

**LIU Collaborative Program MASTERS OF SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
LAST COMPLETED IN MAY 2016**

Form AS 4 (M) Duplicate and expand as needed. Provide table(s) to support self -study narrative addressing the *accreditation standards* below.

This form is used to assist the COA in the evaluation of the program’s compliance with the accreditation standards below:

4.0.2 *The program provides summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of its competencies, identifying the percentage of students achieving the benchmark.*

4.0.4 *The program uses Form AS 4 (B) and/or AS 4 (M) to report assessment outcomes to its constituents and the public on its website and routinely updates (minimally every 2 years) these postings.*

All Council on Social Work Education programs measure and report student learning outcomes. Students are assessed on their mastery of the competencies that comprise the accreditation standards of the Council on Social Work Education. These competencies are dimensions of social work practice that all social workers are expected to master during their professional training. A measurement benchmark is set by the social work programs for each competency. An assessment score at or above that benchmark is considered by the program to represent mastery of that particular competency.

COMPETENCY	MEAN SCORES AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK					
	Measured on a Likert scale from 1-5 with 5 indicating a higher level of competency Benchmark was set as 85% achieving 4 or higher					
	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=87)	CHILDREN AND FAMILIES CONCENTRATION (N=41)	FORENSICS CONCENTRATION (N=14)	GERONOTOLOGY CONCENTRATION (N=6)	NON-PROFIT MANAGEMENT CONCENTRATION (N=5)	SUBSTANCE ABUSE CONCENTRATION (N=20)
1) Identify as a Professional Social Worker	4.40 96.7%- Benchmark met	4.41 97.6%	4.47 100%	4.41 83.3%	4.46 100%	4.32 95%
2) Apply Ethical Principles	4.26 90.1%- Benchmark met	4.24 92.3%	4.35 100%	4.50 83.3%	4.20 100%	4.20 80%
3) Apply Critical Thinking	4.21 83.6%- Benchmark NOT met	4.18 82.4%	4.33 100%	4.36 75%	4.22 100%	4.16 73.7%
4) Engage Diversity in Practice	4.51 96.3%- Benchmark met	4.47 94.7%	4.69 100%	4.83 100%	4.63 100%	4.37 95%
5) Advance Human Rights/ Social and Economic Justice	4.32 90.8%- Benchmark met	4.22 88.2%	4.37 92.9%	4.67 83.3%	4.40 100%	4.31 94.1%

COMPETENCY	MEAN SCORES AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK					
	Measured on a Likert scale from 1-5 with 5 indicating a higher level of competency					
	Benchmark was set as 85% achieving 4 or higher					
	TOTAL SAMPLE (N=87)	CHILDREN AND FAMILIES CONCENTRATION (N=41)	FORENSICS CONCENTRATION (N=14)	GERONOTOLOGY CONCENTRATION (N=6)	NON-PROFIT MANAGEMENT CONCENTRATION (N=5)	SUBSTANCE ABUSE CONCENTRATION (N=20)
6) Engage Research Informed Practice/Practice Informed Research	4.09 78.2%- Benchmark NOT met	4.10 78.6%	4.08 85.7%	3.86 50%	4.38 100%	4.06 73.3%
7) Apply Human Behavior Knowledge	4.24 89.3%- Benchmark met	4.19 89.7%	4.24 92.9%	4.57 83.3%	4.36 100%	4.21 85%
8) Engage Policy Practice to Advance Well-Being and Deliver Services	4.26 84.9%- Benchmark met	4.30 82.6%	4.17 88.9%	4.21 75%	4.50 100%	4.18 84.6%
9) Respond to Practice Contexts	4.20 84.8%- - Benchmark met	4.24 90.3%	4.15 90%	4.50 75%	4.25 100%	4.06 70.6%
10a) Practice Engagement	4.41 90.5%- Benchmark met	4.40 86.4%	4.00 100%	4.73 100%	4.60 100%	4.40 90%
10b) Practice Assessment	4.37 90.2%- Benchmark met	4.33 90.5%	4.00 100%	4.67 100%	4.60 100%	4.36 80%
10c) Practice Intervention	4.33 87.8%- Benchmark met	4.28 85.7%	4.00 100%	4.67 100%	4.55 100%	4.36 80%
10d) Practice Evaluation	4.25 82.8%- Benchmark NOT met	4.23 84.2%	3.93 80%	4.50 100%	4.56 100%	4.26 73.3%

Narrative:

These data were gathered through direct observation of the students' performance by their field instructors at the end of their graduating year. Overall, our graduating students achieved the set benchmark in nine of the thirteen competencies. The area in which students showed the highest level of competency is engaging diversity in practice. This may not be surprising given the diversity of the areas the program serves (New York City and Long Island). The competencies that were not met were in the areas of critical thinking,

engaging in research–informed practice and practice-informed research, and practice evaluation. Some of these areas are related, such as practice evaluation and research.

The deficiencies in the research related competencies could be an indication of the types of field experiences provided by various agencies, which may not give students an opportunity to sufficiently demonstrate successful application of research skills, or an inability to translate coursework into the field, or in other words, transitioning from theory into practice. This is further supported by the number of “N/A” responses indicated by field instructors. One follow up step would be to further discuss this response chosen with field instructors, and clarify if it is due to lack of opportunity, expertise of agency or lack of interest from students. One immediate change that can be made is to require an explanation for each “N/A’ option selected. Another step to overall rectify the overall deficiencies is to educate field agencies about the different areas of research and evaluation, such as needs assessment and organizational analysis. This may help to expand the conceptualization of research and opportunities afforded to students.

Of the areas where the benchmark was not met, we are most concerned with the area of critical thinking, as this is most related to student capabilities rather than possible lack of opportunity as discussed above. Critical thinking is also a paramount overarching skill necessary for competent social work practice. The fact that our students did not meet the benchmark may thus be an indication of our students’ challenges. Expanded content in this area throughout the curriculum will be considered as well convert to the EPAS 2015.

In sum, we will explore the implications of the areas in which the set benchmark was not set as they relate to students competency versus variations in agency experience.

Further analysis showed that there were no significant differences between any outcomes between concentration or campus. This is reaffirming, as we strive for consistency across programming, regardless of location delivery or concentration focus.