Assurance of Student Learning 2022-2023	
CHHS	Social Work
Bachelor of Social Work (594)	
Dr. Simon Funge, BSW Program Director/Assessment Coordinator	
Is this an online program? ☒ Yes ☐ No (Includes on campus *and* online program options)	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf . Indicate verification here ☒ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under **Assessment Cycle**)

Program Student Learning Outcome 1: Students will demonstrate ethical and professional behavior.			
Instrument 1	Direct: SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI)		
Instrument 2	Direct: Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE)		
Instrument 3	**N/A**		
Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.		☒ **Met**	☐ **Not Met**

Program Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will engage anti-racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion (ADEI) in practice.			
Instrument 1	Direct: SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI)		
Instrument 2	Direct: Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE)		
Instrument 3	**N/A**		
Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.		☒ **Met**	☐ **Not Met**

Program Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will advance human rights and social, racial, economic, and environmental justice.			
Instrument 1	Direct: SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI)		
Instrument 2	Direct: Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE)		
Instrument 3	**N/A**		
Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.		☒ **Met**	☐ **Not Met**

Program Student Learning Outcome 4: Engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice.	
Instrument 1	Direct: SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Exit Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI)
Instrument 2	Direct: Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE)

Instrument 3	N/A		
Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.		☐ Met	☒ Not Met

Program Student Learning Outcome 5: Students will engage in policy practice.			
Instrument 1	Direct: SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI)		
Instrument 2	Direct: Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE)		
Instrument 3	N/A		
Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 5.		☐ Met	☒ Not Met

Program Student Learning Outcome 6: Students will demonstrate engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation skills across client systems and populations.			
Instrument 1	Direct: SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI)		
Instrument 2	Direct: Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE)		
Instrument 3	N/A		
Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 6.		☒ Met	☐ Not Met

Assessment Cycle Plan:
For example, list any outcomes not assessed this cycle and indicate the next year in which they will be assessed. If you plan to change any program learning outcomes, please explain that and when it will occur as well. If everything will be the same next cycle, just indicate that nothing will change in terms of the timeline.
All Program Student Learning Outcomes were assessed this cycle. However, for AY 22-23, several revisions were made to the Program Student Learning Outcomes. SLO #6 was changed to include client "systems" (alongside "populations") to more accurately describe expectations students will competently work within systems (e.g., political, economic, social, organizational, etc.), and SLO #2 and #3 were changed to align with the greater focus on antiracism, diversity, equity, and inclusion (ADEI) as outlined in the Council on Social Work Education's (CSWE) 2022 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS). The changes are outlined here:

Prior SLOs	Revised SLOs
SLO 1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior	**SLO 1:** No change
SLO 2: Engage diversity and difference in practice	**SLO 2:** ~~Engage diversity and difference in practice~~ Engage Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI) in Practice
SLO 3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	**SLO 3:** Advance human rights and social, racial, economic, and environmental justice

SLO 4: Engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice	**SLO 4:** No change
SLO 5: Engage in policy practice	**SLO 5:** No change
SLO 6: Demonstrate engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation skills across client populations	**SLO 6:** Demonstrate engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation skills across client ==systems and== populations.

The change to the program student learning outcomes was made in preparation for the BSW program's reaffirmation of accreditation processes. To be submitted to the CSWE's Council on Accreditation (COA) in 2025, WKU's BSW program will produce a self-study including program changes made based on data drawn from AY 23-24. As part of this preparation, WKU's BSW program participated in a pilot study conducted by SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) in AY 22-23. Students completed a new Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) based on the 2022 EPAS – rather than the 2015 EPAS. (The EPAS are revised and updated every seven years.) SWEAP's study used a test/re-test methodology in which students took the same survey twice over an approximate one-month period. (Only scores from the first survey were used for this assessment report.) It's important to note, because SWEAP was piloting its FCAI survey, the organization did not provide comparative mean national average scores for each competency. Therefore, unlike prior ASL reports, national SWEAP-FCAI data are not provided in this report.

Despite the focus on the 2022 EPAS for the FCAI survey, items on the Learning Plan Evaluation (LPE) were based on the earlier version of CSWE's EPAS (2015). Though the latest iteration of the EPAS includes a more explicit focus on ADEI, it is argued the 2015 and 2022 EPAS are substantively similar such that aggregating the data from the instruments, i.e., the LPE and SWEAP-FCAI survey, still produced useful assessment data for this report. (The items included on the LPE to be used for the AY 23-24 assessment report will be based on the 2022 EPAS.)

It should also be noted that while the response rate for the LPE was 100%, the response rate for the SWEAP-FCAI was substantially lower. Unlike prior years when survey completion was required of students in SWRK 483, the survey was presented as optional in AY 22-23 since the instrument was being evaluated as part of a study. As a result, the response rate for the SWEAP-FCAI was considerably lower (54.5%) as compared to prior years. The intent is to ensure completion of the SWEAP-FCAI survey is once again required in SWRK 483 from Spring 24 and beyond. Therefore, it is expected the rate of survey completions will return to close-to-100% in future reports. (For example, the response rate was 97.5.% in AY 21-22.)

WKU's BSW Program uses an 85% benchmark to determine students' competencies. In other words, at least 85% of graduating students are expected to demonstrate threshold mastery of each CSWE competency as measured by the *combined* LPE and SWEAP-FCAI assessment measures. Therefore, to determine whether graduating students met each Program Student Learning Outcome only those students who had completed a Learning Plan Evaluation *and* the SWEAP-FCAI survey (n = 42) were included in the analysis to assess the 85% benchmark. (An analysis of the data inclusive of all students (n = 77) produced results similar to those reported here; however, it could not be determined

whether selection bias occurred such that only the more motivated students completed the SWEAP-FCAI survey possibly positively skewing the data. Should the AY 23-24 report reflect a higher, i.e., typical, response rate on the SWEAP-FCAI survey *and* produce similar results, the BSW program can be confident the data was not skewed in this report.)

Though only 7 of 22 (31.8%) graduates from the Online BSW program option completed a Learning Plan Evaluation *and* the SWEAP-FCAI survey, their results are noted in this report.

Student Learning Outcome 1	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Students will demonstrate ethical and professional behavior.

Measurement Instrument #1	SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured by the SWEAP-FCAI Instrument.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	At least 80% of graduating Social work Majors will answer at least 50% of questions correctly for this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	95.2%
Methods	The SWEAP-FCAI Instrument is made available to students online at the end of the second semester of their Field Practica (during SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). During AY 22-23, 42 of 77 eligible students completed the instrument – an overall response rate of 54.5%. Student responses to the seven SWEAP-FCAI items used to measure Competency #1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior (see Appendix E) were used for this part of the assessment. Per SWEAP, a student is deemed competent if s/he answers 50% or more of the total number of questions correctly.		

Measurement Instrument #2	Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured on the LPE by students' Field Instructors.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	85% of graduating Social Work Majors will score at least a 4 on this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	96.1%
Methods	The LPE is completed by a student's Field Instructor at the end of each of the two semesters in their Field Practicum (SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). The Field Instructor evaluated whether the student effectively demonstrated each of three practice behaviors associated with Competency #1: Intern demonstrates ethical and professional behavior (see Appendix F). On the basis of this evaluation, they then scored the competency from 1: lowest to 5: highest. This score was used for this part of the assessment. Students must earn a score of 3-5 for each competency by the end of the second semester (SWRK 483) in order for the student to pass their Field Practicum. During AY 22-23, Field Instructors completed LPEs for 77 of 77 students enrolled in SWRK 483 – a 100.0% completion rate.		

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	☒ Met	☐ Not Met

Results

Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle? Explain

A minimum 85% threshold of the combined SWEAP-FCAI Exit Instrument *and* LPE measures was used to assess achievement of SLO #1. Over 95% of the 42 graduating Social Work students included in this analysis met or exceeded this threshold. Therefore, the program achieved SLO #1.This was an increase from AY 21-22 (89.9%) and higher than the 6-year average (88.7%).

(See Appendix B – Table 1 for year-to-year comparisons.)

Online students. Only those students who completed the SWEAP-FCAI survey *and* whose LPE was also completed (7 of 22; 31.8%) were included to assess their achievement of this competency. Though lower than the percentage of the overall group of students (95.2%), close to 93% of the graduating Online Social Work students included in this analysis met or exceeded this threshold. Therefore, these students achieved SLO #1. (See Appendix B – Table 2 for comparison with all students included in the analysis as outlined in Table 1.)

The percentage of students who achieved the 80% benchmark on the SWEAP-FCAI Survey increased from 86.1% in AY 21-22 to 95.2%.
And the percentage of students who achieved the 85% benchmark on the LPE increased from 93.8% in AY 21-22 to 96.1% (close to the 96.3% reported for this benchmark in AY 20-21 and above)the 6-year average [95.0%].

(See Appendices G and H for more details regarding the individual measures including changes over time.)

Conclusions

What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.

A more extensive capstone review of knowledge gained from human behavior, social welfare policy, research, and generalist practice courses was integrated into SWRK 483: Field Seminar II in Spring 23 (along with other programmatic changes outlined in the AY 21-22 ASL report). This was expected to correlate with at least a 2.5% increase in the percentage of graduating students achieving the minimum threshold on the

SWEAP-FCAI Survey in the AY 22-23 report. The percentage of students who achieved the 80% benchmark increased by 9.1% from 86.1% in AY 21-22 to 95.2% in AY 22-23. Therefore, this expectation was surpassed.

Plans for Next Assessment Cycle

IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle: As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a plan for the following year's assessment – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to collect a more appropriate artifact. Or, you may need to adjust targets because there are consistently exceeded or not met; Or, you might see the need to reconstruct your curriculum map. Or, you've found that the sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided. Whatever you plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. **All changes need not lead to quantitative results.

No change is planned for assessing this SLO in the next assessment cycle. This SLO will be assessed again in Spring 2024 using the LPE and SWEAP-FCAI Survey. Students' completed LPEs will be collected via the online Field platform, Tevera, in the Spring semester as each student finishes their required internship hours at their field practicum (SWRK 482). The data will then be forwarded to the assessment coordinator (TBD). Students' access to the SWEAP-FCAI Survey to students in their field seminar (SWRK 483) will be coordinated by Dr. Dana Sullivan who will forward a report generated by SWEAP to the assessment coordinator. Analyses of the combined averages from the LPE data and SWEAP-FCAI survey reports for this SLO will then be undertaken by the assessment coordinator for inclusion in the AY 23-24 ASL Report.

Student Learning Outcome 2	
Student Learning Outcome	Students will engage anti-racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion (ADEI) in practice.

Measurement Instrument #1	SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured by the SWEAP-FCAI Instrument.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	At least 80% of graduating Social work Majors will answer at least 50% of questions correctly for this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	88.1%
Methods	The SWEAP-FCAI Instrument is made available to students online at the end of the second semester of their Field Practica (during SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). During AY 22-23, 42 of 77 eligible students completed the instrument – an overall response rate of 54.5%. Student responses to the seven SWEAP-FCAI items used to measure Competency #2: Engage anti-racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion (ADEI) in practice (see Appendix E) were used for this part of the assessment. Per SWEAP, a student is deemed competent if s/he answers 50% or more of the total number of questions correctly.		

Measurement Instrument #2	Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured on the LPE by students' Field Instructors.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	85% of graduating Social Work Majors will score at least a 4 on this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	96.1%
Methods	The LPE is completed by a student's Field Instructor at the end of each of the two semesters in their Field Practicum (SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). The Field Instructor evaluated whether the student effectively demonstrated each of three practice behaviors associated with Competency #2: Intern Engages Diversity and Difference in Practice (see Appendix F). On the basis of this evaluation, they then scored the competency from 1: lowest to 5: highest. This score was used for this part of the assessment. Students must earn a score of 3-5 for each competency by the end of the second semester (SWRK 483) in order for the student to pass their Field Practicum. During AY 22-23, Field Instructors completed LPEs for 77 of 77 students enrolled in SWRK 483 – a 100.0% completion rate		

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.	☒ Met	☐ Not Met

Results

Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle? Explain

A minimum 85% threshold of the combined SWEAP-FCAI Survey *and* LPE measures was used to assess achievement of SLO #2. Only those students who completed the SWEAP-FCAI Survey and whose LPE was also completed were included to make this assessment. Nine in ten (90.5%) of the 42 graduating Social Work students included in this analysis met or exceeded this threshold.. It should be noted this was a decrease from AY 21-22 (95.6%) though still well above the 85% benchmark and close to the 6-year average (93.8%). Despite this, the program achieved SLO #2.

(See Appendix B – Table 1 for year-to-year comparisons.)

Online students. Only those who completed the SWEAP-FCAI Survey *and* whose LPE was also completed (7 of 22; 31.8%) were included to assess their achievement of this competency. Close to 93% of the graduating Online Social Work students included in this analysis met or exceeded this threshold. (This was higher than the percentage of the overall group of students [90.5%].) Therefore, these students achieved SLO #2. (See Appendix B – Table 2 for comparison with all students included in the analysis as outlined in Table 1.)

The percentage of students who achieved the 80% benchmark on the SWEAP-FCAI survey decreased from 98.7% in AY 21-22 to 88.1% in AY 22-23. However, the percentage of students who achieved the 85% benchmark on the LPE increased from 92.6% in AY 21-22 to 96.1% which is above the 93.9% reported for this benchmark in AY 20-21 and above the 6-year average (95.0%).

(See Appendices G and H for more details regarding the individual measures including changes over time.)

Conclusions

What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.

As indicated in the AY 21-22 ASL report, it was expected that current efforts were sufficient to maintaining the percentage of graduating students achieving the minimum threshold on the SWEAP-FCAI. While SLO #2 was achieved, the reported decrease in the percentage of students achieving the SWEAP-FCAI benchmark needs to be assessed further.

Beginning in Fall 2019, Social Work Majors are now required to complete an additional 3-hour Social Work elective requirement. This provides the opportunity for students to increase their exposure and deepen their understanding and skillset related to working with diverse populations (e.g., older Americans, active duty military personnel and veterans, juvenile offenders). The majority of the graduating class in Spring 23 were subject to this new requirement. It was expected the potential benefit of the additional elective would be more fully evidenced by this group.

In addition, in SWRK 301: Social Work Practice for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (recently renamed Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Human Services), a a group assignment focused on culturally competent social work practice with diverse groups (e.g., Black/African American, Latinx/Hispanic Americans, immigrants/refugees, LGBTQ, people with disabilities) was added. It was expected the potential benefit of the additional assignment would be evidenced in this report.)

Further, a more coordinated and thorough capstone review of knowledge gained from human behavior, social welfare policy, research, and generalist practice courses – particularly as related to working with diverse populations – will continue to be integrated and enhanced in SWRK 483: Field Seminar II.

Each of the above strategies will continue along with the introduction of a *Common Reading* program. The program is designed to foster and deepen students' critical thinking, understanding, and application of key concepts highlighted in the reading as relevant to the subject matter of each of the BSW Program's required SWRK-courses through the entire curriculum. The integration will launch in Fall 23. The first cohort will be provided *Educated: A Memoir* (2018) by Tara Westover in Summer 23. Particular emphasis will be placed on highlighting and integrating concepts from the reading as applicable to this SLO. Potential benefits of the *Common Reading* program are expected to be evidenced in the AY 24-25 report when the first participating cohort will complete the BSW program in Spring 2025.

Plans for Next Assessment Cycle

IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle: As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a plan for the following year's assessment – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to collect a more appropriate artifact. Or, you may need to adjust targets because there are consistently exceeded or not met; Or, you might see the need to reconstruct your curriculum map. Or, you've found that the sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided. Whatever you plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. **All changes need not lead to quantitative results.

No change is planned for assessing this SLO in the next assessment cycle. This SLO will be assessed again in Spring 2024 using the LPE and SWEAP-FCAI Instrument. Students' completed LPEs will be collected via the online Field platform, Tevera, in the Spring semester as each student finishes their required internship hours at their field practicum (SWRK 482). The data will then be forwarded to the assessment coordinator (TBD). Students' access to the SWEAP-FCAI Instrument to students in their field seminar (SWRK 483) will be coordinated by Dr. Dana Sullivan who will forward a report generated by SWEAP to the assessment coordinator. Analyses of the combined averages from the LPE data and SWEAP-FCAI survey reports for this SLO will then be undertaken by the assessment coordinator for inclusion in the AY 23-24 ASL Report.

Student Learning Outcome 3	
Student Learning Outcome	Students will advance human rights and social, racial, economic, and environmental justice.

Measurement Instrument #1	SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured by the SWEAP-FCAI Instrument.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	At least 80% of graduating Social work Majors will answer at least 50% of questions correctly for this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	90.5%
Methods	The SWEAP-FCAI Instrument is made available to students online at the end of the second semester of their Field Practica (during SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). During AY 22-23, 42 of 77 eligible students completed the instrument – an overall response rate of 54.5%. Student responses to the seven SWEAP-FCAI items used to measure Competency #3: Advance human rights and social, racial, economic, and environmental justice. (see Appendix E) were used for this part of the assessment. Per SWEAP, a student is deemed competent if s/he answers 50% or more of the total number of questions correctly.		

Measurement Instrument #2	Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured on the LPE by students' Field Instructors.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	85% of graduating Social Work Majors will score at least a 4 on this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	94.8%
Methods	The LPE is completed by a student's Field Instructor at the end of each of the two semesters in their Field Practicum (SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). The Field Instructor evaluated whether the student effectively demonstrated each of two practice behaviors associated with Competency #3: Intern Advances Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice (see Appendix F). On the basis of this evaluation, they then scored the competency from 1: lowest to 5: highest. This score was used for this part of the assessment. Students must earn a score of 3-5 for each competency by the end of the second semester (SWRK 483) in order for the student to pass their Field Practicum. During AY 22-23, Field Instructors completed LPEs for 77 of 77 students enrolled in SWRK 483 – a 100.0% completion rate		

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal	☒ Met	☐ Not Met

Student Learning Outcome 3.		

Results

Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle? Explain

A minimum 85% threshold of the combined SWEAP-FCAI Survey *and* LPE measures was used to assess achievement of SLO #3. Only those students who completed the SWEAP-FCAI Survey and whose LPE was also completed were included to make this assessment. Over 9 in 10 (92.9%) of the 42 graduating Social Work students included in this analysis met or exceeded this threshold.

This was an increase from AY 21-22 (89.2%) and higher than the 6-year average (89.4%).

The program achieved SLO #3.

(See Appendix B – Table 1 for year-to-year comparisons.)

Online students. Only those Online BSW program option students who completed the SWEAP-FCAI Survey *and* whose LPE was also completed (7 of 22; 31.8%) were included to assess their achievement of this competency. Close to 93% of the graduating Online Social Work students included in this analysis met or exceeded this threshold. (This was the same as the percentage of the overall group of students [92.9%].) These students achieved SLO #3. (See Appendix B – Table 2 for comparison with all students included in the analysis as outlined in Table 1.)

The percentage of students who achieved the 80% benchmark on the SWEAP-FCAI Survey increased from 86.1% in AY 21-22 to 90.5%. The percentage of students who achieved the 85% benchmark on the LPE increased from 92.6% in AY 21-22 to 94.8% which is above the 92.6% reported for this benchmark in AY 20-21 and above the 6-year average (93.3%).

(See Appendices G and H for more details regarding the individual measures including percent changes over time.)

Conclusions

Conclusions: What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.

It was expected that the more coordinated and thorough capstone review of knowledge gained from human behavior, social welfare policy, research, and generalist practice courses including content on advancing human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice in social work practice integrated into SWRK 483: Field Seminar II would result in an additional 2.5% percentage increase of graduating students achieving the minimum threshold on the SWEAP-FCAI Survey above the level reported in the AY 21-22 report. It was also anticipated that the present political context was likely to increase students' focus and interest in social and economic justice issues. This occurred.

The following strategies will continue:

Most Social Work Majors now complete two (2) 3-hour Social Work electives. This provides the opportunity for students to increase their exposure and deepen their understanding and skillset related to working with diverse populations (e.g., older Americans, active duty military personnel and veterans, juvenile offenders) and/or related social, economic, and/or environmental justice issues (e.g., the opioid epidemic, trauma, diversity and social welfare, financial well-being).

In SWRK 301: Social Work Practice for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (recently renamed as Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Human Services), and specific to SLO #3, students explore how their personal identity and experiences shape their views of social, economic, and environmental justice issues affecting marginalized populations. The course also focuses on building upon this understanding to help students begin to develop cultural competence in preparation for social work practice with vulnerable client systems.

A more coordinated and thorough capstone review of knowledge gained from human behavior, social welfare policy, research, and generalist practice courses including content on advancing human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice in social work practice will continue to be integrated and enhanced in SWRK 483: Field Seminar II.

Plans for Next Assessment Cycle

IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle: As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a plan for the following year's assessment – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to collect a more appropriate artifact. Or, you may need to adjust targets because there are consistently exceeded or not met; Or, you might see the need to reconstruct your curriculum map. Or, you've found that the sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided. Whatever you plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. **All changes need not lead to quantitative results**.

No change is planned for assessing this SLO in the next assessment cycle. This SLO will be assessed again in Spring 2024 using the LPE and SWEAP-FCAI Instrument. Students' completed LPEs will be collected via the online Field platform, Tevera, in the Spring semester as each

student finishes their required internship hours at their field practicum (SWRK 482). The data will then be forwarded to the assessment coordinator (TBD). Students' access to the SWEAP-FCAI Instrument to students in their field seminar (SWRK 483) will be coordinated by Dr. Dana Sullivan who will forward a report generated by SWEAP to the assessment coordinator. Analyses of the combined averages from the LPE data and SWEAP-FCAI survey reports for this SLO will then be undertaken by the assessment coordinator for inclusion in the AY 23-24 ASL Report.

Student Learning Outcome 4	
Student Learning Outcome	Students will engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice.

Measurement Instrument #1	SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured by the SWEAP-FCAI Instrument.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	At least 80% of graduating Social work Majors will answer at least 50% of questions correctly for this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	76.2%
Methods	The SWEAP-FCAI Instrument is made available to students online at the end of the second semester of their Field Practica (during SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). During AY 22-23, 42 of 77 eligible students completed the instrument – an overall response rate of 54.5%. Student responses to the seven SWEAP-FCAI items used to measure Competency #4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice (see Appendix E) were used for this part of the assessment. Per SWEAP, a student is deemed competent if s/he answers 50% or more of the total number of questions correctly.		

Measurement Instrument #2	Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured on the LPE by students' Field Instructors.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	85% of graduating Social Work Majors will score at least a 4 on this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	92.2%
Methods	The LPE is completed by a student's Field Instructor at the end of each of the two semesters in their Field Practicum (SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). The Field Instructor evaluated whether the student effectively demonstrated each of three practice behaviors associated with Competency #4: Intern Engages in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice (see Appendix F). On the basis of this evaluation, they then scored the competency from 1: lowest to 5: highest. This score was used for this part of the assessment. Students must earn a score of 3-5 for each competency by the end of the second semester (SWRK 483) in order for the student to pass their Field Practicum. During AY 22-23, Field Instructors completed LPEs for 77 of 77 students enrolled in SWRK 483 – a 100.0% completion rate		

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.	☐ Met	☒ Not Met

Results

Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle? Explain

A minimum 85% threshold of the combined SWEAP-FCAI Survey *and* LPE measures was used to assess achievement of SLO #4. Only those students who completed the SWEAP-FCAI Survey and whose LPE was also completed were included to make this assessment. The 42 graduating Social Work students included in this analysis fell just short of the 85% threshold (84.5%). Therefore, the program *did not* achieve SLO #4.

However, this was a substantial increase from AY 21-22 (66.5%), and the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the threshold was higher than the 6-year average (73.0%).

(See Appendix B – Table 1 for year-to-year comparisons.)

Online students. Only those Online BSW program option students who completed the SWEAP-FCAI Survey *and* whose LPE was also completed (7 of 22; 31.8%) were included to assess their achievement of this competency. Though over two-thirds (78.6%) of the graduating Online Social Work students included in this analysis met or exceeded this threshold (this was lower than the percentage of the overall group of students [94.5%]), these students did not achieve SLO #4. (See Appendix B – Table 2 for comparison with all students included in the analysis as outlined in Table 1.)

The percentage of students who achieved the 85% benchmark on the LPE decreased slightly from 92.6% in AY 21-22 to 92.2%; however, this was still above the 91.5% reported for this benchmark in AY 20-21 and above the 6-year average (91.1%). Therefore, this is not an area of concern.

(See Appendices G and H for more details regarding the individual measures including changes over time.)

Conclusions

What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.

The percentage of students who achieved the 80% benchmark on the SWEAP-FCAI survey increased from 40.5% in AY 21-22 to 76.2%.

This major increase is attributed to the more coordinated and thorough capstone review of knowledge gained from human behavior, social welfare policy, research, and generalist practice courses including content on research methods integrated into SWRK 483: Field Seminar II (a modest 2.5% percentage increase of graduating students achieving the minimum threshold on the SWEAP-FCAI Survey above the AY 21-22 was anticipated.)

In AY 19-20, assignments in SWRK 345 were modified and reorganized to more strongly emphasize the knowledge and skills required for program evaluation in students' Field Practicum I (SWRK 480). This included the inclusion of new assignments focused on: 1) research literacy and 2) program evaluation; and 3) the completion of two CITI (Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative) Trainings ([a] Social/Behavioral Research Course and [b] Social and Behavioral Responsible Conduct of Research Course [RCR]). Parallel to this course, students proposed a project in SWRK 481: Field Seminar I that is implemented at their Field agency in response to an identified agency need in their second semester of their Field Practicum II (SWRK 482). The proposal outlines their project and the methods required to evaluate their project including a draft of a pre- and post-test survey. Our expectation has been that they are better prepared to develop and execute their program evaluation on the basis of taking SWRK 345 concurrently with their first semester in their Field Practicum.

The group of students assessed for this report were the third group to take SWRK 345 as a required course concurrent with their Field Practicum I (SWRK 480) and Field Seminar I (SWRK 481) (in Fall 2021) – a strategy designed to enhance their research and program evaluation knowledge and skillset.*

Course designers from the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (CITL) worked with the BSW program through its Quality Assurance Program (QAP) in Spring 2022 to enhance the course design of SWRK 345. While the process focused on an asynchronous bi-term version of the course to be implemented in Fall 2022 for the BSW Program's new Online program option, it was anticipated the re-design would have a corollary impact on the design of the full-term version of the course (as evidenced in this report).

A more coordinated and thorough capstone review of knowledge gained from human behavior, social welfare policy, research, and generalist practice courses including specific research methods content was integrated into SWRK 483: Field Seminar II.

*It should be noted due to the complexity of coordinating SWRK 345 and SWRK 481/483 instruction, the challenge of navigating multiple students through the IRB process, and the challenges of evaluating an off-site program at students' internship agencies, the BSW program has determined not to continue this curricular innovation. Instead, students will complete a capstone project in SWRK 483 that does not include an implemented program evaluation component. It is unclear how this change will affect student competency in this area. However, it is hoped the coordinated and thorough capstone review of knowledge gained from human behavior, social welfare policy, research, and generalist

practice courses including content on research methods in SWRK 483 will be sufficient to support students' competency in this area on the SWEAP-FCAI survey.

Plans for Next Assessment Cycle

IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle: As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a plan for the following year's assessment – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to collect a more appropriate artifact. Or, you may need to adjust targets because there are consistently exceeded or not met; Or, you might see the need to reconstruct your curriculum map. Or, you've found that the sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided. Whatever you plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. **All changes need not lead to quantitative results.

This SLO will be assessed again in Spring 2024 using the LPE and SWEAP-FCAI Instrument. Students' completed LPEs will be collected via the online Field platform, Tevera, in the Spring semester as each student finishes their required internship hours at their field practicum (SWRK 482). The data will then be forwarded to the assessment coordinator (TBD). Students' access to the SWEAP-FCAI Instrument to students in their field seminar (SWRK 483) will be coordinated by Dr. Dana Sullivan who will forward a report generated by SWEAP to the assessment coordinator. Analyses of the combined averages from the LPE data and SWEAP-FCAI survey reports for this SLO will then be undertaken by the assessment coordinator for inclusion in the AY 23-24 ASL Report.

Additionally, the team has decided to add a class artifact to the assessment plan. This artifact will be the final research proposal paper completed in SWRK 345. This paper will be assessed by each instructor utilizing a rubric which includes a score for the introduction of the social problem, literature review, research question, and methodology utilizing the selected evaluation instrument. A percentage of 70% on the selected rubric items will be utilized to assess competency. The rubric is currently under development, and so it is unable to be included in this report. It will be available next year. This artifact will be used to assess with more specificity the issue that undermines or limits students' knowledge regarding this SLO.

Student Learning Outcome 5	
Student Learning Outcome	Students will engage in policy practice.

Measurement Instrument #1	SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured by the SWEAP-FCAI Instrument.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	At least 80% of graduating Social work Majors will answer at least 50% of questions correctly for this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	78.6%
Methods	The SWEAP-FCAI Instrument is made available to students online at the end of the second semester of their Field Practica (during SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). During AY 22-23, 42 of 77 eligible students completed the instrument – an overall response rate of 54.5%. Student responses to the seven SWEAP-FCAI items used to measure Competency #5: Engage in Policy Practice (see Appendix E) were used for this part of the assessment. Per SWEAP, a student is deemed competent if s/he answers 50% or more of the total number of questions correctly.		

Measurement Instrument #2	Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured on the LPE by students' Field Instructors.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	85% of graduating Social Work Majors will score at least a 4 on this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	90.9%
Methods	The LPE is completed by a student's Field Instructor at the end of each of the two semesters in their Field Practicum (SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). The Field Instructor evaluated whether the student effectively demonstrated each of three practice behaviors associated with Competency #5: Intern Engages in Policy Practice (see Appendix F). On the basis of this evaluation, they then scored the competency from 1: lowest to 5: highest. This score was used for this part of the assessment. Students must earn a score of 3-5 for each competency by the end of the second semester (SWRK 483) in order for the student to pass their Field Practicum. During AY 22-23, Field Instructors completed LPEs for 77 of 77 students enrolled in SWRK 483 – a 100.0% completion rate		

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 5.	☐ Met	☒ Not Met

Results

Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle? Explain

A minimum 85% threshold of the combined SWEAP-FCAI Survey and LPE measures was used to assess achievement of SLO #5. Only those students who completed the SWEAP-FCAI Survey and whose LPE was also completed were included to make this assessment. Though over 8 in 10 (84.5%) of the 42 graduating Social Work students included in this analysis met or exceeded this threshold, the program *did not* achieve SLO #5.

Despite this, this was an impressive increase from AY 21-22 (68.4%), and the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the threshold was higher than the 6-year average (75.1%).

(See Appendix B – Table 1 for year-to-year comparisons.)

Online students. Only those Online BSW program option students who completed the SWEAP-FCAI Survey *and* whose LPE was also completed (7 of 22; 31.8%) were included to assess their achievement of this competency. Over nine-in-ten (92.9%) of the graduating Online Social Work students included in this analysis met or exceeded this threshold. (This was higher than the percentage of the overall group of students [84.5%]). Therefore, these students achieved SLO #5. (See Appendix B – Table 2 for comparison with all students included in the analysis as outlined in Table 1.)

The percentage of students who achieved the 85% benchmark on the LPE showed a modest increase from 90.1% in AY 21-22 to 90.9%. This exceeded the 90.2% reported for this benchmark in AY 20-21 and was above the 6-year average (90.1%).

(See Appendices G and H for more details regarding the individual measures including changes over time.)

Conclusions

What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.

The percentage of students who achieved the 80% benchmark on the SWEAP-FCAI Survey increased from 46.8% in AY 21-22 to 78.6%.

The more coordinated and thorough capstone review of knowledge gained from human behavior, social welfare policy, research, and generalist practice courses including content on policy practice integrated into SWRK 483: Field Seminar II was anticipated to result in a modest 2.5% percentage increase of graduating students achieving the minimum threshold on the SWEAP-FCAI Survey above the level reported in the AY 21-22 report. This was exceeded.

Therefore, the capstone review and the following strategy will continue:

Planned in AY 18-19, the sequencing of the required course, SWRK 395: Social Welfare Policy and Issues, in the Social Work curriculum was moved so that students (beginning in AY 20-21) would be concurrently enrolled in their second semester of their Field Practicum II (SWRK 482). The third group to experience this realignment are the students included in this assessment report. The assignments in SWRK 395 were not modified; however, it was expected that students' experiences at their Field Practicum agencies would better ground their perspectives about the topics in the course that focus on: the development of the current social welfare system in the US, the effects of the economic and political context on policy and the social welfare system, tools for analyzing policy as it relates to need, and skills and steps for policy development. It was expected that the federal, state, local, and/or agency-based policies that impact students' Field Practicum agencies would function as reference material for better understanding these more abstract course concepts in SWRK 395.

Plans for Next Assessment Cycle

IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle: As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a plan for the following year's assessment – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to collect a more appropriate artifact. Or, you may need to adjust targets because there are consistently exceeded or not met; Or, you might see the need to reconstruct your curriculum map. Or, you've found that the sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided. Whatever you plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. **All changes need not lead to quantitative results.

This SLO will be assessed again in Spring 2024 using the LPE and SWEAP-FCAI Instrument. Students' completed LPEs will be collected via the online Field platform, Tevera, in the Spring semester as each student finishes their required internship hours at their field practicum (SWRK 482). The data will then be forwarded to the assessment coordinator (TBD). Students' access to the SWEAP-FCAI Instrument to students in their field seminar (SWRK 483) will be coordinated by Dr. Dana Sullivan who will forward a report generated by SWEAP to the assessment coordinator. Analyses of the combined averages from the LPE data and SWEAP-FCAI survey reports for this SLO will then be undertaken by the assessment coordinator for inclusion in the AY 23-24 ASL Report.

Additionally, it seems some of the SWEAP questions related to policy are more historical (i.e., the year that Social Security was implemented, etc.), so the plan is to add an assignment based specifically on the history of social welfare policy implementation. The proposed assignment is for students to watch a video on that topic and then take a quiz after to reinforce historical dates.

Student Learning Outcome 6	
Student Learning Outcome	Students will demonstrate engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation skills across client systems and populations.

Measurement Instrument #1	SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured by the SWEAP-FCAI Instrument.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	At least 80% of graduating Social work Majors will answer at least 50% of questions correctly for this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	95.2%
Methods	The SWEAP-FCAI Instrument is made available to students online at the end of the second semester of their Field Practica (during SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). During AY 22-23, 42 of 77 eligible students completed the instrument – an overall response rate of 54.5%. Student responses to the 24 combined SWEAP-FCAI items used to measure Competency #6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities, Competency #7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities, Competency #8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities, and Competency #9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities (see Appendix E) were used for this part of the assessment. The combined competencies reflect the interrelated parts of the planned change process used by social workers when working with client systems (i.e., engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation). Per SWEAP, a student is deemed competent if s/he answers 50% or more of the total number of questions correctly.		

Measurement Instrument #2	Learning Plan and Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE).		
Criteria for Student Success	Graduating Social Work Majors will demonstrate competency in this area as measured on the LPE by students' Field Instructors.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	85% of graduating Social Work Majors will score at least a 4 on this competency.	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	93.8%
Methods	The LPE is completed by a student's Field Instructor at the end of each of the two semesters in their Field Practicum (SWRK 483: Field Practicum II). The Field Instructor evaluated whether the student effectively demonstrated each of fifteen practice behaviors associated with Competency #6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities, Competency #7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities, Competency #8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations		

	and Communities, and Competency #9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities (see Appendix F) were used for this part of the assessment. The combined competencies reflect the interrelated parts of the planned change process used by social workers when working with client systems (i.e., engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation). On the basis of this evaluation, they then scored the competency from 1: lowest to 5: highest. This score was used for this part of the assessment. Students must earn a score of 3-5 for each competency by the end of the second semester (SWRK 483) in order for the student to pass their Field Practicum. During AY 22-23, Field Instructors completed LPEs for 77 of 77 students enrolled in SWRK 483 – a 100.0% completion rate

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 6.	☒ **Met**	☐ **Not Met**

Results
Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle? Explain A minimum 85% threshold of the combined SWEAP-FCAI Survey and LPE measures was used to assess achievement of SLO #6. Only those students who completed the SWEAP-FCAI Survey and whose LPE was also completed were included to make this assessment. Over 9 in 10 (95.2%) of the 42 graduating Social Work students included in this analysis met or exceeded this threshold. Therefore, the program achieved SLO #6. In AY 21-22, graduating students did not meet the benchmark with 84.3% meeting or exceeding the threshold so this is a positive development for WKU's BSW program. In addition, the AY 22-23 percentage was higher than the 6-year average (88.7%). (See Appendix B – Table 1 for year-to-year comparisons.) ***Online students.*** Only those Online BSW program option students who completed the SWEAP-FCAI Survey *and* whose LPE was also completed (7 of 22; 31.8%) were included to assess their achievement of this competency. Over ninety-four percent (94.6%) of the graduating Online Social Work students included in this analysis met or exceeded this threshold. (This was only slightly lower than the percentage of the overall group of students [95.2%]). These students achieved SLO #6. (See Appendix B – Table 2 for comparison with all students included in the analysis as outlined in Table 1.) The percentage of students who achieved the 85% benchmark on the LPE showed an increase from 91.4% in AY 21-22 to 93.8%. This was above the 93.6% reported for this benchmark in AY 20-21 and above the 6-year average (92.7%).

(See Appendices G and H for more details regarding the individual measures including changes over time.)

Conclusions

What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.

The percentage of students who achieved the 80% benchmark on the SWEAP-FCAI Survey increased from 77.5% in AY 21-22 to 97.6%.

It was expected that the benefits to students' knowledge as a result of a more coordinated and thorough capstone review of knowledge gained from human behavior, social welfare policy, research, and generalist practice courses particularly related to the planned change process, i.e., client engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation, integrated into SWRK 483: Field Seminar II would realize an increase in the percentage of graduating students achieving the minimum threshold on the SWEAP-FCAI Survey. It should be noted that the planned implementation of the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning's (CITL) Quality Assurance Program (QAP) process to the BSW Program's practice courses, i.e., SWRK 357, 375, 378, 379, 381 was anticipated to have a similarly positive impact on students' competency in this area. However, in Fall 22, the BSW program determined to suspend the QAP process until completion of syllabi revisions currently in process and needed to prepare for the BSW program's reaffirmation of accreditation process, i.e., integration of the 2022 EPAS. (This process will likely not re-start until Fall 25.) Nevertheless, the anticipated 2.5% increase of students demonstrated competency in this area was well exceeded.

For this reason, the following strategy will continue:

BSW students complete two 3-hour Social Work electives , e.g., SWRK 326: Services for Older Americans, SWRK 356: Services for Juvenile Offenders, SWRK 436: Services to Children, and SWRK 437: Military Social Work, which focus on engaging, assessing, intervening, and evaluating with a variety of client populations and systems.

Plans for Next Assessment Cycle

**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle: As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a plan for the following year's assessment – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to collect a more appropriate artifact. Or, you may need to adjust targets because there are consistently exceeded or not met; Or, you might see the need to reconstruct

your curriculum map. Or, you've found that the sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided. Whatever you plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. **All changes need not lead to quantitative results**.

No change is planned for assessing this SLO in the next assessment cycle. This SLO will be assessed again in Spring 2024 using the LPE and SWEAP-FCAI Instrument. Students' completed LPEs will be collected via the online Field platform, Tevera, in the Spring semester as each student finishes their required internship hours at their field practicum (SWRK 482). The data will then be forwarded to the assessment coordinator (TBD). Students' access to the SWEAP-FCAI Instrument to students in their field seminar (SWRK 483) will be coordinated by Dr. Dana Sullivan who will forward a report generated by SWEAP to the assessment coordinator. Analyses of the combined averages from the LPE data and SWEAP-FCAI survey reports for this SLO will then be undertaken by the assessment coordinator for inclusion in the AY 23-24 ASL Report.

Appendix A

Curriculum Map

Course Subject	Number	Course Title	SLO1 Behavior	SLO2 Diversity	SLO3 Justice	SLO4 Research	SLO5 Policy	SLO6 Practice	
SWRK	101	Foundations of Human Service	I	I	I		I		**Pre-Major**
SWRK	301	Social Work Practice for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	R/A	R/A	R/A		R/A	I	**Sem 1**
SWRK	330	Human Behavior in the Social Environment	R	R	R/A		R	R/A	
SWRK	375	Social Work Practice I	R/A	R/A	R			R/A	
SWRK	357	Case Management	R	R/A	R			R/A	**Sem 2**
SWRK	378	Social Work Practice II	R	R	R	R/A		R/A	
SWRK	379	Introduction to Social Work Communication Skills	R	R	R	I		R/A	
SWRK	345	Social Work Research Methods	R	R/A	R/A	R/A/M			**Sem 3**
SWRK	381	Social Work Practice III	R	R	R	R/A		R/A	
SWRK	480	Social Work Field Practicum I	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	
SWRK	481	Social Work Field Seminar I	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	
SWRK	395	Social Work Policy and Issues	R	R	R/A		R/M/A		**Sem 4**
SWRK	482	Social Work Field Practicum II	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	
SWRK	483	Social Work Field Seminar II	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	M/A	

I = Introduced; R = Reinforced/Developed; M = Mastered; A = Assessed

Appendix B

***Combined* Learning Plan Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE) Scores**
***and* SWEAP-FCAI Survey and Exit Instrument* Scores**

Table 1. *Percentage of Students Meeting & Exceeding Benchmark (85%)*

Academic Year (No. of respondents) [1]	Student Learning Outcomes					
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
AY 22-23 (# of Respondents = 42)	95.2%	90.5%	92.9%	84.5%	84.5%	95.2%
AY 21-22 (# of Respondents = 79)	89.9%	95.6%	89.2%	66.5%	68.4%	84.3%
AY 20-21 (# of Respondents = 80)	85.0%	93.8%	88.8%	65.6%	68.1%	83.9%
AY 19-20 (# of Respondents = 67)	89.1%	93.5%	87.0%	70.1%	66.5%	79.9%
AY 18-19 (# of Respondents = 37)	84.1%	93.8%	89.0%	65.8%	73.9%	83.2%
AY 17-18 (# of Respondents = 43)	89.1%	91.2%	87.2%	74.5%	78.8%	86.8%
Average AY 17-18 through AY 22-23 (N = 348)	*88.7%*	*93.8%*	*89.4%*	*73.0%*	*75.1%*	*88.7%*

Note. Benchmark = At least 85% of students will demonstrate threshold mastery of SLOs as measured by *combined* LPE *and* SWEAP-FCAI assessment measures; *The SWEAP-FCAI survey used for AY 22-23 was not labelled by SWEAP as an "exit instrument"

Table 2. *Percentage of Online Students Meeting & Exceeding Benchmark (85%)*

Academic Year (No. of respondents)	Student Learning Outcomes					
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
AY 22-23 (# of Respondents = 7)	92.9%	92.9%	92.9%	78.6%	92.9%	94.6%

Note. Benchmark = At least 85% of students will demonstrate threshold mastery of SLOs as measured by *combined* LPE *and* SWEAP-FCAI assessment measures

---

[1] In AY 22-23, 21-22, and 20-21, the number of respondents includes only those graduating students who completed *both* a Learning Plan Evaluation (LPE) *and* the SWEAP-FCAI Exit Survey.

Appendix C

Council on Social Work Education (CSWE)
2015 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS)

<mark>*** Learning Plan Evaluation (LPE) criteria were based on the 2015 EPAS ***</mark>

Core Competencies

In 2008 CSWE adopted a competency-based education framework for its EPAS. As in related health and human service professions, the policy moved from a model of curriculum design focused on content (what students should be taught) and structure (the format and organization of educational components) to one focused on student learning outcomes. A competency-based approach refers to identifying and assessing what students demonstrate in practice. In social work this approach involves assessing the students' ability to demonstrate the competencies identified in the educational policy. (EPAS, 2015, p. 4)

Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior

Social workers understand the value base of the profession and its ethical standards, as well as relevant laws and regulations that may impact practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Social workers understand frameworks in practice, research, and policy arenas. Social workers recognize personal values and the distinction between personal and professional values. They also understand how their personal experiences and affective reactions influence their professional judgment and behavior. Social workers understand the profession's history, its mission, and the roles and responsibilities of the profession. Social workers also understand the role of other professions when engaged in inter-professional teams. Social workers recognize the importance of life-long learning and are committed to continually updating their skills to ensure they are relevant and effective. Social workers also understand emerging forms of technology and the ethical use of technology in social work practice. Social workers:

- Make ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models of ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context;
- Use reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations;
- Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written and electronic communication;
- Use technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes; and
- Use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior.

Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice

Social workers understand how diversity and difference characterize and shape the human experience and are critical to the formation of identify. The dimensions of diversity are understood as the intersectionality of multiple factors including but not limited to age, class, color, culture, disability and ability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, marital status, political ideology, race, religion/spirituality, sex, sexual orientation, and tribal sovereign status. Social workers understand that, as a consequence of difference, a person's life experiences may include oppression, poverty, marginalization, and alienation as well as privilege, power, and acclaim. Social workers also understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination and recognize the extent to

which a culture's structures and values, including social, economic, political, and cultural exclusions, may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create privilege and power. Social workers:

- Apply and communicate understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels;
- Present themselves as learners and engage clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences; and
- Apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies.

Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice
Social workers understand that every person regardless of position in society has fundamental human rights such as freedom, safety, privacy, an adequate standard of living, health care, and education. Social workers understand the global interconnections of oppression and human rights violations, and are knowledgeable about theories of human need and social justice and strategies to promote social and economic justice and human rights. Social workers understand strategies designed to eliminate oppressive structural barriers to ensure that social goods, rights, and responsibilities are distributed equitably and that civil, political, environmental, economic, social, and cultural human rights are protected. Social workers:

- Apply their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels; and
- Engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice.

Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice
Social workers understand quantitative and qualitative research methods and their respective roles in advancing a science of social work and in evaluating their practice. Social workers know the principles of logic, scientific inquiry, and culturally informed and ethical approaches to building knowledge. Social works understand that evidence that informs practice derives from multi-disciplinary sources and multiple ways of knowing. They also understand the processes for translating research findings into effective practice. Social workers:

- Use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research;
- Apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative and qualitative research methods and research findings; and
- Use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy and service delivery.

Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice
Social workers understand that human rights and social justice, as well as social welfare and services, are mediated by policy and its implementation at the federal, state, and local levels. Social workers understand the history and current structure of social policies and services, the role of policy in service delivery, and the role of practice in policy development. Social workers understand their role in policy development and implementation within their practice settings at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels and they actively engage in policy practice to effect change within those settings. Social workers recognize and understand the historical, social, cultural, economic, organizational, environmental, and global influences that affect social policy. They are also knowledgeable about policy formulation, analysis, implementation, and evaluation. Social workers:

- Identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services;

- Assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services; and
- Apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.

Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
Social workers understand that engagement is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers value the importance of human relationships. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge to facilitate engagement with clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand strategies to engage diverse clients and constituencies to advance practice effectiveness. Social workers understand how their personal experiences and affective reactions may impact their ability to effectively engage with diverse clients and constituencies. Social workers value principles of relationship-building and inter-professional collaboration to facilitate engagement with clients, constituencies, and other professionals as appropriate. Social workers:
- Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies; and
- Use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies.

Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
Social workers understand that assessment is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge in the assessment of diverse clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities. Social workers understand methods of assessment with diverse clients and constituencies to advance practice effectiveness. Social workers recognize the implications of the larger practice context in the assessment process and value the importance of inter-professional collaboration in this process. Social workers understand how their personal experiences and affective reactions may affect their assessment and decision-making. Social workers:
- Collect and organize data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies;
- Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies;
- Develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies; and
- Select appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies.

Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
Social workers understand that intervention is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers are knowledgeable about evidence-informed

interventions to achieve the goals of clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge to effectively intervene with clients and constituencies. Social workers understand methods of identifying, analyzing and implementing evidence-informed interventions to achieve clients and constituency goals. Social workers value the importance of inter-professional teamwork and communication in interventions, recognizing that beneficial outcomes may require interdisciplinary, inter-professional, and inter-organizational collaboration. Social workers:

- Critically choose and implement interventions to achieve practice goals and enhance capacities of clients and constituencies;
- Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies;
- Use inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to achieve beneficial practice outcomes;
- Negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies; and
- Facilitate effective transitions and endings that advance mutually agreed-on goals.

Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
Social workers understand that evaluation is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individual, families, groups, organizations, and communities.   Social workers recognize the importance of evaluating processes and outcomes to advance practice policy, and service delivery effectiveness. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge in evaluating outcomes. Social workers understand qualitative and quantitative methods for evaluating outcomes and practice effectiveness. Social workers:

- Select and use appropriate methods for evaluation of outcomes;
- Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes;
- Critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate intervention and program processes and outcomes, and
- Apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.

Council on Social Work Education (CSWE)
2022 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) [2]

Core Competencies
CSWE adopted a competency-based education framework for its EPAS. A competency-based approach identifies and assesses what students demonstrate in practice. In social work, this approach involves assessing students' ability to demonstrate the competencies identified in the educational policy. Social work competence is the ability to integrate and apply social work knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes to practice situations in a culturally responsive, purposeful, intentional, and professional manner to promote human and community well-being. An individual social worker's competence is seen as developmental and dynamic, evolving over time in relation to continuous learning and changes in the social environment and professional knowledge base. Competency-based education is an outcome-oriented approach to curriculum design. The goal of the outcome-oriented approach is to ensure that students are able to demonstrate the integration and application of the competencies in practice. Programs use assessment methods to gather data that serve as evidence of student learning outcomes and the demonstration of competence. (CSWE, 2022, p. 7)

Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior
Social workers understand the value base of the profession and its ethical standards, as well as relevant policies, laws, and regulations that may affect practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand that ethics are informed by principles of human rights and apply them toward realizing social, racial, economic, and environmental justice in their practice. Social workers understand frameworks of ethical decision making and apply principles of critical thinking to those frameworks in practice, research, and policy arenas. Social workers recognize and manage personal values and the distinction between personal and professional values. Social workers understand how their evolving worldview, personal experiences, and affective reactions influence their professional judgment and behavior. Social workers take measures to care for themselves professionally and personally, understanding that self-care is paramount for competent and ethical social work practice. Social workers use rights-based, antiracist, and anti-oppressive lenses to understand and critique the profession's history, mission, roles, and responsibilities and recognize historical and current contexts of oppression in shaping institutions and social work. Social workers understand the role of other professionals when engaged in interprofessional practice. Social workers recognize the importance of lifelong learning and are committed to continually updating their skills to ensure relevant and effective practice. Social workers understand digital technology and the ethical use of technology in social work practice. Social workers:

- Make ethical decisions by applying the standards of the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics within the profession as appropriate to the context;
- Demonstrate professional behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication;
- Use technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes; and
- Use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior.

Competency 2: Advance Human Rights and Social, Racial, Economic, and Environmental Justice

---

[2] SWEAP-FCAI Pilot Survey items were based on the 2022 EPAS

Social workers understand that every person regardless of position in society has fundamental human rights. Social workers are knowledgeable about the global intersecting and ongoing injustices throughout history that result in oppression and racism, including social work's role and response. Social workers critically evaluate the distribution of power and privilege in society in order to promote social, racial, economic, and environmental justice by reducing inequities and ensuring dignity and respect for all. Social workers advocate for and engage in strategies to eliminate oppressive structural barriers to ensure that social resources, rights, and responsibilities are distributed equitably and that civil, political, economic, social, and cultural human rights are protected. Social workers:

- Advocate for human rights at the individual, family, group, organizational, and community system levels; and
- Engage in practices that advance human rights to promote social, racial, economic, and environmental justice.

Competency 3: Engage Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI) in Practice
Social workers understand how racism and oppression shape human experiences and how these two constructs influence practice at the individual, family, group, organizational, and community levels and in policy and research. Social workers understand the pervasive impact of White supremacy and privilege and use their knowledge, awareness, and skills to engage in anti-racist practice. Social workers understand how diversity and intersectionality shape human experiences and identity development and affect equity and inclusion. The dimensions of diversity are understood as the intersectionality of factors including but not limited to age, caste, class, color, culture, disability and ability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, generational status, immigration status, legal status, marital status, political ideology, race, nationality, religion and spirituality, sex, sexual orientation, and tribal sovereign status. Social workers understand that this intersectionality means that a person's life experiences may include oppression, poverty, marginalization, and alienation as well as privilege and power. Social workers understand the societal and historical roots of social and racial injustices and the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination. Social workers understand cultural humility and recognize the extent to which a culture's structures and values, including social, economic, political, racial, technological, and cultural exclusions, may create privilege and power resulting in systemic oppression. Social workers:

- Demonstrate anti-racist and anti-oppressive social work practice at the individual, family, group, organizational, community, research, and policy levels; and
- Demonstrate cultural humility by applying critical reflection, self-awareness, and self- regulation to manage the influence of bias, power, privilege, and values in working with clients and constituencies, acknowledging them as experts of their own lived experiences.

Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice
Social workers use ethical, culturally informed, anti-racist, and anti-oppressive approaches in conducting research and building knowledge. Social workers use research to inform their practice decision making and articulate how their practice experience informs research and evaluation decisions. Social workers critically evaluate and critique current, empirically sound research to inform decisions pertaining to practice, policy, and programs. Social workers understand the inherent bias in research and evaluate design, analysis, and interpretation using an anti-racist and anti-oppressive perspective. Social workers know how to access, critique, and synthesize the current literature to develop appropriate research questions and hypotheses. Social workers demonstrate knowledge and skills regarding qualitative and quantitative research methods and analysis, and they interpret data derived from these methods. Social workers demonstrate knowledge about methods to assess reliability and validity in social work research. Social workers can articulate and share research findings in ways that are usable to a variety of clients and constituencies. Social workers understand the value of evidence derived from interprofessional and diverse research methods, approaches, and sources. Social workers:

- Apply research findings to inform and improve practice, policy, and programs; and
- Identify ethical, culturally informed, anti-racist, and anti-oppressive strategies that address inherent biases for use in quantitative and qualitative research methods to advance the purposes of social work.

Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice

Social workers identify social policy at the local, state, federal, and global level that affects well-being, human rights and justice, service delivery, and access to social services. Social workers recognize the historical, social, racial, cultural, economic, organizational, environmental, and global influences that affect social policy. Social workers understand and critique the history and current structures of social policies and services and the role of policy in service delivery through rights-based, anti-oppressive, and anti-racist lenses. Social workers influence policy formulation, analysis, implementation, and evaluation within their practice settings with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers actively engage in and advocate for anti-racist and anti-oppressive policy practice to effect change in those settings. Social workers:

- Use social justice, anti-racist, and anti-oppressive lenses to assess how social welfare policies affect the delivery of and access to social services; and
- Apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, racial, economic, and environmental justice.

Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Social workers understand that engagement is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with and on behalf of individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers value the importance of human relationships. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and person-in-environment and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge to facilitate engagement with clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers are self-reflective and understand how bias, power, and privilege as well as their personal values and personal experiences may affect their ability to engage effectively with diverse clients and constituencies. Social workers use the principles of interprofessional collaboration to facilitate engagement with clients, constituencies, and other professionals as appropriate. Social workers:

- Apply knowledge of human behavior and person-in-environment, as well as interprofessional conceptual frameworks, to engage with clients and constituencies; and
- Use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to engage in culturally responsive practice with clients and constituencies.

Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Social workers understand that assessment is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and person-in-environment, as well as interprofessional conceptual frameworks, and they critically evaluate and apply this knowledge in culturally responsive assessment with clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Assessment involves a collaborative process of defining presenting challenges and identifying strengths with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities to develop a mutually agreed-upon plan. Social workers recognize the implications of the larger practice context in the assessment process and use interprofessional collaboration in this process. Social workers are self- reflective and understand how bias, power, privilege, and their personal values and experiences may affect their assessment and decision making. Social workers:

- Apply theories of human behavior and person-in-environment, as well as other culturally responsive and interprofessional conceptual frameworks, when assessing clients and constituencies; and

- Demonstrate respect for client self-determination during the assessment process by collaborating with clients and constituencies in developing a mutually agreed-upon plan.

Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
Social workers understand that intervention is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice. Social workers understand theories of human behavior, person-in-environment, and other interprofessional conceptual frameworks, and they critically evaluate and apply this knowledge in selecting culturally responsive interventions with clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand methods of identifying, analyzing, and implementing evidence-informed interventions and participate in interprofessional collaboration to achieve client and constituency goals. Social workers facilitate effective transitions and endings. Social workers:
- Engage with clients and constituencies to critically choose and implement culturally responsive, evidence-informed interventions to achieve client and constituency goals; and
- Incorporate culturally responsive methods to negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of clients and constituencies.

Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
Social workers understand that evaluation is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with and on behalf of diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers evaluate processes and outcomes to increase practice, policy, and service delivery effectiveness. Social workers apply anti-racist and anti-oppressive perspectives in evaluating outcomes. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and person-in-environment, as well as interprofessional conceptual frameworks, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge in evaluating outcomes. Social workers use qualitative and quantitative methods for evaluating outcomes and practice effectiveness. Social workers:
- Select and use culturally responsive methods for evaluation of outcomes; and
- Critically analyze outcomes and apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Appendix E

SWEAP (Social Work Education Assessment Project)
Pilot Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) [3] [4]

Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior
A social worker is leaving their current position and taking a position with a new agency. The social worker asks their client if the client would like to continue to see the social worker at the new agency. The social worker's offer is:
Making clients aware of their choices in receiving services from a social worker is inherent in which social work ethical obligation?
When a social worker's colleague is displaying incompetence during service to their clients, the social worker should discuss this matter first with the:
Which of the following is an ethical violation of a client's right to privacy and confidentiality?
Sexual relationships between social workers and clients:
When a social worker's personal values/beliefs clash with a client's values/beliefs:
According to the NASW Code of Ethics, which of the following statements align with the standards for how social workers can appropriately use technology in their practice:

Competency 2: Advance Human Rights and Social, Racial, Economic, and Environmental Justice
Expecting people to behave a certain way based on their gender is best described as:
The connected nature of social categorizations, such as race, class, gender, religion and ability create overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination and/or advantage is best described by which of the following terms?
Terms like: police officers, postal workers, spokesperson, and chairperson are examples of:
Policy makers were determining where to place a waste transfer site in their community. They considered the impact that this placement would have on the health of the community members around the site. This consideration was based on concerns about:
Facial recognition software was taken out of use by a police department because it was more likely to falsely identify people of color. This concern is related to:
The United States Supreme Court decision that established the right to marriage for same-sex couples is an example of:
Which of the following terms relates to how dimensions of diversity and difference for an individual combine to further alienate them in their environment:

---

[3] SWEAP only provides the FCAI items without the response sets to prevent social work education programs from "teaching to the test."

[4] Items based on the 2022 EPAS.

Competency 3: Engage Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI) in Practice
Social and economic benefits that accrue to certain members of society because of their skin color is known as:
Social Workers obligation to learn about aspects of diversity is associated with which ethical responsibility to clients?
A social worker at your agency has deeply held religious beliefs that homosexuality is a sin, and is uncomfortable working with a gay client. Which of the following is the most ethical way of handling the conflict for the social worker?
A commitment to the process of self-reflection and inquiry of personal biases in order to be appropriately sensitive to the understandings and experiences of those we interact with is best described as:
A client at your agency who identified as White expresses discomfort with being assigned a social worker who identifies as Black. Which of the following is the most ethical way of handling this situation?
A competent social worker:
ADEI stands for:

Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice
Which type of research maximizes the social worker's ability to connect with subjects in personal ways, and provide unique context to the experiences of the subjects?
Identify the **INDEPENDENT VARIABLE** in the following hypothesis: "Researchers expect that children exposed to opiates prenatally will be at increased risk for developmental delays, regardless of their race or socioeconomic class."
Identify the **DEPENDENT VARIABLE** in the following hypothesis: "Researchers expect that children exposed to opiates prenatally will be at increased risk for developmental delays, regardless of their race or socioeconomic class."
The age distribution (in order) amongst participants in a research study is: 22, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 32, 32, 32, 36 The **mode** age of the sample is:
The age distribution (in order) amongst participants in a research study is: 22, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 32, 32, 32, 36 The **median** age of the sample is:
The requirements for a "classical experimental" design include:
When using random sampling (based on probability theory):

Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice
The Governor of a state is an example of which branch of government:
The Elizabethan Poor Laws are important for understanding social welfare in the US because:
A major social welfare program to emerge from the New Deal was:
The enactment of the Personal Responsibilities Act and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (TANF) resulted in:
An example of the legislative branch at the federal level of government is the:
Which of the following historical eras/movements saw major attention to instituting broad social improvements through child labor laws, compulsory education laws, and occupational protections:
Which of the following historical eras/movements saw major attention to racial justice in the United States:

Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
When beginning work with a client who is in the precontemplation stage of the change process, a social worker:
Systems theory:
Reflecting feelings refers to the process of:
The strengths-perspective is best described as:
Listening empathetically involves:
Clients who are considered "mandated":

Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
A strengths-based assessment is most likely to include evaluation of:
A social worker wants to determine if they should develop a new non-profit organization in their community. The social worker reviews census information and speaks with local community members and leaders to discuss community concerns and resources.The social workers is:
When an organization is more concerned with their internal operations and structures, rather than the influence of external factors on their operations, their system can be defined as a:
Considerations for the use of open-ended questions during the assessment process include:
The primary purpose of the assessment process is to:
An individual's right to make their own decision is known as:

Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
When using an evidence-based method of intervention it is:
Self-disclosure by the social worker during treatment with a client:
Giving feedback to the client:
Replacing stopping-thoughts about sexual behavior with positive sexual attitudes and learning sexual skills is an example of:
When setting goals with clients, it is best:
Social learning theory places an emphasis on which of the following:

Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
During assessment with a social worker, the client filled out the Major Depression Inventory (MDI), a standardized instrument to measure their symptoms. After 6 weeks of case management with the client, the client filled out the MDI again. Data from the MDIs show that the client's depression has begun to decrease. This is an example of:
Program evaluation:
A drawback of using standardized measures to monitor client outcomes includes:
Results of the evaluation of client progress through the social work intervention:
Evaluation:
The social worker and client agree to using a particular intervention method for 6 weeks, and then reevaluating the client's functioning. At the end of the time period, the evaluation found that the client's functioning has neither improved, nor deteriorated. The social worker and client should:

WKU®

Department of Social Work
BSW Learning Plan and Evaluation
Revised 8/22/2016
[Now completed via the Online Platform, Sonia]

Student Name: _____ School Term: _____

Field Agency: _____ Field Instructor: _____

Instructions for Scoring: This chart indicates the standard for scoring the nine competencies. Under each competency, there are behavioral indicators to consider when determining the overall scoring of each competency. Each behavior should have:

- A "minus" if the student has not demonstrated the behavior to a satisfactory degree for this point in field;
- A "check" if the student has effectively demonstrated the behavior.
- "N/A" if student has not had the chance to demonstrate the behavior yet. **NOTE:** "**N/A" is allowed in semester one ONLY**.

The evaluation process is done at the end of semester one and two of the field year. You will notice that the highest score possible for semester one is "3", which indicates students are not expected work at a high level of mastery. The highest score possible for semester two is "5", to allow opportunity to show growth in student performance from the first to the second semester. All behaviors must be demonstrated by the end of the second semester in order for the student to pass field.

Semester One	Semester Two	
N/A		Student has not had a chance to practice the behaviors of the competency. **A rating of Not Applicable (N/A) is allowed in semester one only.**
1 Fail	1 Fail	Student is not able to demonstrate the behaviors of the competency at this time. Student may or may not have a clear understanding of the competency.
1.5 Pass	1.5 Fail	Student understands the competency and recognizes it when he or she sees it. The student is expected to improve in this area with additional experience.
2 Pass	2 Fail	**Semester 1**- Student is at a beginner's level in ability to demonstrate the behaviors of this competency. Student may be able to demonstrate some but not all of the behaviors. Student may understand the competency and recognize it when he/she sees it. The student is expected to improve in this area with additional experience. **Semester 2** – I have concerns about the student's performance related to this competency. Student has not consistently demonstrated the behaviors expected under this competency.
3 Pass	3 Pass	Student exhibits solid skills in this area and is able to demonstrate the behaviors of this competency at the expected level for a student at this point in the internship. The student is expected to improve in this area with additional experience.
	4 Pass	Student demonstrates the behaviors of this competency more consistently and seamlessly than most students at this point in the internship. The student could use additional experience to improve and refine skills in this area.
	5 Pass	Student consistently demonstrates competency above the expected level in this area- has work experience and/or natural gifts that enable her or him to perform at a higher level than expected at this point in the internship.

Competency #1: Intern demonstrates ethical and professional behavior.

Semester 1 Final Score				Semester 2 Final Score				
(Please circle one)				*(Please circle one)*				
1	1.5	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

	Place a "checkmark" beside the behaviors effectively demonstrated. *Place a "minus" beside the behaviors not demonstrated at a satisfactory level.* *"N/A" allowable only for semester one.*	Semester 1	Semester 2
1.1	Makes ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context		
1.2	Uses reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations		
1.3	Demonstrates professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication		
1.4	Uses technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes		
1.5	Uses supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior		

Tasks:
- Review and comply with all "Agency" and "Field" policy.
- Appearance and behavior is consistently appropriate for a professional setting.
- Always be respectful to and supportive of clients, supervisor and co-workers.
- Complete all required professional writing accurately and present agency and field documentation in a timely manner.
- Seek consultation/supervision and practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development.
- Consider the implication of technology in developing programs and services.
-

Semester 1 Comments:
Semester 2 Comments:

Competency #2: Intern engages diversity and difference in practice.

Semester 1 Final Score				Semester 2 Final Score				
(Please circle one)				*(Please circle one)*				
1	1.5	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

	Place a "checkmark" beside the behaviors effectively demonstrated. *Place a "minus" beside the behaviors not demonstrated at a satisfactory level.* *"N/A" allowable only for semester one.*	Semester	
		1	**2**
2.1	Apply and communicate understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels		
2.2	Present themselves as learners and engage clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences		
2.3	Apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies		

Tasks:
- Look for systems of oppression and disparities related to diversity that affects clients at the agency.
- Research and read relevant articles pertaining to diverse populations and to enhance cultural sensitivity and discuss with field instructor.
- Engage with clients that differ in age, class, gender, etc. and research pertinent information. With the use of reflection recordings and supervision, field instructor will discuss student's knowledge and sensitivity around recognizing differing cultural issues.
- Always reflect respect for and appreciation of diverse opinions, and view themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants.
-

Semester 1 Comments:
Semester 2 Comments:

Competency #3: Intern advances human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.

Semester 1 Final Score				Semester 2 Final Score				
(Please circle one)				*(Please circle one)*				
1	1.5	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

	Place a "checkmark" beside the behaviors effectively demonstrated. *Place a "minus" beside the behaviors not demonstrated at a satisfactory level.* *"N/A" allowable only for semester one.*	Semester	
		1	**2**
3.1	Apply their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels		
3.2	Engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice		

Tasks:
- Participate in at least one community activity to advocate for human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice (community outreach events, and public policy meetings, advocacy groups).
- Examine the impact of oppression and discrimination on the delivery of services within your agency.
- Discuss issues of oppression and discrimination with at least 3 clients from a vulnerable population, to glean from people's stories how social injustice operates in their lives.
- Demonstrate ability to impact environmental injustice regarding agency, clients, and community.
- Research advocacy methods and come up with at least two relevant actions that they will take on behalf of client issue(s).
- Familiarize self with current political events and their effects on clients in your agency.
-

Semester 1 Comments:
Semester 2 Comments:

Competency #4: Intern engages in practice-informed research and research-informed practice.

Semester 1 Final Score				Semester 2 Final Score				
(Please circle one)				*(Please circle one)*				
1	1.5	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

	Place a "checkmark" beside the behaviors effectively demonstrated. *Place a "minus" beside the behaviors not demonstrated at a satisfactory level.* *"N/A" allowable only for semester one.*	**Semester**	
		1	**2**
4.1	Use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research		
4.2	Apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative and qualitative research methods and research findings		
4.3	Use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy and service delivery		

Tasks:
- Read and analyze relevant literature which impacts service delivery in your agency.
- Identify both qualitative and quantitative ways to evaluate their own practice within the agency.
- Identify research activities utilized by the agency including data collection/statistics, current research projects and program evaluation.
- Critically analyze, and then discuss with field instructor, the current information gathered by the agency for purposes of assessment.
- Compile data around demographics regarding who is seeking services at agency. Explore ways to provide outreach to other populations.
-

Semester 1 Comments:

Semester 2 Comments:

Competency #5: Intern engages in policy practice.

Semester 1 Final Score				Semester 2 Final Score				
(Please circle one)				*(Please circle one)*				
1	**1.5**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

	Place a "checkmark" beside the behaviors effectively demonstrated. *Place a "minus" beside the behaviors not demonstrated at a satisfactory level.* *"N/A" allowable only for semester one.*	**Semester**	
		1	**2**
5.1	Identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services		
5.2	Assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services		
5.3	Apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice		

Tasks:
- Identify current public policy and relevant legislation issues on service provision to your agency/clients.
- Formulate ideas towards advocacy in the interests of improving policies specific to your practice context or agency.
- Study history and current structure of your agency; discuss with field instructor the funding streams, federal/state/local laws that govern services.
- Communicate with and discuss policy development and formulation with legislators/ community leaders/board members/administrators.
-

Semester 1 Comments:

Semester 2 Comments:

Competency #6: Intern engages with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Semester 1 Final Score				Semester 2 Final Score				
(Please circle one)				*(Please circle one)*				
1	1.5	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

	Place a "checkmark" beside the behaviors effectively demonstrated. *Place a "minus" beside the behaviors not demonstrated at a satisfactory level.* *"N/A" allowable only for semester one.*	Semester 1	2
6.1	Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies		
6.2	Use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies		

Tasks:
- Shadow and observe effective colleagues and other interns during interactions with clients. Debrief sessions with staff and field instructor.
- Identify conceptual frameworks that explain development and impact on a client system.
- Assist, conduct and debrief client interviews using agency formats; compare to classroom tools.
- Demonstrate effective use of empathy and interviewing skills.
-

Semester 1 Comments:
Semester 2 Comments:

Competency #7: Intern assesses individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Semester 1 Final Score				Semester 2 Final Score				
(Please circle one)				*(Please circle one)*				
1	**1.5**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

	Place a "checkmark" beside the behaviors effectively demonstrated. *Place a "minus" beside the behaviors not demonstrated at a satisfactory level.* *"N/A" allowable only for semester one.*	Semester	
		1	**2**
7.1	Collect and organize data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies		
7.2	Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies		
7.3	Develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies		
7.4	Select appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies		

Tasks:
- Complete quality assessments, case plans and case notes, per agency expectations.
- Demonstrate ability to help clients' solve problems using interventions to negotiate and mediate.
- Provide an assessment of a client system in the context of person in environment.
- Use various theories to inform client behavior and interactions. Discuss with field instructor.
- Critique and apply knowledge to understand person-in-environment.
-

Semester 1 Comments:
Semester 2 Comments:

Competency #8: Intern intervenes with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Semester 1 Final Score				Semester 2 Final Score				
(Please circle one)				*(Please circle one)*				
1	1.5	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

	Pla Place a "checkmark" beside the behaviors effectively demonstrated. *Place a "minus" beside the behaviors not demonstrated at a satisfactory level.* *"N/A" allowable only for semester one.*	Semester 1	Semester 2
8.1	Critically choose and implement interventions to achieve practice goals and enhance capacities of clients and constituencies		
8.2	Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies		
8.3	Use inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to achieve beneficial practice outcomes		
8.4	Negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies		
8.5	Facilitate effective transitions and endings that advance mutually agreed-on goals		

Tasks:
- Develop mutually agreed upon long and short term goals with clients/groups.
- Observe and participate in client treatment plans, case reviews and consultation. Discuss with field instructor.
- Develop planned change process and be able to understand the definition and discuss how it is implemented in helping clients achieve their goals.
- Attend to professional boundaries and ethical behavior in terminating services with clients. Use reflection recordings and journals to reflect on transition and termination issues.
- Co-facilitate group meetings for clients, agencies, and communities.
- Discuss interaction of theory and practice with field instructor.
- Complete a psychosocial assessment and upon completion will discuss what social work skills were used as well as strengths and weaknesses on conducting this assessment.
-

Semester 1 Comments:

Semester 2 Comments:

Competency #9: Intern evaluates practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Semester 1 Final Score				Semester 2 Final Score				
(Please circle one)				*(Please circle one)*				
1	1.5	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

	Place a "checkmark" beside the behaviors effectively demonstrated. *Place a "minus" beside the behaviors not demonstrated at a satisfactory level.* *"N/A" allowable only for semester one.*	Semester	
		1	**2**
9.1	Select and use appropriate methods for evaluation of outcomes		
9.2	Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes		
9.3	Critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate intervention and program processes and outcomes		
9.4	Apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels		

Tasks:
- Discuss with FI, the current agency strengths and weaknesses related to the incorporation of critical thinking into: Assessment; Prevention; Intervention; Evaluation
- Solicit feedback on outcomes and analyze data; and, initiate actions to achieve organizational change/improvement.
- Develop evaluations and intervention questions to further assessments and service needs. Discuss in supervision.
- Review, evaluate, and appraise current agency services as well as needs and trends in the communities in which services are being provided.
-

Semester 1 Comments:

Semester 2 Comments:

STUDENT NAME: _____

Learning Plan Signatures (to be developed and signed by all parties within the first four weeks of beginning field placement)

Signature of Student/Date: _____

Signature of Field Instructor/Date: _____

Signature of Task Supervisor/Date: _____
(if applicable)

Signature of Field Liaison/Date: _____

SEMESTER 1 MIDTERM COMMENTS:

Student/Date: _____ Field Instructor/Date: _____

Task Supervisor/Date: _____ Liaison/Date: _____

SEMESTER 1 FINAL EVALUATION:

Field Instructor Section: EACH COMPETENCY MUST SCORE N/A, 1.5, OR ABOVE TO PASS FIELD.

Overall GRADE Student has earned: PASS/FAIL (Based on N/A, 1.5 or higher on each of the 9 competencies)

I attest this student has completed _____ field hours during this semester.

Comments:

Field Instructor/Date: _____

Student Section: I agree with the evaluation: YES   or   NO
(If the intern disagrees with the evaluation she/he should state that disagreement in writing and submit a copy to both the field instructor and the faculty liaison. A meeting between the student, field instructor, and faculty liaison should then be held to discuss the disagreement.)

Comments:

Student Signature/Date: _____

Liaison Section: GRADES: Seminar Grade _____ (A-F)   Passed All Assignments: YES   or   NO

Comments:

Liaison Signature/Date: _____

STUDENT NAME: _____

SEMESTER 2 MIDTERM COMMENTS:

Student/Date: _____ Field Instructor/Date: _____

Task Supervisor/Date: _____ Liaison/Date: _____

SEMESTER 2 FINAL EVALUATION:

Field Instructor Section: EACH COMPETENCY MUST SCORE 3.0 OR ABOVE TO PASS FIELD.

Overall GRADE Student has earned: PASS/FAIL (Based on 3.0 or higher on each of the 9 competencies)

I attest this student has completed _____ field hours during this semester.

Comments:

Field Instructor/Date: _____

Student Section: I agree with the evaluation: YES   or   NO
(If the intern disagrees with the evaluation she/he should state that disagreement in writing and submit a copy to both the field instructor and the faculty liaison. A meeting between the student, field instructor, and faculty liaison should then be held to discuss the disagreement.)

Comments:

Student Signature/Date: _____

Liaison Section: GRADES: Seminar Grade _____ (A-F)   Passed All Assignments: YES   or   NO

Comments:

Liaison Signature/Date: _____

Appendix G

SWEAP-FCAI Survey and Exit Instrument* Scores

Table 1. *Percentage of WKU Social Work Students Meeting & Exceeding Benchmark (80%)*

Academic Year (No. of respondents) [5]	Student Learning Outcomes					
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
AY 22-23 (N = 42) [6] [7]	**95.2%**	**88.1%**	**90.5%**	**76.2%**	**78.6%**	**97.6%**
AY 21-22 (N = 79) [8]	86.1%	98.7%	86.1%	40.5%	46.8%	77.5%
AY 20-21 (N = 80) [9]	72.5%	92.5%	83.8%	38.8%	46.3%	73.8%
AY 19-20 (N = 67) [10]	83.6%	91.0%	80.6%	52.2%	46.3%	73.1%
AY 18-19 (N = 37) [11]	73.0%	89.2%	81.1%	37.8%	54.1%	69.6%
AY 17-18 (N = 43) [12]	84.5%	89.6%	85.2%	60.8%	66.2%	80.2%
Average AY 17-18 through AY 22-23 (N = 348)	*82.5%*	*91.5%*	*84.5%*	*51.0%*	*56.4%*	*78.6%*

[5] The number of respondents who complete the SWEAP-FCAI Exit Survey each year is consistently lower than the number of respondents who complete the Learning Plan Evaluation (LPE) each academic year.

[6] In AY 22-23, WKU's BSW program participated in a pilot study to evaluate SWEAP's new FCAI survey. The pilot survey included new items based on CSWE's 2022 EPAS with its more explicit focus on ADEI. For this reason, the SWEAP-FCAI students completed in Spring 23 was not equivalent to prior years' SWEAP-FCAI Exit Survey items which were based on the 2015 EPAS. However, items included on the EPAS 2022 survey were deemed to substantively similar enough to items included on the EPAS 2015 survey that year-to-year comparisons remain appropriate.

[7] As shown below, the 2022 revision of the EPAS effectively switched Competencies #2 and #3 from the 2015 EPAS. This was accounted for in the data analysis:

Competencies #2 and #3	
EPAS 2015	**EPAS 2022**
2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	2: Advance Human Rights and Social, Racial, Economic, and Environmental Justice
3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	3: Engage Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI) in Practice

Response Rates:
[8] AY 22-23: 42/77 = 54.5%
[9] AY 21-22: 79/81 = 97.5%
[9] AY 20-21: 80/82 = 97.6%
[10] AY 19-20: 67/76 = 88.2%
[11] AY 18-19: 37/64 = 57.8%
[12] AY 17-18: 43/68 = 63.2%

Note. WKU Benchmark = Greater than 80% of students answer at least 50% of questions correctly for each competency on the SWEAP-FCAI Survey. (Per SWEAP, a student is deemed competent if s/he answers 50% or more of the total number of questions correctly.) For SLO #6, CSWE Competencies #6-9 (i.e., engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation) are combined. These reflect the planned change process when working with client systems; *The SWEAP-FCAI survey used for AY 22-23 was not labelled by SWEAP as an "exit instrument"

Appendix H

Learning Plan Evaluation of Field Placement Performance (LPE) Scores

Table 1. *Percentage of Students Meeting & Exceeding Benchmark (85%)*

Academic Year (No. of respondents) [13]	Student Learning Outcomes					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
AY 22-23 (# of Respondents = 77)	96.1%	96.1%	94.8%	92.2%	90.9%	93.8%
AY 21-22 (# of Respondents = 81)	93.8%	92.6%	92.6%	92.6%	90.1%	91.4%
AY 20-21 (# of Respondents = 82)	96.3%	93.9%	92.7%	91.5%	90.2%	93.6%
AY 19-20 (# of Respondents = 76)	94.7%	96.0%	93.3%	88.0%	86.7%	86.7%
AY 18-19 (# of Respondents = 64)	95.3%	98.4%	96.9%	93.8%	93.8%	96.9%
AY 17-18 (# of Respondents = 68)	93.6%	92.8%	89.2%	88.2%	91.4%	93.5%
Average AY 17-18 through AY 22-23 (N = 447)	*95.0%*	*95.0%*	*93.3%*	*91.1%*	*90.5%*	*92.7%*

Note. Benchmark = At least 85% of students will score 4 or 5 for each competency.

---

[13] The number of respondents who complete the Learning Plan Evaluation (LPE) is higher than the number of respondents who complete the SWEAP-FCAI Exit Instrument because the response rate for the LPE is consistently higher than the response rate for the SWEAP-FCAI Exit Instrument each academic year. See Appendix A – Table 1 for the combined percentages.