

**REPORT ON AY2022-2023 ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT****Submission date:** 11/15/2023**Assessment Plan covered in the report:** Social Work BSW**College:** College of Health**Campuses where the program(s) is delivered:** ☒ Anchorage ☐ KOD ☐ KPC ☐ MSC ☐ PWSC**Submitted by:** Matthew J. Cuellar; BSW Program Chair; mjcuellar@alaska.edu

*After responding to the questions below, the program should email this form to the dean, with a copy to the appropriate community campus director(s) if the program is delivered on a community campus.*

- 1. Please list and number the Program Student Learning Outcomes your program assessed in AY23. For each outcome, indicate one of the following: Exceeded faculty expectations, Met faculty expectations, or Did not meet faculty expectations.**

***Example: 1. Communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and formats – Exceeded faculty expectations.***

This past year, the BSW program evaluated the following SLOs. These SLOs are the same as those in the current catalog.

1. Demonstrate Ethical & Professional Behavior - Met faculty expectations
2. Engage in Diversity & Difference in Practice - Met faculty expectations
3. Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, & Environmental Justice - Met faculty expectations
4. Engage in Practice-informed Research & Research-informed Practice - Did not meet faculty expectations
5. Engage in Policy Practice - Did not meet faculty expectations - Did not meet faculty expectations
6. Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations & Communities - Exceeded faculty expectations
7. Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, & Communities - Exceeded faculty expectations
8. Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, & Communities - Exceeded faculty expectations

9. Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, & Organizations - Did not meet faculty expectations

**2. Describe your assessment process in AY23 for these Program Student Learning Outcomes, including the collection of data, analysis of data, and faculty (and other, e.g., advisory board) conversations around the findings. (1000 words or less)**

Each year, the BSW program assesses each of its nine (9) program level competencies/student learning outcomes (SLOs) within the explicit curriculum. In addition, the program annually assesses the program's implicit curriculum (i.e., the learning environment). Following data collection, the program engages in an annual faculty-driven continuous program improvement cycle. To assess students' demonstration of the AY 22/23 BSW program SLOs/competencies, we utilized two primary standardized direct measures: 1) Field Instructor Field Assessment Tool - Revised (FIFAT); and 2) Social Work Education Project (SWEAP) Curriculum Instrument. Scores are derived from 27 different field instructors' ratings of demonstrated behaviors of 27 students were returned by the community-based field instructors. The FIFAT-Generalist/BSW is a direct measure to assess the degree to which students demonstrate the program's nine designated competencies. The BSW Field Coordinator asks the assigned field instructor for each graduating senior to complete the 32-item FIFAT-G/B. The FIFAT-G/B measures each of the BSW program's practice behaviors that are embedded within each of the 9 competencies or student learning outcomes. Each item is rated on a four-point scale that measures the student demonstration of the practice behavior. The SWEAP FCAI is a direct measure, as it evaluates students' knowledge across the BSW generalist curriculum and nine competencies using multiple choice exam questions. In addition, the SWEAP-FCAI measures the dimensions of knowledge, values, and critical thinking as required by CSWE accreditation. Each student is provided a unique url link to complete the measure. Exam results include comparisons of student scores with national score comparison to identify local challenges for our program. The assessment process referenced herein is consistent with the process described in the program's current assessment plan. To determine the percentage of students achieving benchmarks set forth by the faculty (75%), the FIFAT scores are added to the SWEAP scores, then divided by two to get an average score representing each student.

**3. What are the findings and what do they tell the faculty about student learning in your program? (1000 words or less)**

The BSW Program is seeing increased scores in several SLOs pertaining to direct practice (i.e., engagement and practice), with the most notable being in "Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice", with a 5.1% increase in scores from AY 21/22. At this time, we also see an increase in student scores from AY 21/22 in "Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities" with 91.5% of students meeting benchmark, and "Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities" with 90.3% of students meeting benchmark. The highest scored SLO for AY 22/23 was "Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, & Communities", with 94.3% of students achieving the AY 22/23 benchmark. While there are observable strengths in SLOs concerning direct practice and client and systems

engagement, the BSW Program is currently experiencing its lowest scores to date in areas concerning policy, research, and evaluation of practice. For example, the SLO "Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice" saw the greatest decrease since AY 21/22 with 61.9% of students meeting the benchmark (a 5.8% decrease in scores), which warrants further examination and special attention in curriculum action moving forward. Student feedback on all other SLOs can help faculty address and improve this content moving forward. In sum, these findings tell us that students are generally scoring highest in areas concerning direct practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities, while scoring lower in areas concerning research, policy, and program evaluation. This suggest students might benefit from curricular and instructor enhancements with particular focus in the underperforming competency benchmark areas.

**4. Based on the findings, did the faculty make any recommendations for changes to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Yes**

- i. Please describe the recommended action(s), what improvements in student learning the program hopes to see, the proposed timeline, and how the program will know if the change(s) has worked. If no recommendations for changes were made, please explain that decision. (1000 words or less)**

Moving forward, continued and deeper examination needs to focus on assessment and identify strategies for improving BSW research, policy, and evaluation of practice. Faculty and administrators should prioritize focus on curricular and instructor enhancements in student interactions that focus on engaging in practice informed research and research informed practice, policy practice, and practice and program evaluation. Moving into curriculum revisions this year, faculty might consider developing master syllabi/course shells in well-performing competency areas to assure wisdom and experience of faculty teaching this content is preserved. In regards to assessment, faculty and administrators should consider requiring assessment completion as part of BSW program graduation requirements, similar to what other programs require (e.g., psychology). Finally, efforts should be made to review assessment methods/measures for program assessment of new SLOs and curriculum beginning AY24/25 (renewed accreditation cycle for CSWE) and submit a revised assessment plan with program/curricular changes.

**5. In the past academic year, how did your program use the results of previous assessment cycles to make changes intended to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Please check all that apply.**

- ☐ Course curriculum changes
- ☐ Course prerequisite changes
- ☐ Changes in teaching methods
- ☒ Changes in advising

- ☐ Degree requirement changes
- ☐ Degree course sequencing
- ☐ Course enrollment changes (e.g., course capacity, grading structure [pass/fail, A-F])
- ☐ Changes in program policies/procedures
- ☐ Changes to Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)
- ☐ College-wide initiatives (e.g., High-Impact Practices)
- ☒ Faculty, staff, student development
- ☐ Other
- ☐ No changes were implemented in AY23. *(If no options above were selected)*

**If you checked "Other" above, please describe. (100 words or less)**

N/A

**6. Do you have any information about how well these or other past improvements are working? Are they achieving their intended goals? Please include any data or assessment results that help you demonstrate this. (1000 words or less)**

Advising has been distributed to additional faculty. Initiatives to incorporate student voice have been implemented over the course of the last academic year. A larger focus on Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion has been made across the curriculum. Data from the most recent evaluation of the implicit curriculum highlight improvements in all of these areas. Efforts toward improved advising models, increasing ADEI in curriculum and student-program interactions, and continuing student town halls to gain student feedback appear to be improving the implicit and explicit curriculum.

---

**DEAN SECTION (Due to the program on January 15)**

*After completing the Dean Section and signing it, the dean should email this form to the program, and copy [uaa\\_ooo@alaska.edu](mailto:uaa_ooo@alaska.edu) for posting. If the program is delivered on one or more community campus, the dean should consult with the appropriate community campus director(s) on the response and copy the appropriate community campus director(s) when emailing the response to the program.*

**1. Based on the program's responses above, what guidance and support do you have for the program moving forward? (200 words or less)**

The faculty in the Department of Undergraduate Social Work Studies assessed all nine program student learning outcomes. Students met or exceeded expectations with all but two program student learning outcomes (engaging in practice-informed research and research-informed practice, and engaging in policy practice). Overall, student achievement of program student learning outcomes is highest in areas concerning direct practice with individuals, families, groups,

organizations, and communities. Student achievement is lowest in areas concerning research, policy, and program evaluation. This is a consistent finding. It has been reported in previous assessments. Unfortunately, previous recommendations have not been successful in increasing student achievement. Students' ability to engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice declined in the past year.

**2. Discuss what the program is doing particularly well in terms of its processes for the assessment and improvement of student learning, for example, the use of a common rubric or prompt, a signature assignment, etc. (200 words or less)**

The faculty in the Department of Undergraduate Social Work Studies continued to implement a robust assessment plan, measuring both the explicit and implicit curriculum, using multiple measures and data sources. Results continue to show that students are meeting or exceeding faculty expectations for most program student learning outcomes. Recent changes to the explicit and implicit curriculum have been successful in helping students achieve the program's student learning outcomes. However, students continue to experience difficulties with engaging in research, policy, and program evaluation; and recent changes to the explicit and implicit curriculum have not improved student achievement in these learning outcomes. I urge the faculty to refocus on these important program student learning outcomes and identify promising strategies to help students demonstrate competency in areas concerning research, policy, and program evaluation.

Dean's signature:

Debbie Craig, PhD

Date: 12/20/2023