

## **Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2022-2023**

**Program:** Social Work BSW Program

(Due: June 1, 2023) Date report completed: <u>05/18/2023</u>

Completed by: Arlene Reilly-Sandoval

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): <u>Judy Baca, Pam Richmond, Jamie Peralta, David Anderson, Marisa Gonzalez</u>

Please describe the 2022-2023 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for <u>each undergraduate major</u>, <u>minor</u>, <u>certificate</u>, <u>and graduate program</u> (e.g., B.A., B.S., B.A.S, M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Executive Director for Assessment as an email attachment by June 1, 2023. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at <a href="https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html">https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html</a>. Thank you.

## **Brief statement of Program mission and goals:**

**I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle.** Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2023-2024 based on the assessment process.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last reported on prior to this cycle? (Spring 2022)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N =	E. What is the expected proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.)	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
			34).				
1. Demonstrat	2021-2022	Faculty	All students	80% of	Pueblo	The	Only two faculty provided
e Ethical	AY	developed	graduating	students will	Students	faculty-developed	suggested edits on the
and		assessment	Spring 2022,	score 50% or	meeting	assessment tool is	faculty-developed assessment
Professional		tool; 45 "exam"	Summer	higher on	benchmark	not meeting our	tool, but we were informed by
Behavior		questions		the exam	(N = 19):		CSWE that we could go back to

	2022, Fall	1. 64.91%	needs and needs to	using the SWEAP assessment,
2. Engage	2022, Tall	2. 70.18%	be revamped.	which is a nationally-normed
Diversity			be revamped.	assessment tool that the
and		3. 71.93%		department has used for years.
Difference		4. 44.36%		So we scrubbed the
in Practice		5. 75.44%		faculty-developed assessment
III Tuctice		6. 84.21%		tool in favor of the SWEAP for
3. Advance		7. 67.11%		future years.
Human		8. 64.47%		•
Rights and		9. 70.40%		
Social,		J. 70.4070		
Economic,				
and		Colorado		
Environmen		Springs		
tal Justice		Students		
		meeting		
4. Engage In		benchmark		
Practice-inf		(N = 15):		
ormed		1. 62.48%		
Research		2. 66.07%		
and		3. 68.89%		
Research-in		4. 53.33%		
formed		5. 80.00%		
Practice				
		6. 78.86%		
5. Engage in		7. 73.33%		
Policy		8. 78.33%		
Practice		9. 85.83%		
6. Engage with				
Individuals,				
Families,		Combined		
Groups,		students (N		
Organizatio		= 34):		
ns, and		1. 63.70%		
113, and		2. 68.12%		
		3. 70.41%		

Communiti			4. 48.85%		
es			5. 77.72%		
7. Assess			6. 81.54%		
Individuals,			7. 70.22%		
Families,			8. 71.40%		
Groups,			9. 78.11%		
Organizatio					
ns, and					
Communiti					
es					
8. Intervene					
with					
Individuals,					
Families,					
Groups,					
Organizatio					
ns, and					
Communiti					
es					
9. Evaluate					
Practice					
with					
Individuals,					
Families,					
Groups,					
Organizatio					
ns, and					
Communiti					
es					
All 9 SLOs,	2021-2022		Pueblo	We are concerned	The Field Coordinator will
above	AY		Students	that all the	include information on

meeting	students are	evaluating students in the field
benchmark	earning 100%	instructor training for the
(N = 19):	meets or exceeds	future.
1. 100%	expectations in the	
2. 100%	field evaluation,	
3. 100%	but we do screen	
4. 100%	our students	
5. 100%	throughout their	
6. 100%	100, 200, and 300	
7. 100%	level courses. Only	
8. 94.44%	those students who	
9. 94.44%	can adhere to the	
	Code of Ethics and	
Colorado	pass all classes with	
Springs	a C or higher are	
Students	admitted into field.	
meeting		
(N = 15):	social work courses	
1. 100%		
2. 100%	will ensure our field	
	instructors	
4. 100%	understand how to	
5. 100%	evaluate students,	
	- I	
	these scores have	
9. 100%	merit.	
Combined		
l ctudante (N		
students (N		
= 34)		
= 34) 1. 100%		
= 34)		
	benchmark (N = 19): 1. 100% 2. 100% 3. 100% 4. 100% 5. 100% 6. 100% 7. 100% 8. 94.44% 9. 94.44%  Colorado Springs Students meeting benchmark (N = 15): 1. 100% 2. 100% 3. 100% 4. 100% 5. 100% 6. 100% 7. 100% 8. 100% 9. 100% Combined	benchmark (N = 19): 1. 100% 2. 100% 3. 100% 4. 100% 5. 100% 6. 100% 7. 100% 8. 94.44% 9. 94.44% 9. 94.44% Colorado Springs Students benchmark benchmark (N = 15): 1. 100% 1. 100% 2. 100% 3. 100% 4. 100, 200, and 300 1evel courses. Only those students who can adhere to the Code of Ethics and pass all classes with a C or higher are admitted into field. All students must have a 2.5 GPA for social work courses to enter field. We will ensure our field instructors 4. 100% 4. 100% 5. 100% 6. 100% 6. 100% 7. 100% 8. 100% 8. 100% 9. 100% 9. 100%  Meets or exceeds expectations in the field evaluation, but we do screen our students who can adhere to the Code of Ethics and pass all classes with a C or higher are admitted into field. All students must have a 2.5 GPA for social work courses to enter field. We will ensure our field instructors 4. 100% 4. 100% 4. 100% 5. 100% 6. 100% 6. 100% 7. 100% 8. 100% 9. 100

	5. 100% 6. 100% 7. 100% 8. 97.22% 9. 97.22%
--	---

Comments on part I:

**II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2022-2023 cycle.** These are those that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) or other issues did you address in this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment column H and/or feedback?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
Competency 4: engage in practice-informe d research and research-inform ed practice	Spring 2022	We discovered that we were allowed to use the SWEAP after all, as confirmed by CSWE. So rather than continue with evaluating and editing our faculty-developed assessment tool, we went back to using the SWEAP in	The Department met in Spring 2023 to discuss changes and immediately ordered the SWEAP for the 2023 students.	We will not know the results of this change until Fall 2023, when we will meet again to discuss assessment data compiled during Summer 2023.

2023. The program has used	
the SWEAP for many years	
and this will allow us to	
evaluate the program with	
longitudinal data.	
The Chair of the Department	
also conducted a "Science	
and Pseudoscience"	
presentation with all	
300-level students in Pueblo	
during Spring 2023 to assess	
the presentation's usefulness	
in increasing competency 4	
scores. The Pueblo students	
will be compared to the	
Colorado Springs students in	
Spring 2023 to determine if	
their scores are any better on	
competency 4.	

Comments on part II: