

MSW Evaluation Report: 2018-2019
Submitted by: April L. Murphy, Ph.D.
To: Dr. Patricia Desrosiers, Department Head
Dr. Dr. Saundra Starks, MSW Program Director
Date: 07/24/2019

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 2018-2019. 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) Lum's Cultural Awareness Inventory (2003); and (2) 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 an Excel Spreadsheet to each instructor who taught a section of the courses listed above. Each instructor completed the spreadsheet 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 spreadsheet 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 2018-2019.

Table 2
Rubric Scores for AY 2018-2019

Competency	Percentage Achieved	Goal Met?
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	100.0%	Yes
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	80.0%	No
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	69.6%	No
Competency 4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice	91.7%	Yes
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	73.9%	No
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	100.0%	Yes
Competency 7: Assess with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	100.0%	Yes

Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	100.0%	Yes
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	100.0%	Yes

The goal was met for Competencies 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9; however, there is room for improvement in Competencies 2, 3, and 5. The lowest performing area was Competency 3 (69.6% if students earned a 4 or above) while four of the Competencies (Competency 1, Competency 6, Competency 7, Competency 8) all achieved 100%.

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 2015-2016 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 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. Therefore, Table 3 below shows the ASWB MSW Exam Percentages, the number of questions in each category for the 2019 administration of the PRE.

Based on these changes, it is clear that the PRE content areas more closely resemble the ASWB's MSW Licensure Exam. There was an intentional 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-one (51) students took the PRE on April 8, 2019. Of these, 47 achieved a passing score of 70 and 4 failed to achieve this benchmark (following item analysis). Thus, 92.2% of students taking the exam passed and 7.8% failed during this administration. All students who did not successfully pass the PRE during its first administration decided to retake the PRE on the first date given on April 29, 2019. All of these students passed the exam with a minimum score of 70. 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 2018 compared to scores in 2019.

Table 3
ASWB MSW Licensure Exam vs. the PRE

ASWB (MSW Exam Percentages)	PRE 2019	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
2018 & 2019 PRE Averages (Standard Deviations) By Content Area

Content Area	2018 (n = 56)	2019 (n = 51)	Diff	t-stat	p-value
HBSE	77.9 (17.8)	69.0 (25.1)	(8.84)	2.085	.040*
Foundation Policy	79.3 (12.6)	70.2 (16.7)	(9.01)	2.615	.010**
Advanced Policy	87.5 (25.7)	58.8 (23.9)	(28.68)	5.965	.000***
Family Practice	58.5 (20.4)	58.8 (22.3)	0.34	-0.083	.934
Supervision and Administration	75.9 (20.8)	71.6 (21.8)	(4.32)	1.051	.296
Research	59.4 (19.3)	64.5 (20.5)	5.09	-1.323	.189
Groups	82.4 (12.5)	73.9 (15.7)	(8.58)	3.108	.002**
Rural Communities	79.1 (13.0)	81.8 (11.8)	2.66	-1.105	.271
Diagnosis	74.4 (15.9)	67.6 (19.0)	(6.76)	2.004	.048*
Ethics	84.3 (12.8)	84.7 (13.5)	0.42	-0.166	.868
Diversity	82.8 (12.2)	82.0 (8.2)	(0.80)	0.398	.696
Foundation Practice	79.3 (12.6)	78.4 (12.0)	(0.88)	0.367	.715
Advanced Practice	73.4 (13.7)	80.4 (12.6)	7.00	-2.743	.007**
Community Organizations	58.9 (24.6)	68.0 (20.0)	9.05	-2.096	.039*
Total Questions	76.3 (8.5)	75.1 (6.4)	(1.24)	0.847	.399

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

Overall, the mean score on the 2019 PRE was 75.1 (SD = 6.4), which was 1.24 points lower than the 2018 average. Looking at the table above, the subject areas where students appeared to struggle (< 70%) the most were HBSE (M = 69.0, SD = 25.1), Advanced Policy (M = 58.8, SD = 23.9), Family Practice (M = 58.8, SD = 22.3), Research (M = 64.5, SD = 20.5), Diagnosis (M = 67.6, SD = 19.0) and Community Organizations (M = 68.0, SD = 20.0). There was a statistically significant decrease in scores from 2018 to 2019 in the areas of HBSE, Foundation Policy, Advanced Policy, Groups, and Diagnosis, with the most concerning decrease in Advanced Policy (28.7%). Positively, based on the table above, the subject areas where the most students appeared to perform the best (> 80%) were Rural Communities (M = 81.8, SD = 11.8), Ethics (M = 84.7, SD = 13.5), Diversity (M = 82.0, SD = 8.2), and Advanced Practice (M = 80.4, SD = 12.6). Students made statistically significant gains in Advanced Practice and Community Organizations, with the greatest gain being in Community Organizations (9.05%).

As previously mentioned, the 2019 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 5 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 2018 compared to scores in 2019.

Table 5
2016 & 2017 PRE Averages (Standard Deviations) By Competency

Competency	2018 (n = 56)	2019 (n = 51)	Diff	t-stat	p-value
Competency 1	80.5 (12.4)	80.4 (12.6)	(0.28)	0.119	.905
Competency 2	77.5 (11.7)	76.6 (8.6)	(0.94)	0.467	.642
Competency 3	78.9 (17.8)	81.7 (16.8)	2.83	-0.844	.401
Competency 4	56.8 (19.4)	71.8 (21.6)	15.0	-3.782	.000***
Competency 5	85.3 (14.5)	75.2 (14.3)	(10.02)	3.598	.000***
Competency 6	83.6 (14.5)	79.3 (11.7)	(4.28)	1.670	.098
Competency 7	70.8 (9.6)	68.8 (12.3)	(1.94)	0.913	.363
Competency 8	77.2 (9.7)	76.9 (11.4)	(0.27)	0.135	.893
Competency 9	66.8 (24.2)	61.2 (22.1)	(5.61)	1.249	.215
Total Questions (100)	76.3 (8.5)	75.1 (6.4)	(1.24)	0.847	.399

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

Looking at the table above, the subject area where students appeared to struggle (< 70%) the most was Competency 7 (M = 68.8, SD = 12.3) and Competency 9 (M = 61.2, SD = 22.1). However, this was not statistically significantly different from results in the previous year. The most concerning was the statistically significant decrease in Competency 5 (10.02 pts). Positively, based on the table above, students did make statistically significant gains in Competency 4 (15.0 pts).

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 6 below presents a summary from May 2019 summarizing the field assessment for academic year 2018-2019.

Table 6
Percentage of Students Meeting Field Competencies

Competency	Competency Benchmark	Foundation	Concentration
C1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	100%	100%
C2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	100%	100%
C3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	100%	100%
C4: Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	100%
C5: Engage in Policy Practice	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	85%	96%
C6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	100%
C7: Assess with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	100%	100%
C8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	100%
C9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	85% of students will earn 4 or higher	92%	100%

Based on the results above in Table 6, students achieved the benchmark of 85% for all of the competencies during both their foundation year and concentration year.

Implicit Measures

Lum's Cultural Awareness Inventory

Lum's Cultural Awareness Inventory is used to assess a critical component of this program's standard and mission, which is "...to prepare students for advanced professional social work practice to meet the needs of increasingly diverse rural population in the community, in Kentucky, and in a global society." The program wants to produce graduates who know the traditions, histories, and cultural norms of multicultural groups and can put this knowledge into practice by designing culturally sensitive interventions. In fact, one of the primary goals of the MSW program at WKU is

that graduates emerge with the knowledge, skills, and self-awareness required for culturally sensitive practice (Gabbard, Starks, Cappiccie, & Jagers, 2011). Towards this end, both advanced standing and traditional students complete flagship diversity courses (SWRK 612 or SWRK 501) to master diversity and cultural competency content. In order to assess student's cultural self-awareness, the MSW program at WKU utilizes an instrument that has been validated and employed in numerous diversity evaluative studies nationwide.

The Cultural Awareness Inventory is adapted from Lum's Social Work Cultural Competencies Self-Assessment (2003). The Cultural Awareness Inventory consists of a number of sections, including an introduction, background information, 44 statements that are answered on a 4-point scale, and two open-ended items. This is a self-report instrument that measures self-perception of cultural awareness across the domains of cultural awareness, knowledge acquisition, skill development, and inductive learning. Ultimately, there are 44 items where students rate their level of competency on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (unlikely) to 4 (definitely), with higher scores being indicative of a higher level of cultural competency in each of the aforementioned domains. Therefore, scores could range from 44 – 176. As alluded to above, the Cultural Awareness inventory include 4 subscales: *cultural awareness*, *knowledge acquisition*, *skill development*, and *inductive learning*. The *Cultural Awareness* domain contained 8 items, with possible scores ranging from 8 – 31. The *Knowledge Acquisition* domain included 9 items, with possible scores ranging from 9 – 36. There were 23 items related to *Skill Development*, indicating that possible scores could range from 23 – 92. The *Inductive Learning* domain included 4 items, with possible scores ranging from 4 – 16.

The Cultural Awareness Inventory is employed as a pre-and post-test assessment procedure, statistically evaluated with dependent sample t-tests. It is administered at the beginning (orientation) and conclusion of the student's MSW program. The goal is to assess for significant changes (or lack thereof) in students' perceived level of cultural competency and cultural self-awareness. While self-perceived change does have its obvious limitations, it does allow for students to reflect back on the knowledge and skills they have acquired in courses and in fieldwork, which is a valuable exercise for them to engage in at the conclusion of their study. This, coupled with a self-reflection paper they write in their flagship course, helps them to identify biases, stereotypes, and schemas they must come to grips with in serving multicultural, and often oppressed, clients.

There were 40 students (78.4% of 51 graduating) who completed both the pre- and post-Cultural Awareness Inventory. Results are displayed in Table 7 below.

Table 7
Cultural Competency Overall

Domain	Pre-test M (SD)	Post-test M (SD)	t-stat	p-value
Cultural Awareness	28.28 (2.58)	29.93 (1.99)	-3.560	.001**
Knowledge Acquisition	27.88 (3.49)	31.60 (3.18)	-5.983	<.001***
Skill Development	67.29 (8.89)	79.87 (8.00)	-9.506	<.001***

Inductive Learning	12.20 (2.23)	12.60 (2.31)	-1.004	.322
Overall	135.64 (14.55)	154.00 (13.61)	-8.123	<.001***

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

A dependent samples t-test was conducted in order to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between pre- and post-test on the subscales of the Cultural Awareness Inventory as well as overall. As the results in Table 7 indicate, there was a statistically significant difference between pre- and post-test on three of the subscales (i.e., Cultural Awareness, Knowledge Acquisition and Skill Development) as well as overall. The only area where there was not a statistically significant difference was in the areas of inductive learning. However, students did slightly improve 0.40 points so this indicator is moving in a positive direction.

MSW Student Exit Survey

Graduating MSW students were given the opportunity to complete an exit survey, which was administered online via Qualtrics. Students were also 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 2018 and 2019. Table 8 below presents the results of the MSW Student Exit Survey.

Table 8
MSW Student Exit Survey Results

Item	2018 M(SD)	2019 M(SD)	difference	t-stat	p- value
I am satisfied with the MSW Program experience at WKU	4.46 (.881)	4.55 (.596)	0.081	-0.370	.713
The MSW Program at WKU is respectful of individual diversity.	4.68 (.723)	4.59 (.590)	(0.088)	0.461	.647
I would recommend this program to a prospective student.	4.50 (.839)	4.55 (.739)	0.045	-0.200	.842
I am satisfied with the student organizations available at the MSW Program.	4.19 (.962)	4.55 (.596)	0.360	-1.604	.116
Overall, I am satisfied with the core curriculum offered in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.43 (.690)	4.41 (.796)	(0.019)	0.093	.927
Overall, I am satisfied with the elective offerings within the Department of Social Work.	3.96 (1.091)	4.23 (.813)	0.264	-0.942	.351
Overall, I am satisfied with the support I have received in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.44 (.934)	4.50 (.859)	0.056	-0.215	.831
Overall, I am satisfied with my field experience in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.56 (.751)	4.68 (.568)	0.126	-0.651	.518
I had a manageable workload in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.27 (.827)	4.32 (.568)	0.049	-0.234	.816

Overall, library access at WKU is adequate.	3.96 (1.038)	4.29 (1.102)	0.324	-1.035	.306
The WKU Student Accessibility Resource Center is adequate for my needs.	4.35 (.786)	4.08 (.793)	(0.270)	0.907	.373
The Counseling and Testing Center at WKU is adequate for my needs.	4.00 (.926)	4.07 (1.207)	0.071	-0.180	.859
The faculty in the MSW Program at WKU were sufficiently accessible.	4.32 (1.056)	4.59 (.590)	0.269	-1.142	.260
I am satisfied with the quality of advising I received in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.50 (.793)	4.77 (.528)	0.273	-1.454	.153
I am satisfied with the overall quality of instruction I received in the MSW Program at WKU.	4.32 (.723)	4.59 (.734)	0.269	-1.300	.200
I feel comfortable approaching faculty to collaborate in service/research.	4.37 (.967)	4.59 (.734)	0.221	-0.882	.382
I feel prepared to begin advanced level professional practice.	4.64 (.559)	4.59 (.734)	(0.052)	0.284	.777
I feel prepared to successfully work with multicultural clients in professional practice.	4.68 (.548)	4.77 (.429)	0.094	-0.662	.511
I feel prepared to apply the NASW Code of Ethics in professional practice.	4.75 (.441)	4.68 (.716)	(0.068)	0.414	.681
I feel prepared to engage in evidence based research in professional practice.	4.54 (.838)	4.45 (.671)	(0.081)	0.370	.713
I feel prepared to be a consumer of evidence-based research.	4.56 (.751)	4.59 (.590)	0.035	-0.180	.858
I feel prepared to advocate for the rights of vulnerable populations in professional practice.	4.64 (.870)	4.77 (.528)	0.130	-0.616	.541
I feel prepared to engage in the political process as a professional social worker.	4.39 (.737)	4.27 (1.077)	(0.120)	0.468	.642
I feel prepared for professional practice in a rural setting.	4.71 (.535)	4.59 (.734)	(0.123)	0.688	.495

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

The results in Table 8 above show no statistically significant differences between the 2018 cohort and the 2019 cohort. However, there were 8 items (33.3%) where students indicated less satisfaction. It is important to note that no item had an average rating less than 4, which suggests that students are ultimately satisfied with their experience in the MSW program. Average scores ranged from 4.07 (“*The WKU Student Accessibility Resource Center is adequate for my needs*”) to 4.77 (“*I am satisfied with the quality of advising I received in the MSW program at WKU*”; “*I feel prepared to successfully work with multicultural clients in professional practice*”; and “*I feel prepared to advocate for the rights of vulnerable populations in professional practice*”).

In both 2018 and 2019, questions were added to the exit survey regarding student employment, licensure status and doctoral education plans. This data is presented below for the last two years. Based on the data presented in Table 9 below, a higher percentage of students reported working full-time during their MSW program in 2019 when compared to 2018 (66.7% vs. 59.3%). Additionally, a higher percentage of students (57.1% vs. 28.6%) reported already having been offered a MSW position in 2019 compared to 2018. Lastly, it is important to note that no students reported that

they were not planning on taking the ASWB Master's Exam in 2019 which reflects the emphasis that MSW faculty place on the importance of obtaining licensure post-graduation.

Table 9

MSW Student Exit Survey Results: Employment, Licensure, & Doctoral Plans

Item	2018	2019
Employment Status During MSW Program		
Currently employed full-time (35+ hours)	16 (59.3%)	14 (66.7%)
Currently employed part-time (0-34 hours)	6 (22.2%)	6 (28.6)
Not seeking employment	3 (11.1%)	1 (4.8%)
Seeking employment	2 (7.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Licensure Status		
Already passed the ASWB Master's Exam	2 (7.1%)	4 (19.0%)
Will be taking the ASWB Master's Exam within the next year	25 (89.3%)	17 (81.0%)
Not planning on taking the ASWB Master's Exam	1 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Job Offer		
Already formally offered a MSW position	8 (28.6%)	15 (57.1%)
Not offered MSW position yet	20 (71.4%)	9 (42.9%)
Doctoral Education		
Planning to pursue doctoral-level education	6 (21.4%)	6 (30.0%)
Already accepted into a doctoral program	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Recommendations for 2019-2020

Recommendations for the 2019-2020 academic year will be discussed at the MSW Program retreat in order to have a consensus on priorities moving forward.

References

- Gabbard, W. J., & Starks, S., Cappiccie, A., & Jagers, J. (2011). An effective model of teaching cultural competency to MSW students in a global society. *Journal of Human and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 204-208.
- Lum, D. (2003). *Culturally competent practice: A framework for understanding diverse groups and justice issues*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

