



## Submission Guidelines for **INTERIM** Assessment Reports (assessment results from AY 2016-17)

### Guidelines:

- 1) *Submission deadline: **October 2, 2017**, early submissions are encouraged*
- 2) *Submit electronically to Yvonne Kirby (Director of OIRA) as an email attachment ([ykirby@ccsu.edu](mailto:ykirby@ccsu.edu))*
- 3) *Provide a SEPARATE REPORT for each academic program. All certificate and degree programs are required to be assessed per NEASC. Check the reporting calendar to see which certificate programs are considered embedded in a degree program as these programs do not need to be reported on separately.*
- 4) *An Interim report consists of the completed Overview report for the academic program and General Education Overview, if appropriate.
  - a. *If your department contributes to the General Education (GE) curriculum and has not conducted any assessment on GE but your faculty have contributed artifacts to the Multi-State Collaborative, please indicate which faculty have provided artifacts (item 7 in the GE report).**

**Reminder:** Assessment reporting is on a five-year cycle, consisting of a full report in year one followed by interim reports for three years and then a summary report is due in the fifth year. The assessment cycle is aligned with the Program Review Cycle such that the full assessment report is due the year prior to the year that the department will submit their program review report. Departments are not required to submit an assessment report for a program in the year the department is scheduled to begin writing the Program Review self-study (see [Program Review Policy](#) and [Assessment Calendar](#)). For example, if your program is scheduled for program review in Spring 2017 or Fall 2017 then only a Summary assessment report will be due for that program in Fall 2017 (report covering AY 2016-17 activities); this is necessary to comply with BOR requirements. Departments that are accredited by an outside agency, and thus exempt from the Program Review Policy, should follow the guidelines for assessment reporting as described in this document and follow the Assessment Calendar. Where possible, the assessment cycle will be aligned with the accreditation cycle and a Summary report will be due in the year the self-study is due to the accrediting body.

**Interim reports:** complete ONLY the Overview for the program, complete with contribution to general education.

URL to Assessment website resources: [http://web.ccsu.edu/oira/assessment/assessment\\_aap.asp](http://web.ccsu.edu/oira/assessment/assessment_aap.asp)

**Overview:** The following questions are required by the Connecticut State Colleges and University Board of Regents, NEASC and the CCSU Academic Assessment Committee. These questions must be completed annually for all academic programs as well as all departments offering courses in general education. Submit a separate table for each program and for each general education learning outcome the department teaches.

- You are encouraged to address the questions using bullet statements rather than paragraph form —full details should be included within the text of the full report when it is due, not in the Overview.

- **Interim reports:** the Overview should append clearly labeled data tables as appropriate - for both the academic program as well as general education.

**Overview**

**Department:** \_Social Work

**Report Preparer:** \_\_\_Joanne León, Department Chair

**Program Name and Level:** \_\_\_Social Work Undergraduate-Bachelor of Arts Degree (BA)

Program Assessment Question	Response
<p><b>URL:</b> Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.</p>	<p><a href="http://www.ccsu.edu/socialwork/">http://www.ccsu.edu/socialwork/</a> - provided in a pdf file. There are 9 competencies with indicators under each competency. The program is working to get these added to the website in html format.</p> <p>For ease of navigating this report, within the link below, the competencies and indicators are easily visible.</p> <p><b>URL:</b> <a href="https://www.taskstream.com/ts/horton102/SocialWorkAssessmentReports">https://www.taskstream.com/ts/horton102/SocialWorkAssessmentReports</a>  <b>Password:</b> CSWE</p>
<p><b>LO Changes:</b> Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed (e.g., make LO more discrete, align LO with findings). If no changes were made, please report not applicable.</p>	<p>No changes since last report.</p>
<p><b>Strengths:</b> What about your assessment process is working well?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program began using Taskstream as the assessment management software in 2015. As such, only two years of data are available. Key assessments in certain courses are required to be scored by a rubric that is aligned with the program outcomes (called competencies by the program faculty and accrediting body).</li> <li>• Data reports are generated at the end of each academic year. Faculty view data for strengths and weaknesses.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Improvements:</b> What about your assessment process needs to improve? (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systematic review of data for programmatic changes.</li> <li>• Systematic review of rubrics to ensure rubrics provide specific, actionable feedback to candidates.</li> <li>• Periodic review of competencies (learning outcomes) to ensure alignment with key assignments and rubrics.</li> </ul>
<p><b>For Each Learning Outcome (LO) complete questions 1, 2 and 3:</b> Many programs have a large number of LOs, please limit the report to no more than five. <b>The Social Work Program has 9 Competencies (Learning Outcomes). This year’s report will address competencies 1 to 5. Next year’s report will address competencies 6 to 9.</b></p>	
<p><b>LO 1. Competency 1 – Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior</b></p>	
<p>1.1) <b>Assessment Instruments:</b> What is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated</p>	<p>1) Data from the rubrics aligned with identified key assignments to assess learning outcomes in major and senior social work core courses: SW 374: Research Methodology Assignment; SW 426 Final Policy Analysis; SW 360 DAC; SW 362 Funding Proposal; SW 368 Ecosystems Perspective. All rubrics have 4 levels: Exceptional or Outstanding (4pts), Accomplished (3) points, Developing (2 pts), and Deficient (1 pt).</p>

outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)	2) 70-hour Volunteer field experience evaluations for 360/361 3) 400-hour academic year- Senior Internship Field Experience evaluations
1.2) <b>Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty</li> </ul>
1.3) <b>Results:</b> Since the most recent full report, list: a. The conclusion(s) drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)	<p><b>To view Data for ALL Competencies/Learning Outcomes, use the link and password below:</b></p> <p><b>URL:</b> <a href="https://www.taskstream.com/ts/horton102/SocialWorkAssessmentReports">https://www.taskstream.com/ts/horton102/SocialWorkAssessmentReports</a>  <b>Password:</b> CSWE</p> <p><b>Click Competency 1. Then click on the data report for F16 to Sp17 to view data. Follow this same procedure for each competency.</b></p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b>          Course Key Assignments: The overall average for Competency 1 (learning outcome) during Fall 2016 &amp; Spring 2017 was 2.89/4 (72%) and the benchmark is 80% as required by CSWE (external accrediting body). This is slightly down 3% from the 2015/2016 data report (2.98/4.0 (75%).          70 Hour Evaluations: The instrument is on a 4 point scale (Always, Almost Always, Sometimes, Almost Never) and is completed by the site supervisor at the agency (not a faculty member). Items A to I in Part 1 provide evidence for Competencies 1 and 2. The majority of candidates are scoring Always or Almost Always on all nine items.          Senior Field Evaluations: This instrument is on a 4 point scale (Exceptional, Good, Developing, and Deficient) and is completed by the site supervisor at the agency (not a faculty member). Items are listed by competency.</p> <p><b>Analysis:</b> Based on the data from key course assessments in 2016-2017, candidates are scoring below the 80% on Competency 1. Upon drilling down into the data utilizing the “distribution” feature within the Taskstream report, it is evident that the biggest weakness is the use of grammar and mechanics in written work. This is related to the professional behavior aspect of Competency 1.          70 Hour Evaluation data indicate that the majority of candidates are meeting Competency 1 at the required level. With respect to the Senior Field Evaluation, 95% of candidates are scoring Good to Exceptional on items aligned to Competency 1. High scores on this assessment are expected, as these are seniors competing their field placements required for graduation.</p> <p><b>Changes:</b> Based on the data, faculty made changes to beginning level courses (SW 225, 226, and 227) to require a more intense focus on writing. The program continues to monitor the data to note improvements in the area of written communication.</p>
<b>LO 2. Competency 2 – Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</b>	
2.1) <b>Assessment Instruments:</b> What is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	1) Identified key assignments to assess learning outcomes in major and senior social work core courses: SW 360 DAC; SW 362 Funding Proposal; SW 362 Presentation; SW 374 Research Methodology; SW 426 Political Autobiography 2) 70-hour Volunteer field experience evaluations for SW 360/361 3) 400-hour academic year- Senior Internship Field Experience evaluations
2.2) <b>Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty</li> </ul>

<p>2.3) Since the most recent full report, list:</p> <p>a. The conclusion(s) drawn</p> <p>b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)</p>	<p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>Course Key Assignments: The average for Competency 3 for Fall 2016 &amp; Spring 2017 was 3.22/4 (80.51%). As such, the average exceeds the 80%, as required by CSWE.</p> <p>70 Hour Evaluations: 70 Hour Evaluations: The instrument is on a 4-point scale (Always, Almost Always, Sometimes, Almost Never) and is completed by the site supervisor at the agency (not a faculty member). Items A to I in Part 1 provide evidence for Competencies 1 and 2. The majority of candidates are scoring Always or Almost Always on all nine items.</p> <p>Senior Field Evaluation: This instrument is on a 4-point scale (Exceptional, Good, Developing, and Deficient) and is completed by the site supervisor at the agency (not a faculty member). Items are listed by competency. Three items provide evidence for Competency 2. Data indicate that 93% of candidates scored Good to Exceptional on these items.</p> <p><b>Analysis:</b> Competency 2 is being met by the majority of the candidates in the program.</p>
	<p><b>Changes:</b> While it appears that candidates are performing well on Competency 2, faculty do note that items on assessments that relate to self-awareness or self-regulation tend to have lower scores. For example, within SW 426, candidates complete a political autobiography and one rubric item that aligns with self-awareness, self-regulation and personal biases and values had an average score of 2.24/4. This area will be monitored and faculty will discuss implications of the score does not improve.</p>
<p><b>LO 3: Competency 3 – Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</b></p>	
<p>3.1) <b>Assessment Instruments:</b> For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p>1) Identified key assignments to assess learning outcomes in major and senior social work core courses: SW 362 Funding Proposal; SW 426 Political Autobiography; and SW 452/453 Group Project.</p> <p>2) 70-hour Volunteer field experience evaluations</p> <p>3) 400-hour academic year- Senior Internship Field Experience evaluations</p>
<p>3.2) <b>Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Faculty</li> </ul>
<p>3.3) Since the most recent full report, list:</p> <p>a. The conclusion(s) drawn</p> <p>b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)</p>	<p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>Course Key Assignments: The average across all assignments for Competency 3 was 3.23/4 (80.74%). Benchmark is met.</p> <p>70 Hour Evaluations: The majority of candidates are scoring Always or Almost Always on all items relating to Competency 3.</p> <p>Senior Field Evaluations: Ninety-one percent (mean 3.26/4) of candidates scored Good to Exceptional on the items pertaining to Competency 3.</p> <p><b>Analysis:</b> While the benchmark was met across course key assignments, faculty noted that a potential area for improvement is related to candidates' ability to understand and connect current events with the social work profession. For example, within the key assessment in SW 426: Political Autobiography, the average score on this item was 2.47/4.</p>
	<p><b>Changes:</b> Based on this assessment there are no changes planned in the near future.</p>

<b>LO 4. Competency 4 – Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice</b>	
4.1) <b>Assessment Instruments:</b> For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	1) Identified key assignments to assess learning outcomes in major and senior social work core courses: SW 368 Ecosystems Perspective; SW 374 Research Methodology; SW 426 Political Autobiography. 2) 70-hour Volunteer field experience evaluations 3) 400-hour academic year- Senior Internship Field Experience evaluations
4.2) <b>Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program faculty</li> </ul>
4.3) Since the most recent full report, list: a. The conclusion(s) drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)	<p><b>Conclusion:</b>            Course Key Assignments: The average across all assignments for Competency 4 was 3.21/4 (80.14%). Benchmark is met.            70 Hour Evaluations: The majority of candidates are scoring Always or Almost Always on all items relating to Competency 4.            Senior Field Evaluations: Eighty-three percent (mean 3.14/4) of candidates scored Good to Exceptional on the items pertaining to Competency 4.</p> <p><b>Analysis:</b> Competency 2 is being met by the majority of the candidates in the program. However, faculty note that approximately 18% of candidates scored at that Developing level on items aligning with Competency 4. For example, 22% of site supervisors rated candidates at the Developing level on their ability to “use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research. In addition, 20% of candidates were rated at the Developing level on their ability to “use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery. Faculty plan to monitor these data to see if a trend emerges that suggests changes.</p> <p><b>Changes:</b> Based on this assessment there are no changes planned in the near future.</p>
<b>LO 5. Competency 5 – Engage in Policy Practice</b>	
5.1) <b>Assessment Instruments:</b> For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	1) Identified key assignments to assess learning outcomes in major and senior social work core courses: SW 362 Presentation and SW 426 Final Policy Analysis. 2) 70-hour Volunteer field experience evaluations 3) 400-hour academic year- Senior Internship Field Experience evaluations
5.2) <b>Interpretation:</b> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Faculty</li> </ul>
5.3) Since the most recent full report, list: a. The conclusion(s) drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)	<p><b>Conclusion:</b>            Course Key Assignments: The average across all assignments for Competency 5 was 3.24/4 (80.98%). Benchmark is met.            70 Hour Evaluations: The majority of candidates are scoring Always or Almost Always on all items relating to Competency 5.            Senior Field Evaluations: Eighty-three percent (mean 3.16/4) of candidates scored Good to Exceptional on the items pertaining to Competency 5.</p> <p><b>Analysis:</b> While overall data indicate students are meeting Competency 5, information gleaned from the Senior Field Evaluation suggests that students may need additional opportunities in engaging in policy practice. For example, approximately 18% received a rating of Developing to Deficient on their ability to “identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services.” In addition, 18% scored Developing to Deficient on their ability to “assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services.”</p> <p><b>Changes:</b> Based on this assessment there are no changes nor planned in the near future; however, faculty may revisit the 70 Hour evaluation items to ensure better alignment with the intent of Competency 5 – Engagement in Policy Practices.</p>

	Specifically, the question to answer is whether the 70 field placements provide an opportunity for students to exhibit behavior relative to this competency. The results of this “deep dive” may trigger changes to the Senior Field evaluation.
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

General education is not applicable.