assessment in SW 500).
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: At least 80% of students will achieve a score of 80% or better on their policy analysis paper in SW 500 Policy analysis.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
100% of students earned at least 80% on their policy analysis papers. One of the more complex aspects of identifying as a professional social worker and conducting oneself as a professional social worker is the ability to analyze social welfare policies and to propose feasible methods for revising inadequate policies. Because 100% of our students achieved a grade of B or better on their policy analysis assignment, we conclude that there is no need at this time for improvement in this outcome.

SLO 5: Apply social work ethical principles
Students will apply social work ethical principles to guide their professional practice

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 7: Field Education Instructor's ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target: Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this study learning outcome was 3.7 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they applied ethical principles to their social work practice. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome.

The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 8: Conduct and report on interview- SW 579
In SW 579, students are required to conduct and report on an interview. In so doing, they are required to follow ethical principles regarding privacy, confidentiality, and sensitivity. This measure is the instructor's rating of the degree to which the students follow ethical principles (Course-embedded assessment in SW 579).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: At least 80% of the students will achieve a score of 80% or better on their interview report in SW 579.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
100% of the students achieved at least an 80% on their interview report. Students must apply ethical principles as they conduct and document their interviews. Because 100% of the students earned at least a B on their interview reports, we conclude that they do indeed apply ethical principles in practice. We further conclude that no improvement is necessary in this outcome at this time.

SLO 6: Use critical thinking to make professional judgments
Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments in social work practice.

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 9: Field Education Instructor's ratings
Measure 6.1 MSW Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 for this outcome.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target: Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this study learning outcome was 3.6 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they used critical thinking skills in making decisions and judgments in their social work practice with clients. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome at this time.

The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 10: Clinical or Case Analysis-SW 540
In their first practice class, social work practice with individuals and families, students learn to assess a client's
situation, from a psychosocial perspective, and to document that assessment with a clinical analysis of the case. They document that analysis in a clinical presentation or in a case analysis paper. This measure is the instructor’s rating of the degree to which the students demonstrate their ability to use critical thinking in developing their analyses (Course-embedded assessment in SW 540).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**

At least 80% of students will score 80% or better on their clinical analysis presentation or case analysis paper in SW 540.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

In three sections of the course, 85%, 100%, and 100% of students earned at least an 80% score on their clinical analysis presentation or case analysis paper. This indicates that our students use critical thinking when they analyze client needs and when they discuss, orally or in writing, their analyses. We conclude, therefore, that at this time no improvements are necessary for this outcome.

**SLO 7: Engage diversity in social work practice**

Students will engage diversity and difference in social work practice

**Connected Documents**

MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Related Measures**

**M 11: Field Education Instructor’s ratings**

MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Document**

MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Target:**

Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.7 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they acknowledged diversity and difference in their social work practice and that they acted with cultural competence in situations when diversity or difference might be an issue. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome.

The field instructor rating form is attached.

**M 12: Reports and exercises - SW533 & SW 565**

SW 533 and SW 565 are advanced practice classes for students concentrating in social work practice with adults and their families and in children, adolescents, and their families, respectively. In these required classes, students learn to value and honor the diversity of their clients and to practice in ways that are effective with regard to any diversity-relevant characteristics of their clients. This measure is the instructor’s rating of the degree to which students demonstrate their appropriate engagement with diversity in an agency report, a practice evaluation report, or a skills lab exercise (Course-embedded assessment in SW533 and SW 565).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**

At least 80% of students will earn a score of at least 80% on their agency analysis or practice evaluation reports and skills labs exercises in one of their required advanced practice classes.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

In seven sections, the following percentages of students earned a score of at least 80% on their diversity assignment: 61, 100, 100, 100, 80, and 100. Although students in one class did not meet expectations, the total percentage of students achieving the benchmark exceeded 80%. Because the field education instructors rated the students highly on this outcome (mean rating was 3.7 out of 4) we suspect that one classroom instructor had higher standards than others for this assignment and so we have minimal concern about the outcome. Rather than developing an action plan, we will monitor the outcome for another year.

**SLO 8: Advance human rights and justice in practice**

Students will act to advance human rights and social and economic justice

**Connected Documents**

MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Related Measures**

**M 13: Field Education Instructor’s ratings**

MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Connected Document**

MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

**Target:**

Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.6 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they act to advance human rights and social and economic justice. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome at this time.

The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 14: Community analysis - SW 542
In their social work practice with communities course, students compete a community analysis. This measure is the extent to which instructors judge that students have exhibited an ability to advance human rights and social and economic justice in their analysis (which includes recommendations for action) (Course-embedded assessment in SW 542).
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: At least 80% of students will earn a score of 80% or better on their community analysis report in SW 542.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
100% of the students earned a score of 80% or better on their community analysis paper. This indicates that all the students demonstrated a more than minimally competent ability to recognize the need to advocate for human rights and social and economic justice and to develop and implement a plan to meet that need. We therefore conclude that at this time there is no need for improvement in this outcome.

SLO 9: Engage in policy practice
Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well being and to deliver effective social work services

Connected Documents
MSW Curriculum Map II
MSW Curriculum Maps 1
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 15: Policy analysis paper
Students will analyze a social policy and write a paper in which they discuss their analysis and provide a feasible plan for revising the policy. Course-embedded assessment in SW 501.

Please note: this is a duplicate of another measure—l do not see how to delete it.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 80% of MSW students will earn a B (80%) or better on their policy analysis paper in SW 501 Advanced Policy Analysis.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In six sections of the advanced policy analysis class, the following percentages of students earned at least a B: 84, 96, 100, 98, 100, and 100. These high scores indicate that our students are able to analyze social welfare policies and design and implement plans to revise policies as needed. We therefore conclude that at this time no improvements are needed for this outcome.

M 16: Field Education Instructor’s ratings
MSW Field Education Instructor’s ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4).
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Connected Document
MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes
Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.5 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they could analyze social welfare policies and plan and implement activities to revise policies as needed. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome. Still, this is one of the lower ratings students earned from field education instructors and so we will develop a plan for improvement.

The field instructor rating form is attached.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Improve student skills in policy practice
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Although the benchmark in policy practice was met, our field instructors’ ratings of student performance in this area was lower...

M 17: Policy analysis SW501
In their required advanced policy analysis class, students improve on their abilities to conduct a professional analysis of a social welfare policy. The policy analysis includes recommendations for policy change and an advocacy plan to
accomplish that change. This measure is the instructor's rating of the students' abilities to engage in policy practice to advance justice and to deliver effective services (Course-embedded assessment in SW501).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
At least 80% of students will score 80% or better on their advanced policy analysis paper for SW 501.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In six sections of SW 501, the following percentages of students earned an 80% or better on their advanced policy analysis paper: 84, 96, 100, 98, 100, and 100. This indicates that our students are able to analyze social welfare policies and to plan and implement activities to revise policies as needed. We therefore conclude that no improvements for this outcome are necessary at this time.

SLO 10: Respond to contexts that shape practice
Respond to contexts that shape social work practice

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 18: Field Education Instructor's ratings
Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Connected Document
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.6 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they could identify and respond to contexts that were relevant to their social work practice with their clients. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome.

The field instructor rating form is attached.

M 19: Evidence-based practice paper-SW 541
In all their courses, students learn to respond to the contexts that shape their clients; lives and their own social work practice. In their practice with individuals and families class, they developed an evidence-based practice paper demonstrating that they can respond to context when ascertaining an appropriate intervention for a particular client or client group. This measure is the instructor's rating of the students' demonstration of attention to context (Course-embedded assessment in SW 541).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
At least 80% of students will achieve a score of 80% or better on their evidence-based practice paper for SW 541.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In each of three sections of this course, 100% of the students earned an 80% or better on their evidence-based practice paper. This indicates that they were able to identify the contextual elements that determined whether available evidence applied to their clients and whether, therefore, they should recommend those interventions to clients they identified as needing an intervention. We conclude there is no need at this time for improvement in this outcome.

SLO 11: Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate
Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities

Connected Documents
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Related Measures

M 20: Field Education Instructor's ratings
Field Education Instructor's ratings of student performance (Benchmark set at an average score of at least 2 (student meets requirements) out of 4).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
- MSW Field education instructor evaluation of student outcomes

Target:
Rating of 2.0 (meets requirements) out of 4.0 on this outcome.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The mean field instructor rating for all graduating MSW students on this student learning outcome was 3.7 out of 4, which exceeds the benchmark of 2.0 (meets requirements). This indicates that our students demonstrated, during their field education experiences, that they could engage with their clients, assess their needs, identify/design and implement appropriate interventions, and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions. We conclude, therefore, that improvement is not necessary for this outcome.
The field instructor rating form is attached.

**M 21: Clinical application paper - SW532 or SW 564**
In one of their advanced practice courses, students write a clinical application paper, which may be a case study. This measure is the instructor's rating of the students' demonstration of their ability to engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate, at an advanced level, with a selected client or client group (Course-embedded assessment in SW532, SW564).

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
At least 80% of the students will achieve a score of 80% or better on their clinical application assignment in one of their advanced practice classes.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**
In six sections of two advanced practice classes, the following percentages of students earned an 80% or better on their clinical application assignment: 85, 100, 100, 100, 98, and 96. This indicates that the students are able to engage their clients, assess their needs, identify an appropriate intervention, and evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention. We conclude that no improvement in this outcome is necessary at this time.

**Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**OthOtm 12: Recognized quality**
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality

**Connected Documents**
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1

**OthOtm 13: Optimal level**
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion

**Connected Documents**
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1

**OthOtm 14: Program Value**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves

**Connected Documents**
- MSW Curriculum Map II
- MSW Curriculum Maps 1

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Improve student skills in policy practice**
Although the benchmark in policy practice was met, our field instructors' ratings of student performance in this area was lower than in other areas. The MSW Program Committee will review field instructor ratings and comments, the intern's comments about policy practice, and the course-embedded assessment results and discuss strategies for improving student ratings in this area. They will then develop and implement a plan for improvement.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Field Education Instructor's ratings
- **Outcome/Objective:** Engage in policy practice

**Implementation Description:** The program committee will review data and develop a plan for improving student outcomes in the area of policy practice. They will then implement the plan.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
**Responsible Person/Group:** The MSW Program Committee, under the leadership of the MSW Program Chair; faculty who teach policy courses, field instructors.

**Additional Resources:** none
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment</th>
<th>Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research</th>
<th>Report self-efficacy with respect to advanced competencies</th>
<th>Identify as a profession social worker</th>
<th>Apply social work ethical principles</th>
<th>Apply critical thinking for diversity and difference in practice</th>
<th>Engage in human rights and social justice</th>
<th>Engage in policy practice</th>
<th>Respond to contexts that shape practice</th>
<th>Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with systems of all sizes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 511</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 525</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 500</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 579</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 540</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 533</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 565</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 542</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 501</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 541</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 532</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 564</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Rubric/Grading Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 511</td>
<td>SW 525</td>
<td>SW 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 579</td>
<td>SW 540</td>
<td>SW 533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 565</td>
<td>SW 542</td>
<td>SW 501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 541</td>
<td>SW 532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curriculum Map II** (What assessment measures will be employed in which courses/activities/assignments for each Student Learning Outcome)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application of knowledge of human behavior and the social environment</th>
<th>Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research</th>
<th>Report self-efficacy with respect to advanced competencies</th>
<th>Identify as a professional social worker</th>
<th>Apply social work ethical principles</th>
<th>Engage in critical thinking</th>
<th>Engage diversity and difference in practice</th>
<th>Engage in policy practice</th>
<th>Respond to contexts that shape practice</th>
<th>Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with systems of all sizes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 511</td>
<td>Rubric for theory paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 525</td>
<td>Rubric for evaluation proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 500</td>
<td>Rubric for professional demeanor</td>
<td>Ethical rule screen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 579</td>
<td>Rubric for ethical rule screen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 540</td>
<td>Rubric for biopsychosocial assessment</td>
<td>Rubric for reaction to diversity issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 533</td>
<td>Rubric for reflective journal</td>
<td>Rubric for reaction to diversity issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 565</td>
<td>Rubric for reflective journal</td>
<td>Rubric for reaction to diversity issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 542</td>
<td>Rubric for social advocacy plan.</td>
<td>Rubric for community analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 501</td>
<td>Rubric for policy proposal</td>
<td>Rubric for policy critique.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 532</td>
<td>Rubric for reflective journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 564</td>
<td>Rubric for reflective journal</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>Specific final exam questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Optional Additional Narrative: Use this space to provide any additional detail concerning the 2011-12 Department Assessment Plan

We survey graduating students each spring. Students respond to a self-efficacy item about each student learning outcome and also respond to questions about the quality of the program. In response to relatively low self-efficacy reports regarding advanced practice competencies, this fall the MSW Committee will implement changes aimed to increase students’ self-efficacy in these areas.
The University of Alabama School of Social Work
SW 590 Field Learning Contract And Evaluation Form

Student's Name: _________________________________________________________
Agency: ________________________________________________________________

Field Instructor: __________________________ Phone: ______________________ Email: __________________________________

Liaison: ________________________________________________

INSTRUCTIONS:
The Learning Contract is generated through a collaborative effort by the student and the field instructor and sent electronically to the liaison for review. At mid-term (approximately 250 hours) the completed midterm evaluation is sent to and filed electronically by the liaison. The final evaluation is generated by the field instructor and student, and submitted electronically to the liaison. The field instructor indicates by electronically highlighting, underlining, or circling the grade (pass or fail). The field instructor sends the final evaluation electronically to the liaison, who submits the grade, and forwards the final evaluation electronically to the field office. Paper copies of the Learning Contract are not accepted.

Students: Become oriented with your field placement. Review the agency’s mission, goals, programs, populations served, etc. Meet with your field instructor to discuss the range of activities available to you. Summarize the scope of these learning activities in a written paragraph under each of the following headings: Experience with individuals and families, experience with groups, community activities, policy activities, research activities, professional development, other major learning activities.

Experience with individuals and families

Experience with groups:

Community activities:

Policy activities:

Research activities:

Professional development activities:

Other major learning activities:

FIELD INSTRUCTORS: WRITE EVALUATION RATINGS IN FAR RIGHT COLUMNS USING THE NUMERICAL SYSTEM BELOW. PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK IN THE SPACE PROVIDED AFTER EACH SECTION.
Rate each student on the degree to which she/he has exhibited beginning competence in performing each of the 42 behaviors listed. Please use the following scale.

Note, “9” is not an allowable rating for the final evaluation. Also note that some of the practice behaviors are complex; for example, the student is expected to exhibit the behavior with several groups or in several settings. To achieve a high rating, the student should have exhibited the behavior in all the ways listed.

4 Excellent Student consistently exceeds expectations regarding required performance
3 Above Average Student frequently exceeds expectations regarding required performance
2 Average Student consistently meets the requirements
1 Below Average Student occasionally fails to meet requirements; must improve
0 Unsatisfactory Student frequently fails to meet requirements; must improve
9 Student has not yet had an opportunity to exhibit this practice behavior

NOTE: Whenever there is a rating of 2 at midterm, the student, field instructor, and field liaison should modify the learning contract to promote student improvement; whenever there is a 9 at midterm, plans should be made to ensure there will be an opportunity for the student to exhibit the behavior before the conclusion of the field placement. There must be no 9s at the final. A student who has even a single 1 at final does not pass this field class.

Note to Field Instructors: Please recall that at midterm and final evaluations, you will evaluate the student’s mastery of the competency – not the practice behaviors or activities individually. Only one numerical grade is needed for each competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency: 2.1.1 student identifies as a professional social worker and conducts herself/himself accordingly</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Behaviors:</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for client access to the services of social work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice personal reflection and self correction to assure continual professional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend to professional roles and boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show a willingness to engage in career long learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use supervision and consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor Comments

Student Comments
### Competency: 2.1.2 student applies social work ethical principles to guide professional practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Behaviors:</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Midterm</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows for professional values to guide practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make ethical decisions by applying standards of the National Association of Social Worker’s Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply strategies of ethical reasoning in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor Comments**

**Student Comments**

### Competency: 2.1.3 student applies critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Behaviors:</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Midterm</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research based knowledge and practice wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor Comments**

**Student Comments**
### Competency: 2.1.4 student engages in diversity and difference in practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Behaviors</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Midterm</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and communicate understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the extent to which a culture’s structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create or enhance privilege and power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain sufficient self awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups, (To include being mindful of diversity within own identity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View herself/himself as a learner, appreciate client cultural differences, and actively learn from her/his clients and colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor Comments**

**Student Comments**

### Competency: 2.1.5 student advances human rights and social economic justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Behaviors</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Midterm</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination and their effects of vulnerable populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for human rights and social economic justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in practices that advance social and economic justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor Comments**

**Student Comments**
### Competency: 2.1.6 Student engages in research informed practice and practice informed research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Behaviors:</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate ability to use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts evidence based practices in field agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ability to use research evidence to inform practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor Comments**

**Student Comments**

---

### Competency: 2.1.7 Student applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Behaviors:</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use conceptual frameworks to guide the process of assessment, intervention, and evaluation across the life course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor Comments**

**Student Comments**
### Competency: 2.1.8 student engages in policy practice to advance social and economic well being and deliver effective social work services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Behaviors:</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Midterm</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well being as they relate to the work of the agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with colleagues, clients, and or community leaders for effective policy actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instructor Comments

### Student Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency: 2.1.9 respond to contexts that shape practice.</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers continuously discover, appraise and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to create responsive policies and provide relevant services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in policy, service delivery, and practice to improve the quality of social services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instructor Comments

### Student Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency: 2.1.10</th>
<th>student engages with, assesses, intervenes with, and evaluates individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Behaviors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To substantively and effectively prepare to work with: Individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates the use of empathy and other interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively with clients toward mutually agreed upon outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect, organize and interpret client data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess client strengths and limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop mutually agreed on intervention goals and objectives with clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize and apply appropriate interventions strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate actions to achieve organizational and community goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help clients resolve problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate transitions and endings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor Comments**

**Student Comments**
Personal/ Professional Growth is an important part of the field experience. This section allows students to identify specific personal/professional growth needs. Please identify at least two areas of personal/professional growth you would like to strengthen during your field experience. This section may also include agency specific requirements.

4 - Excellent  
3 - Above Average  
2 - Average  
1 - Below Average  
0 - Unsatisfactory  
9 - Student has not yet had the opportunity to exhibit this practice behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal/ Professional Growth Competency:</th>
<th>Practice Behaviors:</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Midterm</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Instructor Comments

Student Comments

Acknowledgment of Learning Contract:

Student: __________________________________________________________________ Date: __________

Field Instructor: __________________________________________________________________ Date: __________

Liaison: __________________________________________________________________ Date: __________

Acknowledgement for Midterm

Student: __________________________________________________________________ Date: __________

Field Instructor: __________________________________________________________________ Date: __________

Liaison: __________________________________________________________________ Date: __________
Acknowledgement for Final

Student: _____________________________________________ Date: __________

Field Instructor: ______________________________________ Date: __________

Acknowledgement that student has completed the necessary 500 hours for field

Liaison: _____________________________________________ Date: __________

Student’s Grade (circled by the field instructor and verified by the liaison)

PASS  FAIL