

MSW Evaluation Report: 2017-2018**Submitted by: April L. Murphy, Ph.D., CSW****To: Dr. Patricia Desrosiers, Department Head-Social Work-Western Kentucky University****Dr. Saundra Starks, MSW Program Director****Date: May 16, 2018**

Assessment is a catalyst for continuous program improvement and an integral component of the MSW competency-based educational design. It is an ongoing process that occurs during the life course of a program in order to improve outcomes for students. Contained in this report is a summary of evaluation data gleaned from the MSW program for the academic year 2017-2018. This information will be utilized to supplement departmental and college reports, as well as for CSWE Accreditation purposes. Additionally, these results will be shared with the faculty and larger social work community in order to continually receive input and improve the quality of the MSW program at WKU.

Overview

In order to assess the mastery of MSW students at WKU, several explicit as well as implicit measures were utilized. Explicit measures were as follows: (1) Rubric Scores for Generalist Assessment; (2) Practice Readiness Exam (PRE) for Specialized Assessment; and (3) Field Assessment. Implicit measures were as follows: (1) MSW Exit Survey. More information is provided on each of these measures below in the relevant sections.

Explicit Measures**Generalist Assessment**

In order to assess the mastery of foundation level knowledge of MSW students at WKU, rubrics were developed by faculty teaching core classes covering generalist social work practice. Table 1 below shows the course, the name of the assignment, and the competency assessed with that assignment.

Table 1

Generalist Assessment Assignments

Competency	Course	Assignment
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	SWRK 501: Cultural Competency in Social Work Practice	Cultural Sensitivity Project Paper
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	SWRK 510: Human Behavior in the Social Environment	Generational Paper
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	SWRK 530: Foundation of Social Welfare Policy	Social Policy Analysis/Formulation Paper
Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice	SWRK 540: Foundation on Social Work Research Methods	Research Proposal Paper
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	SWRK 530: Foundation of Social Welfare Policy	Social Policy Analysis/Formulation Paper
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	SWRK 522: Group Dynamic in Social Work Practice	Group Facilitation
Competency 7: Assess with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	SWRK 520: Generalist Social Work Practice	Bio/Psycho-Social/Spiritual Assessment
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	SWRK 523: Rural Community Organization and Development	Hill House Community Change Plan Project
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	SWRK 522: Group Dynamic in Social Work Practice	Group Facilitation

At the end of each semester, the Assessment Coordinator sent a Google Sheet to each instructor who taught a section of the courses listed above. Each instructor was asked to complete the Google Sheet by recording the average score for specifically identified components of the rubric related to the indicated competency. Once this recording was complete,

the instructor sent the Google Sheet back to the Assessment Coordinator, who imported responses into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

SWRK 501, SWRK 510, SWRK 520, and SWRK 540 are taken during the first semester of the first year in the traditional program, while SWRK 522, SWRK 523, and SWRK 530 are taken during the second semester of the first year in the traditional program. The MSW program Assessment Coordinator and Program Director decided that in order to be considered successful, at least 85% of students should score a minimum of 4 out of 5 points on the rubric items corresponding to each competency. Table 2 below shows the results for AY 2017-2018.

Table 2

Rubric Scores for AY 2017-2018

Competency	Percentage Achieved	Met Goal
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	81.8%	No
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	90.9%	Yes
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	100.0%	Yes
Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice	61.5%	No
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	90.0%	Yes
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	71.4%	No
Competency 7: Assess with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	71.4%	No
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	92.9%	Yes
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	85.7%	Yes

As one can see, based on the table above, the goal was met for Competencies 2, 3, 5, 8, and 9; however, there is room for improvement in Competencies 1, 4, 6 and 7. While the lowest performing area last year was Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice, the lowest performing area this year was Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice. Other areas of concern are with Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior and Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice. It is important to note that Competency 1 was measured using a rubric item related to writing and APA, as professional communication (both written and oral) is an important skill that social workers should possess. The MSW program has attempted to identify students who struggle with written communication upon admission to the program and offer them a Writing Course that can serve as one of their electives.

Practice Readiness Exam (PRE)

Per departmental and WKU Graduate School requirements, all graduating MSW students must successfully pass a Practice Readiness Exam (PRE) during their final semester in order to successfully complete the program. Per the 2017-2018 MSW Student Handbook, the PRE exam gives students the opportunity to demonstrate basic competency in essential content areas of social work practice with an emphasis in rural settings. The exam contains 100 multiple choice questions in an objective format, similar to social work licensure exams. These questions are written by faculty whose primary assignment is in that content area. Questions are then reviewed annually by a PRE committee to ensure its applicability to social work content. Further, two faculty members mapped individual questions back to the competencies set forth by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) 2015 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS). Inter-rater reliability was established on all items. In the event that there was a discrepancy between raters, a third faculty member was consulted. The PRE is an excellent tool to prepare students to pass the intermediate licensure exam post-graduation, one of the desired outcomes of the MSW Program at WKU.

Students are required to pass the PRE exam with a score of 70 or better in order to graduate from the program. Per the WKU Graduate School Policy, a student only has two attempts to pass this comprehensive exam. Consequently, a student who fails the exam two times is subject to dismissal from the MSW Program. However, it should also be noted that students who fail the exam are provided with written information regarding their performance and advised on areas they need to improve on before they retake it during one of two later dates (i.e., several weeks from initial administration or during the next Fall semester).

As the test assesses knowledge of specific content from readings, lectures, and field practicums/experiences, it is considered an important evaluative measure of student learning and retention in the program. It measures not only

concrete concepts gleaned but also puts students in “practice situations” where they must respond based on their professional and ethical training. It has been continually refined over the 12 years it has been administered and an item analysis is conducted after each administration to assess the efficacy of specific questions (to decide which ones to keep and which to discard). New questions are continually developed to have fresh questions on each administration, in addition to “battle tested” ones.

Based on recommendations from AY 2015-2016, the number of questions in each category was reexamined. The MSW faculty came to consensus that since the PRE was intended to prepare students for the ASWB MSW Licensure Exam, that it was important that the percentage of questions on the PRE corresponded with those areas on the licensure exam. Table 3 below shows the ASWB MSW Exam Percentages compared to the number of questions in each category for the 2018 administration of the PRE. There was an intentionally over-representation of direct and indirect practice due to the expectation that students have gained adequate practice skills that reflect the knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes required by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). The over-representation in this category was offset by the under-representation of the professional relationships, values, and ethics category.

Fifty-six (56) students took the PRE on April 9, 2018. Of these, 51 achieved a passing score of 70 and 5 failed to achieve this benchmark (following item analysis). Thus, 91.1% of students taking the exam passed and 8.9% failed during this administration. All students (100.0%, n = 5) of students decided to retake the PRE on the first retake of the exam, on April 30, 2018. A majority of students (n = 3, 60.0%) passed the exam with a minimum score of 70, while 2 did not attain the required benchmark. Over the decade-long history of the exam, the 2018 exam fail rate was on par with previous administrations (i.e., average ~10%). Table 4 below depicts the overall mean and standard deviation as well as the mean and standard deviations for each content area. Additionally, an independent-samples t-test was conducted in order to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between scores in 2017 compared to scores in 2018. The same analysis was conducted to compare the Hybrid cohort with the Online cohort (see Table 5).

Table 3

ASWB MSW Licensure Exam vs. the PRE

ASWB (MSW Exam Percentages)	PRE 2018	Total	Diff
HBSE & Diversity (28%)	Cultural Competency & Diversity (11)	26%	(2%)
	HBSE (5)		
	Rural Communities (10)		
Assessment & Intervention (24%)	Foundation Practice (17)	23%	(1%)
	Diagnosis (6)		
Direct & Indirect Practice (21%)	Advanced Practice (10)	42%	21%
	Foundation Policy (5)		
	Advanced Policy (2)		
	Groups (6)		
	Family Practice (4)		
	Community Organization (3)		
	Research (8)		
Administration & Supervision (4)			
Professional Relationships, Values & Ethics (27%)	Ethics (9)	9%	(18%)

Table 4

2017 & 2018 PRE Averages (Standard Deviations) By Content Area

Content Area	2017 (n = 56)	2018 (n = 56)	Diff	t-stat	p-value
HBSE	87.1 (15.5)	77.9 (17.8)	(9.2)	2.951	.004**
Foundation Policy	80.7 (16.6)	79.3 (12.6)	(1.4)	0.423	.673
Advanced Policy	84.8 (23.2)	87.5 (25.7)	2.7	-0.579	.564
Family Practice	61.6 (19.6)	58.5 (20.4)	(3.1)	0.826	.410

Supervision and Administration	83.0 (21.4)	75.9 (20.8)	(7.1)	1.794	.076
Research	67.9 (15.4)	59.4 (19.3)	(8.5)	2.573	.011*
Groups	81.5 (12.2)	82.4 (12.5)	0.9	-0.383	.702
Rural Communities	75.4 (13.2)	79.1 (13.0)	3.7	-1.516	.132
Diagnosis	69.0 (17.8)	74.4 (15.9)	5.4	-1.680	.096
Ethics	87.3 (12.1)	84.3 (12.8)	(3.0)	1.264	.209
Diversity	74.8 (14.5)	82.8 (12.2)	8.0	-3.319	.002**
Foundation Practice	80.8 (9.7)	79.3 (12.6)	(1.5)	0.691	.491
Advanced Practice	71.8 (16.1)	73.4 (13.7)	1.6	-0.570	.570
Community Organizations	61.3 (20.9)	58.9 (24.6)	(2.4)	0.552	.582
Total Questions	76.7 (6.7)	76.3 (8.5)	(0.4)	0.260	.795

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Overall, the mean score on the 2018 PRE was 76.3 (SD = 8.5), which was 0.4 points lower than the 2017 average. Looking at the table above, the subject areas where the most students appeared to struggle (< 70%) the most were Family Practice (M = 58.5, SD = 20.4), Research (M = 59.4, SD = 19.3), and Community Organizations (M = 58.9, SD = 24.6). The most concerning was the statistically significant decrease in the areas of HBSE (9.2 pts) and Research (8.5 pts). Positively, based on the table above, the subject areas where the most students appeared to perform the best (> 85%) were Advanced Policy (M = 87.5, SD = 25.7). Students made statistically significant gains in Diversity (8.0 pts).

Table 5

2018 PRE Averages (Standard Deviations) By Content Area: Hybrid vs. Online Cohort

Content Area	2018 Hybrid (n = 39)	2018 Online (n = 17)	Diff	t-stat	p-value
HBSE	79.0 (17.7)	75.3 (18.1)	(3.7)	0.710	.481
Foundation Policy	78.5 (20.7)	81.2 (15.0)	2.7	-0.487	.628
Advanced Policy	92.3 (21.6)	76.5 (31.2)	(15.8)	2.195	.032*
Family Practice	55.1 (20.0)	66.2 (19.6)	11.1	-1.910	.062
Supervision and Administration	77.6 (22.1)	72.1 (17.4)	(5.5)	0.911	.366
Research	63.8 (18.8)	49.3 (16.8)	(14.5)	2.744	.008**
Groups	83.3 (12.1)	80.4 (13.5)	(2.9)	0.808	.422

Rural Communities	80.0 (14.1)	77.1 (9.9)	(2.9)	0.777	.440
Diagnosis	75.2 (16.6)	72.5 (14.4)	(2.7)	0.574	.568
Ethics	85.8 (13.0)	81.0 (12.3)	(4.8)	1.268	.210
Diversity	83.7 (13.1)	80.7 (10.1)	(3.0)	0.824	.414
Foundation Practice	79.9 (13.1)	81.2 (15.0)	1.3	0.564	.575
Advanced Practice	73.8 (14.4)	72.4 (12.0)	(1.4)	0.373	.710
Community Organizations	59.8 (24.4)	56.9 (25.7)	(2.9)	0.412	.682
Total Questions	77.3 (9.2)	74.1 (6.3)	(3.2)	1.337	.187

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Overall, the mean score for the Hybrid cohort was 77.3 (SD = 9.2), which was 3.2 higher than the Online cohort (M = 74.1, SD = 6.3). Looking at the table above, the only subject areas where there was a statistically significant difference between the hybrid cohort and the online cohort was in Advanced Policy and Research. For Advanced Policy, the Online cohort scored significantly lower (M = 76.5, SD = 31.2) compared to the Hybrid cohort (M = 92.3, SD = 21.6). With respect to Research, again the Online cohort scored significantly lower (M = 49.3, SD = 16.8) compared to the Hybrid cohort (M = 63.8, SD = 18.8).

As previously mentioned, the 2018 exam included questions that were mapped back to the CSWE Competencies (numbers of questions for each competency are denoted) as follows:

- Competency 1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior (12)
- Competency 2: Engage diversity and difference in practice (17)
- Competency 3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice (6)
- Competency 4: Engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice (5)
- Competency 5: Engage in policy practice (8)
- Competency 6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities (11)
- Competency 7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities (19)
- Competency 8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities (17)
- Competency 9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities (5)

Table 6 below depicts the overall mean and standard deviation as well as the mean and standard deviations for each competency. Additionally, an independent-samples t-test was conducted in order to determine whether there was a

statistically significant difference between scores in 2017 compared to scores in 2018. The same analysis was conducted to compare the Hybrid cohort with the Online cohort (see Table 7).

Table 6
2017 & 2018 PRE Averages (Standard Deviations) By Competency

Competency	2017 (n = 56)	2018 (n = 56)	Diff	t-stat	p-value
Competency 1	83.3 (12.0)	80.5 (12.4)	(2.8)	1.224	.223
Competency 2	72.6 (12.8)	77.5 (11.7)	4.9	-2.133	.035*
Competency 3	71.4 (20.5)	78.9 (17.8)	7.5	-2.048	.043*
Competency 4	62.1 (20.1)	56.8 (19.4)	(5.3)	1.438	.153
Competency 5	86.6 (12.4)	85.3 (14.5)	(1.3)	0.526	.600
Competency 6	87.0 (11.2)	83.6 (14.5)	(3.4)	1.389	.168
Competency 7	70.9 (9.3)	70.8 (9.6)	(0.1)	0.053	.958
Competency 8	78.3 (9.7)	77.2 (9.7)	(1.1)	0.574	.567
Competency 9	74.3 (21.8)	66.8 (24.2)	(7.5)	1.722	.088
Total Questions (100)	76.7 (6.7)	76.3 (8.5)	(0.4)	0.260	.795

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Looking at the table above, the subject area where students appeared to struggle (< 70%) the most was Competency 4 (M = 56.8, SD = 19.4) and Competency 9 (M = 66.8, SD = 24.2). There were, however, no significant decreases between the 2017 administration and the 2018 administration of the PRE. Positively, based on the table above, students did make statistically significant gains in Competency 2 (4.9 pts) and Competency 3 (7.5 pts).

Table 7
2018 PRE Averages (Standard Deviations) By Competency: Hybrid vs. Online

Competency	2018 Hybrid (n = 39)	2018 Online (n = 17)	Diff	t-stat	p-value
Competency 1	81.8 (12.5)	77.5 (12.1)	(4.3)	1.219	.228
Competency 2	78.6 (12.8)	75.1 (8.7)	(3.5)	1.027	.309
Competency 3	79.9 (18.8)	76.5 (15.7)	(3.4)	0.661	.511

Competency 4	57.9 (19.9)	54.1 (18.4)	(3.8)	0.677	.501
Competency 5	85.9 (15.2)	83.8 (13.1)	(2.1)	0.488	.628
Competency 6	84.6 (15.5)	81.3 (12.2)	(3.3)	0.785	.436
Competency 7	71.7 (9.6)	68.7 (9.6)	(3.0)	1.054	.296
Competency 8	76.8 (10.6)	78.2 (7.1)	1.4	-0.506	.615
Competency 9	72.3 (23.2)	54.1 (22.1)	(18.2)	2.734	.008**
Total Questions (100)	77.3 (9.2)	74.1 (6.3)	(3.2)	1.337	.187

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Looking at the table above, the subject area where students appeared to struggle (< 70%) the most was Competency 4 (M = 62.1, SD = 20.1). However, this was not statistically significantly different from results in the previous year. The most concerning was the statistically significant decrease in Competency 7 (4.8 pts), Competency 8 (4.1 pts), and Competency 9 (12.8 pts). Positively, based on the table above, students did make statistically significant gains in Competency 5 (9.9 pts).

Looking at the table above, the only competencies where there was a statistically significant difference between the hybrid cohort and the online cohort was in Competency 9. For Competency 9, the Online cohort scored significantly lower (M = 54.1, SD = 22.1) compared to the Hybrid cohort (M = 72.3, SD = 23.2).

MSW Field Data/Evaluation

Just as with the domains assessed above, and in accordance with the accreditation standards established by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the MSW Program annually collects field data in order to assess the program's compliance and success in meeting established benchmarks for each standard. More specifically, the percentage of students achieving each CSWE competency is calculated for both the foundation year as well as the concentration year. This information, which is gathered by the Field Director and posted on the MSW Program website, helps the program evaluate areas of strength and potential growth in field objectives. Table 8 below presents a summary from May 2018 summarizing the field assessment for academic year 2017-2018.

Table 8
Percentage of Students Meeting Field Competencies

Competency	Competency Benchmark	Hybrid		Online
		Foundation	Concentration	Concentration
C1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	100%	94%
C2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	100%	100%
C3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	98%	94%
C4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	100%	81%
C5: Engage in Policy Practice	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	90%	94%
C6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	100%	100%
C7: Assess with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	95%	88%
C8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	95%	94%
C9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	98%	94%

Implicit Measures

MSW Student Exit Survey

Graduating MSW students were given the opportunity to complete an exit survey, which was administered online via Qualtrics. Students were given the opportunity to provide any ideas they had to improve the student experience in the MSW program at WKU. In addition to demographic items, the exit survey included 24 items where students were asked to rate their level of agreement with a statement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), and one open-ended item that allowed students to comment on ways to improve the MSW program at WKU. An independent t-test was conducted to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference on these items between 2017 and 2018. Table 9 below presents the results of the MSW Student Exit Survey. The same analysis was conducted to examine any differences between the Hybrid cohort and the Online cohort (see Table 10)

Table 9
MSW Student Exit Survey Results: 2017 vs.2018

Item	2017 n = 39 M(SD)	2018 n = 28 M(SD)	difference	t-stat	p-value
I am satisfied with the MSW Program experience at WKU	4.23 (.959)	4.46 (.881)	0.23	-1.017	.313
The MSW Program at WKU is respectful of individual diversity.	4.49 (.885)	4.68 (.723)	0.19	-0.941	.350
I would recommend this program to a prospective student.	4.26 (.966)	4.50 (.839)	0.24	-1.075	.287
I am satisfied with the student organizations available at the MSW Program.	4.05 (1.099)	4.19 (.962)	0.14	-0.512	.611
Overall, I am satisfied with the core curriculum offered in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.13 (1.018)	4.43 (.690)	0.30	-1.333	.187
Overall, I am satisfied with the elective offerings within the Department of Social Work.	4.03 (.932)	3.96 (1.091)	(0.07)	0.250	.803
Overall, I am satisfied with the support I have received in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.18 (1.073)	4.44 (.934)	0.26	-1.039	.303

Overall, I am satisfied with my field experience in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.31 (1.004)	4.56 (.751)	0.25	-1.088	.281
I had a manageable workload in the MSW Program at WKU.	3.66 (1.146)	4.27 (.827)	0.61	-2.334	.023*
Overall, library access at WKU is adequate.	4.26 (.978)	3.96 (1.038)	(0.30)	1.182	.242
The WKU Student Accessibility Resource Center is adequate for my needs.	3.89 (1.034)	4.35 (.786)	0.46	-1.626	.110
The Counseling and Testing Center at WKU is adequate for my needs.	3.68 (1.016)	4.00 (.926)	0.32	-1.044	.302
The faculty in the MSW Program at WKU were sufficiently accessible.	4.13 (1.128)	4.32 (1.056)	0.19	-0.710	.480
I am satisfied with the quality of advising I received in the MSW Program at WKU.	3.92 (1.265)	4.50 (.793)	0.58	-2.129	.037*
I am satisfied with the overall quality of instruction I received in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.31 (.863)	4.32 (.723)	0.01	-0.069	.945
I feel comfortable approaching faculty to collaborate in service/research.	4.31 (1.004)	4.37 (.967)	0.06	-0.253	.801
I feel prepared to begin advanced level professional practice.	4.44 (.852)	4.64 (.559)	0.20	-1.122	.266
I feel prepared to successfully work with multicultural clients in professional practice.	4.38 (.907)	4.68 (.548)	0.30	-1.525	.132
I feel prepared to apply the NASW Code of Ethics in professional practice.	4.59 (.785)	4.75 (.441)	0.16	-0.974	.334
I feel prepared to engage in evidence based research in professional practice.	4.38 (.847)	4.54 (.838)	0.16	-0.724	.472
I feel prepared to be a consumer of evidence-based research.	4.28 (.972)	4.56 (.751)	0.28	-1.229	.224
I feel prepared to advocate for the rights of vulnerable populations in professional practice.	4.64 (.778)	4.64 (.870)	0.00	-0.009	.993
I feel prepared to engage in the political process as a professional social worker.	4.15 (.857)	4.39 (.737)	0.24	-1.196	.237
I feel prepared for professional practice in a rural setting.	4.44	4.71	0.27	-1.564	.123

	(.786)	(.535)			
--	--------	--------	--	--	--

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

The results in Table 9 above show that there were only two items that demonstrated a statistically significant difference between the 2017 cohort and the 2018 cohort. These items were as follows: (a) *I had a manageable workload in the MSW Program at WKU* and (b) *I am satisfied with the quality of advising I received in the MSW Program at WKU*. In both cases, the 2018 cohort rated these items significantly higher than the 2017 cohort. Further, while not a significant decrease, there were two items that decreased from 2017 to 2018. These items were as follows: (a) *Overall, I am satisfied with the elective offerings within the Department of Social Work*; and (b) *Overall, library access at WKU is adequate*.

Table 10
MSW Student Exit Survey Results: Hybrid Cohort vs. Online Cohort

Item	2018 Hybrid (n = 19)	2018 Online (n = 6)	difference	t-stat	p-value
I am satisfied with the MSW Program experience at WKU	4.42 (.838)	5.00 (0.00)	0.58	-1.668	.109
The MSW Program at WKU is respectful of individual diversity.	4.68 (.582)	5.00 (0.00)	0.32	-1.309	.204
I would recommend this program to a prospective student.	4.47 (.772)	5.00 (0.00)	0.53	-1.645	.114
I am satisfied with the student organizations available at the MSW Program.	4.37 (.761)	4.00 (1.265)	(0.37)	.879	.388
Overall, I am satisfied with the core curriculum offered in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.38 (.761)	4.83 (.408)	0.45	-1.419	.169
Overall, I am satisfied with the elective offerings within the Department of Social Work.	3.94 (1.110)	4.33 (1.033)	0.39	-0.755	.458
Overall, I am satisfied with the support I have received in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.50 (.707)	5.00 (0.00)	0.50	-1.706	.102
Overall, I am satisfied with my field experience in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.42 (.838)	5.00 (0.00)	0.58	-1.668	.109

I had a manageable workload in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.24 (.903)	4.67 (.516)	0.43	-1.097	.285
Overall, library access at WKU is adequate.	4.00 (.935)	4.50 (.548)	0.50	-1.226	.234
The WKU Student Accessibility Resource Center is adequate for my needs.	4.42 (.793)	4.50 (.577)	0.08	-0.192	.851
The Counseling and Testing Center at WKU is adequate for my needs.	4.00 (1.00)	4.33 (.577)	0.33	-0.543	.597
The faculty in the MSW Program at WKU were sufficiently accessible.	4.53 (.772)	4.17 (1.169)	(0.36)	0.879	.389
I am satisfied with the quality of advising I received in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.53 (.772)	4.50 (.837)	(0.03)	0.071	.944
I am satisfied with the overall quality of instruction I received in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.21 (.787)	4.83 (.408)	0.62	-1.842	.078
I feel comfortable approaching faculty to collaborate in service/research.	4.56 (.705)	4.67 (.516)	0.11	-0.354	.727
I feel prepared to begin advanced level professional practice.	4.74 (.452)	4.83 (.408)	0.09	-0.465	.646
I feel prepared to successfully work with multicultural clients in professional practice.	4.74 (.452)	4.83 (.408)	0.09	-0.465	.646
I feel prepared to apply the NASW Code of Ethics in professional practice.	4.74 (.452)	5.00 (0.00)	0.26	-1.404	.174
I feel prepared to engage in evidence based research in professional practice.	4.42 (.961)	5.00 (0.00)	0.58	-1.454	.159
I feel prepared to be a consumer of evidence-based research.	4.56 (.784)	4.83 (.408)	0.27	-0.823	.419
I feel prepared to advocate for the rights of vulnerable populations in professional practice.	4.74 (.562)	5.00 (0.00)	0.26	-1.130	.270
I feel prepared to engage in the political process as a professional social worker.	4.42 (.692)	4.67 (.816)	0.25	-0.727	.474
I feel prepared for professional practice in a rural setting.	4.68 (.582)	5.00 (0.00)	0.32	-1.309	.204

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

The results in Table 10 above show that there were no statistically significant differences between the Hybrid cohort and the Online Cohort. However, it is important to note that the Online cohort rated their satisfaction higher than the Hybrid cohort on all but three items. These items were as follows: (a) I am satisfied with the student organizations available at the MSW Program; (b) The faculty in the MSW Program at WKU were sufficiently accessible; and (c) I am satisfied with the quality of advising I received in the MSW Program at WKU.

Recommendations for 2018-2019

Recommendations for the 2018-2019 academic will be discussed at the MSW Program retreat in order to have a consensus on priorities moving forward.