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Section I
Response To:
Work Plan for Academic Year
2012-2013

2012 / 2013 Work Plan Summary

1. The Social Work Program Director will meet with next year’s instructor for SWK 453 and SWK 454 to review the mean scores for all the course objectives related to the research competency, calling specific attention to the objectives that were rated below the minimum requirement of 3.00. Additionally, the director will review the CSWE competencies with the instructor and discuss the implementation of a signature assignment and corresponding rubric for the class.

Task Completed? __X__ Yes ______ No

Explanation: Program Director met with instructor in May of 2013 to process this year’s course and to review the signature assignment and corresponding rubric.

2. All signature assignments must have rubrics that set a minimum score of 8.1 necessary to receive proficient status (benchmark). All scored rubrics should be tallied and summaries for each signature assignment and their associated program goals / competencies should be recorded in next year’s evaluative document.

Task Completed? _____ Yes __X__ No

Explanation: This was partially achieved. The social work faculty met with others in the social science division to clarify expectations for signature assignments. A list of signature assignments, that includes the course they are required in as well as the current instructor will be given to the Social Work Administrative Assistant to insure that there is follow-through for 2013-2014. This past year, we only collected data from three of the twelve signature assignments.
3. With regards to signature assignments, the Field Director (Nola Carew) will do the following:

   a) In SWK 221 rework rubric to include competencies addressed in the assignment –should also be more heavily focused on HBSE competency.

      Task Completed?  X  Yes  No

   b) in SWK 331 create stronger rubric for “knocks on the door” and make sure signature assignment better reflects practice behavior.

      Task Completed?  X  Yes  No

**Explanation:** “Knocks on the door” now have reflection briefs that are required but since it isn’t a signature assignment, no rubric was developed. The signature assignment for SWK 331 is the multi-dimensional assessment. The rubric has been revised to reflect clearer linkage to competencies and practice behaviors that are expected for that assignment.

   c) in SWK 222 place more emphasis on HBSE competency in signature assignment.

      Task Completed?  Yes  X  No

**Explanation:** Class not taught by original instructor. SWK faculty should agree on who should take care of this, prior to the Spring of 2014.

   d) in SWK 333 perspective paper should incorporate social justice competency and Christian worldview. The macro project should emphasize EPAS 2.1.9 / SWKPG 1i (contexts that shape practice).

      Task Completed?  X  Yes  No

**Explanation:** SWK 333 perspective paper now incorporates both social justice competency and Christian worldview in its expectations and grading rubric.

*The Macro project also emphasizes EPAS 2.1.9 and SWKPG 1i (contexts that shape practice), but preference would be to incorporate this competency into another signature assignment and have just one signature assignment for this course.*
e) In SWK 451, revise Integrative Case Assignment as a signature assignment / rubric to fully include SWKPG 1j / EPAS 2.1.10 (practice).

Task Completed? _____ Yes ___X___ No

Explanation: Students were required to do the Integrative Case Assignment, but designation as a signature assignment and creation of a corresponding rubric will be done for the Fall of 2013.

Also, develop a signature assignment for professionalism (SWKPG 1a / EPAS 2.1.1) by Fall of 2013.

Task Completed? _____ Yes ___X___ No

Explanation: Assignment was created and implemented last year, but still needs to be designated as a formal signature assignment with corresponding rubric. This will be done for the Fall of 2014.

4. With regards to signature assignments, the Program Director (Scott) will do:

   a) Revise portfolio requirements to reflect minimum requirements for proficiency and expectations for students in student handbook and syllabi.

   Task Completed? ______ Yes ___X___ No

   Explanation: Portfolio requirements have been clarified. Instructors in social work courses have also been informed to include a statement about the portfolio, signature assignments, and expectations in their syllabus. The student handbook needs to be updated.

   b) In SWK 311 Social Policy – revise signature assignment rubrics to more fully reflect social justice and policy competencies (SWKPG 1e and 1h respectively).

   Task Completed? ___X___ Yes ______ No

   c) In SWK 332 – revise group proposal rubric to reflect practice competency (SWKPG 1j / EPAS 2.1.10Aa – engagement and EPAS 2.1.10Cb - intervention).

   Task Completed? ______ Yes ___X____ No

d) In SWK 332 – create a comprehensive rubric for role play summary assignment and include EPAS 2.1.10 Ccde (practice – intervention).

Task Completed? _____ Yes _____ No


5. BY THE END OF 2012-2013 ALL COMPETENCIES SHOULD BE ADDRESSED IN SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS AND CORRESPONDING RUBRICS!

See Competency / Signature Assignment Map Below. Needs review and discussion with the Social Work Faculty and Advisory Board.
# COMPETENCY / SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENT MAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>SWK 221 222 HBSE</th>
<th>SWK 311 Policy</th>
<th>SWK 331 Pract.</th>
<th>SWK 332 Groups</th>
<th>SWK 333 Org.</th>
<th>SWK 417 Diversity</th>
<th>SWK 453-4 Research</th>
<th>SWK 462 Capstone</th>
<th>SWK 451-2 Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
<td>SWK 222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical Decision-Making Paper a-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Adult in Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>SWK 222</td>
<td>Policy Brief</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group Facilit.</td>
<td>Macro Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical Decision-Making Paper a-d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Adult in Society</td>
<td>a-b Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum. Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advoc. c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Dimen. Paper c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Policy Brief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>a Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Justice</strong></td>
<td>Policy Brief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>a Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Advoc. b-c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Dev. Theory Paper a Adult in Soc. b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HBSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
<td>Policy Brief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Advoc. c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contexts that shape practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macro Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macro Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macro Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMPETENCY / SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENT MAP (con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>SWK 221</th>
<th>SWK 311</th>
<th>SWK 331</th>
<th>SWK 332</th>
<th>SWK 333</th>
<th>SWK 417</th>
<th>SWK 453-4</th>
<th>SWK 462</th>
<th>SWK 451-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice 2.1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Dimensional Assessment a-d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macro Persp. Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Christian Worldview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Book Review: The Call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SWK 111 Intro to Social Work requires students to do a written summary of a booklet entitled “So you want to be a Social Worker” by Alan Keith Lucas.
Section II:

Evaluative Summary of Academic Year 2012-2013

The purpose of the Evaluative Summary Document is to provide summary information from all evaluative tools used to assess the Social Work Program and it’s program competencies. Information provided is then used to generate Program responses which are documented in the Social Work Program Response and Work Plan Document for the following academic year.
PART A: Explicit Curriculum Program Evaluation Measures

I. Student Evaluation of Course Objectives.

Bench Mark: Mean Scores averaging at or below 3 merit a specific program response.

Note: Only Multiple Comments are Recorded

SWK 111 - Intro to Social Work  (Fall 2012, Spring 2013)

Total Number of Students in Class:  31 (Fall) 22 (Spring)
Number of Forms Completed: 26 (Fall) 18 (Spring)

1. The student will be able to demonstrate a beginning understanding of what it means to identify as a professional social worker and the conduct expected of a professional social worker (SWPG 1a / EPAS 2.1.1 )

Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.3      Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.55

- The book was very helpful in creating this score, especially the case studies at the beginning. (4)
- So you want to be a Social Worker? Faith and S.W. correlation (2)
- Case studies (2)
- In class discussions (2)
- The readings, assignments, discussions have helped to understand professional social work in a deeper way. (5)
- Lectures/projects/research papers all addressed this well. (2)

2. The student will be able to demonstrate a beginning understanding of SW ethical principles & how they guide professional practice in a variety of settings (SWPG 1b / EPAS 2.1.2/)

Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.34      Sp 2013 Mean Score = 4.50

- Reading assignments about this area and class discussion. (5)
- Reading case studies where social workers had to make decisions that test their ethical principles. (4)

3. Students will begin developing an appreciation for how critical thinking informs and communicates professional judgment (SWPA 1c / EPAS 2.1.3)

Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.07      Sp 2013 Mean Score = 4.11

- Class discussion (3)
4. The students will begin the process of understanding diversity (specifically characterized by age, class, culture, ethnicity, gender, political ideology, religion, & sexual orientation in the context of the SW profession (SWPG 1d / EPAS 2.1.4)

   Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.46  Sp 2013 Mean Score = 4.72

   - Campolo reading. When we talked about the problem of Christians denying help to gays. It really opened my eyes to how big of a problem that is. (2)
   - The discussions and reading assignments, like writing a paper on our thoughts of the readers were helpful to learn more. (2)

5. The students will have increased knowledge of social & economic justice (SWPG 1e / EPAS 2.1.5)

   Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.42  Sp 2013 Mean Score = 4.27

   - The readings somewhat explained about the economic justice. (2)
   - Group project, lectures, readings, discussions (3)

6. Students will increase their understanding of the relationship of social policy & social work practice (SWPG 1h / EPAS 2.1.8)

   Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.07  Sp 2013 Mean Score = 4.22

   - Discussions / lectures/ textbook reading (4)
   - We always talked about how the policy was put into practice either with different cases or when people came in to speak. (2)

7. Students will increase their understanding of the various contexts (settings) that shape social work practice (SWPG 1i / Competency 2.1.9)

   Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.34  Sp 2013 Mean Score = 4.55

   - The book and lectures were very good (5)
8. Students will begin to integrate a Christian worldview with their understanding of the social work profession through completion of reading and homework assignments and classroom discussion (SWPG2)

Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.5
Sp 2013 Mean Score = 4.72

**Student comments:**
- Discussions and out of the textbook assignments and “So you want to be a Social Worker? (6)
  - The book we just read was helpful to give a clear picture of this; I think it would be helpful to read *it at the beginning of the semester* and discuss it more
- Good class discussions (6 comments)
- We did this when we talked to the interns who shared their faith and profession. Also in every day class. (5 comments)
- Tony Campolo readings (3 comments)

**PART B: Additional Comments:**

1. **What was most helpful/beneficial for you in this course?**
   - Guest speakers (8);
   - especially if they were Christians.
   - Class discussions were good and actually helpful in remembering things (8)
   - The study guides for tests (3)
   - Going outside class; the requirement of going to the agency was very good (3)
   - I think it was very helpful seeing all the different areas of social work practice. (2)
   - The extra help that our professor was willing to provide to our class (3)
   - Class discussions and readings (12)
   - Guest speakers (4)
   - Case studies /examples (9)
   - Group project (7)

2. **What was least helpful / beneficial for you in this course?**
   - I didn’t like that we didn’t go all the way through a power point (3)
   - Not very much discussion on chapter material (2)
   - Lecture only days (2)

3. **Please give any constructive criticism or comments regarding the course.**
   - More fun activities. Maybe theoretical case study activities and more hands on things. (3 comments)
   - Move along with teaching. Don’t get off topic or dwell on things too long/focus. (2)
   - More time through power points (3 comments)
   - I liked the course in general and it was very beneficial (9 comments)
   - Give Scott Sanders a raise. He was the best professor I had this semester and last. 😊
SWK 221- Human Behavior in the Social Environment  I Fall 2012
Number of Students in Class:  20 Fall 2012
Number of Forms Completed:  19 Fall 2012

1. The student will demonstrate knowledge of several developmental theories and apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment (SWPG 1g/EPAS 2.1.7) by:
   a. Completing a course assignment of a developmental self-study and theory project incorporating two developmental theories.
   b. Completing a course assignment addressing bio/psycho/social/spiritual factors impacting teenagers struggling with a particular issue utilizing multi-level analyses.
   c. Completing a course assignment applying the student’s knowledge of human behavior and the social environment to case examples and evaluating the social environment impacts on case process.
   d. Completing a psychosocial assessment of an individual between the ages of 0-21 incorporating person in environment and multi-level assessment.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score: 4.25    Fall 2012 Mean Score: 4.42

   Student comments:
   • Class discussion helpful (5)
   • “Turning Stones” was excellent (5)
   • Theory Project (6)

2. The student will apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments (SWPG 1c / EPAS 2.1.3) by:
   a. Completing a course assignment analyzing a social work journal article from a person in environment, empowerment, and strengths based perspective.
   b. Developing a creative representation of a developmental theory integrating multiple resources as well as a critique of the theory through a course assignment.
   c. Analyzing best practice approaches in meeting the needs of teenagers through a group assignment.
   d. Completing a psychosocial assessment by developing questions in key areas, interviewing an individual, and formulating a written assessment incorporating bio/psycho/social/spiritual dimensions.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score: 4.37    Fall 2012 Mean Score: 4.31

   Student comments:
   • I really enjoyed the book “Turning Stones” (10).
   • Great class discussions / case studies (2)
3. Students will begin to develop an appreciation for diversity and difference in practice (SWPA 1 / EPAS 2.1.4 / ) by:
   a. Course readings and class discussion of power, social class, oppression and discrimination, and populations at risk.
   b. Course content and class discussion of diverse parenting styles
   c. Examinations/tests of knowledge of racial and ethnic diversity, populations at risk and child/youth and parenting issues related to diversity and difference.
   d. Course assignments (psychosocial assessment, group teen challenge paper, journal review) incorporating the students understanding of diversity in assessment and intervention.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score: **4.62**   Fall 2012 Mean Score: **4.31**

4. The students will demonstrate beginning ability to integrate Christian worldview with social work practice (SWPG 2) by:
   a. Course readings and discussion on the integration of social work assessment and faith.
   b. Completing an assessment of an individual incorporating a spiritual assessment dimension.
   c. Completing a developmental self-study assignment incorporating the student’s spiritual development in relation to a faith development theory.
   d. Course reading and discussion on the perspective of faith in the context of global social work practice.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score = **4.43**    Fall 2012 Mean Score: **4.31**
   - loved the discussions that integrated our faith into difficult subjects in s.w. (5)

**PART B: Please provide comments below regarding the objectives and any other information helpful to the strengthening of this class in the future:**

**Student comments:**
- Great class, followed all objectives, Great job Nola Carew! (5)
- Liked Turning Stones (3)
- Start projects sooner (2)
SWK 222- Human Behavior in the Social Environment II (Sp 2013)

Number of Students in Class: 20
Number of Forms Completed: 18

1. Develop beginning skills of identifying as a professional social worker (SWPG 1a)
   A  Demonstrating professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication in the course of carrying out a life story project with an elderly adult in the community
   B  Developing an understanding of professional social work roles and boundaries during the course of a life story community project
   C  Demonstrating ability to practice personal reflection and self-correction throughout the course through journaling exercises and course papers

   Spring 2012 Mean Score: 4.6  Spring 2013 Mean Score: 4.5

Student comments:
- The Adult Life Story Project was helpful (6)

2. Apply ethical principles to guide professional practice (SWPG 1b / EPAS 2.1.2)
   A  Demonstrating professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication in the course of carrying out a life story project with an elderly adult in the community
   B  Developing an understanding of professional social work roles and boundaries during the course of a life story community project
   C  Demonstrating ability to practice personal reflection and self-correction throughout the course through journaling exercises and course papers

   Spring 2012 Mean Score: 4.53  Spring 2013 Mean Score: 4.16

- Could have talked more about this (2)
- Discussions in class were the main source of this (4)

3. Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments (SWPG 1c / EPAS 2.1.3)
   A  Demonstrating professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication in the course of carrying out a life story project with an elderly adult in the community
   B  Developing an understanding of professional social work roles and boundaries during the course of a life story community project
   C  Demonstrating ability to practice personal reflection and self-correction throughout the course through journaling exercises and course papers

   Spring 2012 Mean Score: 4.46  Spring 2013 Mean Score: 4.44
4. Demonstrate ability to engage diversity and difference in beginning level practice (SWPG 1d / EPAS 2.1.4)
   A  Demonstrating professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication in the course of carrying out a life story project with an elderly adult in the community
   B  Developing an understanding of professional social work roles and boundaries during the course of a life story community project
   C  Demonstrating ability to practice personal reflection and self-correction throughout the course through journaling exercises and course papers

   Spring 2012 Mean Score: **4.53**  Spring 2013 Mean Score **4.44**
   - The speaker and discussions about homosexuality really helped in this area (2)

5. Apply knowledge of human behavior & social environment (SWPG 1g /EPAS 2.1.7)
   A  Demonstrating professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication in the course of carrying out a life story project with an elderly adult in the community
   B  Developing an understanding of professional social work roles and boundaries during the course of a life story community project
   C  Demonstrating ability to practice personal reflection and self-correction throughout the course through journaling exercises and course papers

   Spring 2012 Mean Score: **4.6**  Spring 2013 Mean Score **4.55**
   - Life Story Project and case studies helpful (2)

6. Respond (engage, assess, intervene) to contexts that shape practice (SWPG 1i /EPAS 2.1.10)
   A  Demonstrating professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication in the course of carrying out a life story project with an elderly adult in the community
   B  Developing an understanding of professional social work roles and boundaries during the course of a life story community project
   C  Demonstrating ability to practice personal reflection and self-correction throughout the course through journaling exercises and course papers

   Spring 2012 Mean Score: **4.28**  Spring 2013 Mean Score: **4.61**
   - Life Story Project and case studies helpful (2)
7. The student will identify and integrate biblical principles and truths relative to human behavior and development to social work practice in contemporary society (SWPG 2 / HSS Objective 1)
   A. Demonstrating professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication in the course of carrying out a life story project with an elderly adult in the community
   B. Developing an understanding of professional social work roles and boundaries during the course of a life story community project

Spring 2012 Mean Score: 4.13  Spring 2013 Mean Score: 3.61

(PART B) Please provide comments below regarding the objectives and any other information helpful to strengthening of this class in the future:

1. What was most helpful/beneficial for you in this course?
   - The ‘End of Life Project’ was the best way to learn our material and interact with an elder. (9)
   - The content was interesting but the reflection times in class where we could just talked about our thoughts on the material we had covered was always beneficial to me just to process everything.
   - The use of multimedia in lectures, power points, and discussion (5)
   - The section about homosexuality and guest speaker really helpful (8)
   - The ‘Tuesday’s with Morrie’ Project (6)

2. What was least helpful/beneficial in this course?

3. Please give any constructive criticism or comments regarding the course.
   - We need more emphasis on reading materials – more accountability (2)

**SWK 311 Social Welfare Policy Fall 2012**

Number of Students in Class: 14
Number of forms completed: 14

1. Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being (SWPG 1h /EPAS 2.1.8)

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.25  Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.28

**Student comments:**
- Policy Advocacy helpful (4)
- Policy Brief helpful (4)
2. Engage in diversity and difference in practice (SWPG 1d / EPAS 2.1.4) and advance human rights and social and economic justice (SWPG 1e / EPAS 2.15)

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.25  Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.42

- Discussions / Debate / CQ Researcher (3)
- Policy advocacy (2)
- Policy brief (2)
- Different speakers came into class (2)

3. Apply social work professional values (SWPG 1b / EPAS 2.1.2) and engage in research informed practice (SWPG 1f / EPAS 2.1.6)

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.16  Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.21

- Policy brief, Advocacy, Debate (4)

4. Apply critical thinking to inform professional judgments (SWPG 1c / EPAS 2.1.3)

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.08  Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.21

- Debate (2)
- Policy brief (2)

5. Integrate their Christian worldview (SWPG 2)

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.75  Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.5

- Book report was very purposeful in the learning process (4)
- There was an article that was helpful (2)
- Discussions (2)
Students will apply the generalist problem solving model in a variety of settings with individuals, families, groups, communities, & organizations (SWPG 1j / EPAS 2.1.10) by:

a. Developing a working knowledge of the generalist intervention model (GIM) and applying the steps of engagement, assessment, planning, intervention, termination & evaluation in practice labs and classroom role plays.

b. Completing a multi-dimensional assessment assignment by applying the GIM to a case study to demonstrate assessment, engagement, planning, intervention, termination, and evaluation skills.

c. Researching a practice area related to individuals or families, completing an annotated bibliography detailing research findings, and applying evidence informed knowledge to practice approaches.

d. Developing knowledge of helping skills with a variety of service populations and needs and demonstrating knowledge and skill through course examinations and video-taped interviews.

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.57  Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.76

Student Comments:
- Knock on the doors were great! (2)
- Role playing really helped (3)

Students will develop beginning skills to be able to identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly (SWPG 1a / EPAS 2.1.1) by:

a. Demonstrating professionalism and ability to self-evaluate and self-correct through role plays, practice labs, and video-taped interview sessions with peer and instructor critiques and feedback.

b. Seeking feedback from peers and professor on practice labs, role-plays, and video-taped interviewing skills and demonstrating beginning ability to utilize supervision and consultation by constructively giving and receiving feedback in each of these assignment areas.

c. Learning about social work roles and boundaries and demonstrating knowledge through role-plays, video-taped interviews and course examinations.

d. Developing beginning skills of personal reflection and self-correction through participating in practice labs, video-taped interviews, multi-dimensional assignment and class role plays to give and receive feedback and integrate into future practice assignments and activities.

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.42  Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.69

Student Comments:
- The video-taped mock assignment was also helpful in being more professional (5)
- ‘Knocks on the door’ super helpful (4)
- Role play is crucial to developing skills as it allows students to make mistakes even though it is awkward at first. Learning from the mistakes we make in class will help us not make as many mistakes in the field hopefully. (3)
- Critiquing each other in class after role playing (2)

3. Students will apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments in social work practice (SWPG 1c / EPAS 2.1.3) by:
   a. Utilizing research skills to develop understanding of evidence-based practice approaches through completion of an annotated bibliography assignment.
   b. Learning about different practice methods w/individuals & families through course readings & class discussions & apply knowledge to case studies & practice labs.
   c. Practicing communication skills in practice labs & role plays & writing a formal assessment through a multi-dimensional assessment assignment.
   d. Observing videos of interviewing skills & techniques & critiquing peer interviewing skills in practice labs & video interview assignments.

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.21  Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.61

Student Comments:
- Class discussions, videos, opportunities to use skills, volunteering, role playing, and researching “best practices” all helpful (7)

4. Students will have a beginning understanding to be able to develop skills to engage with diverse populations (SWPG 1d/ EPAS 2.1.4) by:
   a. Learning effective communication skills w/diverse client populations and applying knowledge in course examinations & multi-dimensional assessment.
   b. Practicing role plays of working w/diverse client populations in the classroom setting & journaling/processing the role play as well as applying knowledge and skills in volunteer experiences and journaling about these activities.
   c. Participating in class discussion, role plays, & practice labs to develop greater self-awareness of personal values & bias & their impact on practice.

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.42  Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.46

Student Comments:
- The ‘knocks on the door’ made me very aware of how important cultural competence is. (5)
- Saundra Santigo for the multi-dimensional assessment was great (2)
5. Students will demonstrate knowledge of actions in accordance with the values of the social work profession (SWPG 1b / EPAS 2.1.2) by:
   a. Applying ethical principles of the NASW Code of Ethics in identifying practice approaches which respect social work core values as evidenced through the completion of multi-dimensional assessment assignment.
   b. Applying core values of social work & their application in practice w/individuals and families in various situations through volunteer journals, role play journals, & case studies & class discussions.

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.5        Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.53

**Student Comments:**
- Class discussion (2)

6. Students will develop skills to utilize and engage in research to inform practice (SWPG 1f / EPAS 2.1.6) by:
   a. Completing an annotated bibliography assignment researching a practice issue w/individuals or families & analyzing best practice approaches from that research.
   b. Observing interviewing techniques in videos & volunteer experience settings to learn from experienced social workers & utilize this knowledge to guide practice lab & video-tape interview assignments.

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.21        Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.30

Students will integrate Christian worldview and social work practice (SWPG 2) by:
   c. Participating in class discussions & course readings on the integration of faith & social work practice & applying these readings in practice labs, role plays, & volunteer journal entries.

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.5        Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.53

**Student Comments:**
- Class discussions comparing a Secular view to a Christian view and applying it to a social work perspective (3)

**PART B: Additional Comments:**

**Student Comments:**
- Really enjoyed the class! (6)
1. Students will begin identifying as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly (SWPG 1a/ EPAS 2.1.1 )
   a. Demonstrating ability to practice personal reflection and self-correction through the completion and implementation of role play feedback.
   b. Understanding and demonstrating the appropriate professional roles and boundaries of a social worker working with groups through assigned readings and role plays.

   Spring 2012 Mean Score = 4.06       Spring 2013 Mean Score= 4.5

   **Student comments:**
   - Role plays are great: very helpful developed professionalism; good to learn to self-reflect. (6)

2. Students will begin applying ethical principles to guide professional practice (SWPG 1b /EPAS 2.1.2 )
   a. Reviewing and responding to case studies that illustrate the importance of managing personal values in ways that insure ethical social work practice with groups.
   b. Reviewing the Association for the Advancement of Social Work with Groups’ (AASWG) Code of Ethics.

   Spring 2012 Mean Score = 3.93       Spring 2013 Mean Score= 3.75

   **Student comments:**
   - Role plays: well covered (2)
   - Case studies (2)

3. Students will apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments in social work practice (SWPG 1c /EPAS 2.1.3)
   a. Completing group proposals that draw on and integrate multiple sources of knowledge and research based evidence to support the rationale for the proposal.
   b. Demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals and groups through role play and group proposal.

   Spring 2012 Mean Score = 4.0       Spring 2013 Mean Score=4.5

4. Students will have an understanding of and be able to engage with diverse populations (SWPG 1d/EPAS 2.1.4 )
   a. Writing written responses, discussing case studies, and participating in role plays that illustrate how a dominant culture’s structures and values may oppress, marginalize, and alienate other diverse groups.
b. Writing written responses and discussing case studies that illustrate how a social worker doing group work wrestles with demonstrating how diversity shapes life experiences.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = 3.8  Spring 2013 Mean Score=3.75

5. Students will demonstrate how group work can advance human rights and social justice (EPAS 2.1.4)
   a. Discussing written responses to articles that exemplify group practices that advance social and economic justice.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = 3.8  Spring 2013 Mean Score=3.41

6. Students will apply knowledge of human behavior in the social environment (SWPG 1g / EPAS 2.1.7)
   a. Completing a group proposal which demonstrates ability to utilize a conceptual framework to guide the implementation and running of a group.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = 4.33  Spring 2013 Mean Score=4.33

7. Students will develop skills to utilize and engage, assess, intervene and evaluate group practice in research to inform practice (SWPG 1f /EPAS 2.1.10 )
   a. Identifying important considerations for successful pre-planning for group work, through class discussion, role play, and other assignments.
   b. Using empathy and other interpersonal skills in all stages of group work through role play and case study review.
   c. Clarifying an understanding of the agreed upon focus of the group through role play and case study review.
   d. Assessing group behavior and identify the various stages of group development through role play and case review.
   e. Develop mutually agreed upon goals for individuals within a group through role play.
   f. Increase understanding of how the group process helps individuals resolve problems through review and discussion of case studies/role plays.
   g. Identify effective means to evaluate group practice through completion of a group proposal.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = 4.26  Spring 2013 Mean Score=4.58

**Student comments:**
- Role play summaries and group proposals provided opportunities for this (5)

8. Students will integrate Christian worldview and social work practice (SWPG 2)

Spring 2012 Mean Score = 4.46  Spring 2013 Mean Score= 4.33
**Additional Comments:**

- Role plays: hands-on (11)
- I like the warm ups in the beginning (2)
- Textbook information was very close to common sense. (3)
- Enjoyed the class. (5)

**SWK 333 Social Work Practice III: Communities and Organizations (Fall 2012)**

Number of Students in the Class: 17  
Number of Forms Completed: 17

1. The student will develop knowledge and skills for competency in identifying as a professional social worker (SWPG 1s / EPAS 2.1.1) by:
   a. Developing skills to advocate for client access to services through a macro practice community project and course examinations.
   b. Practicing personal reflection and self-correction through the completion of a macro perspective paper.
   c. Demonstrating professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication through the completion of a macro practice community project.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score = **4.62**  
   Fall 2012 Mean Score = **3.94**

**Student Comments:**

- Macro project (6)
- Perspectives (3)

2. The student will demonstrate an understanding of advancing human rights and social and economic justice in social work practice (SWPG 1e / EPAS 2.1.5) by:
   a. Developing a broader knowledge of social action and advocacy skills on a macro level through course text reading of community development and student led class discussions.
   b. Completion of a macro practice project utilizing macro practice skills to improve quality of life working toward change at a community or organizational level.
   c. Reading articles on global and social work practice and completing a course assignment that demonstrates understanding of macro social work involvement in global human rights and social justice issues.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score = **4.75**  
   Fall 2012 Mean Score = **4.17**

**Student Comments:**

- Reading the book, “Beyond charity” (3)
- Macro project (3)
3. The student will be able to apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments in social work practice (SWPG 1c/ EPAS 2.1.3) by:
   a. Completion of a macro practice group project where the student compiles information and develops an action plan to meet real organizational needs.
   b. Attending a community based public meeting, analyzing the decision making process, and identifying barriers to the decision making process.
   c. Completing a PERT chart based upon analyzing a real campus issue or need.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score = n/a          Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.17

   Student Comments:
   • Don’t recall completion of a PERT chart (2)
   • Macro project (4)

4. The student will develop knowledge and skills to be able to engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities (SWPG 1j / EPAS 2.1.10 ) by:
   a. Learning macro practice skills of organizational development and community based planning and intervention applying this knowledge through the completion of a group community based macro practice project.
   b. Utilizing macro practice of engagement, assessment, goal planning and intervention skills to develop a PERT chart for a campus issue or need.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.5          Fall 2012 Mean Score = 3.8

   Student Comments:
   • Project (3)

5. The student will develop skills to be able to respond to contexts that shape practice (SWPG 1i / EPAS 2.1.9 ) by:
   a. Completion of an analyzing decision making assignment to develop a broader perspective of decision making at a local, county, or governmental level and various factors which contribute to the decision making process.
   b. Learning about cultural and social environmental factors which impact human behavior and social work practice through participation and student led discussion of a community development text.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.62          Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.17

   Student Comments:
   • Papers (2)
   • Book “Beyond Charity” (4)

6. The student will engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research (SWPC 1f/EPAS 2.1.6) by:
   a. Completion of a macro practice community project which incorporates a literature review and research informed recommendations.
Fall 2011 Mean Score = n/a  
Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.23

**Student comments:**
- Macro Project (4 comments)

7. The student will integrate their Christian worldview & social work macro practice (SWPG 2) by:
   a. Completion of a macro practice perspective paper integrating readings on faith and macro practice as well as the student’s understanding of their Christian worldview in the context of macro social work practice.
   b. Course readings and class discussion of perceptions of faith based social workers to increase awareness and self-understanding of the student’s faith in the context of their professional self and integrating this knowledge in a macro perspective paper assignment.
   c. Learning about social work history and the role of the church in social work macro practice development and social action through the years and its relationship to social work’s core values and ethics through course readings, lectures, and classroom discussion.

Fall 2011 Mean Score = 4.62  
Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.47

**Student comments:**
- Christianity paper (3)
- Macro paper (3 comments)
- Book discussion (3)

**PART B: Additional Comments:**
- I felt as though the macro project and the macro perspective paper were the most beneficial things in this class (2)

**SWK 346 Child Welfare (Spring, 2013)**
Number of Students in Class: 23
Number of Forms Completed: 23

1. Understand how services to children and families are provided along a continuum from the least to most restrictive in the context of the generalist practice model
   
   Spring 2012 Mean Score = 4.75  
   Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.65

2. Understand and interpret the history of provision for children and their families
   
   Spring 2012 Mean Score = 4.87  
   Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.30
3. Explain the roles of the family in the lives of children, how these roles can break down, and how they differ according to the influence of diversity.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = **4.62**  
Spring 2013 Mean Score = **4.52**

4. Demonstrate an understanding of how such social issues as poverty, violence, substance abuse, homelessness, discrimination, migration, immigration, war, and other global issues impact children and their families.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = **4.75**  
Spring 2013 Mean Score = **4.43**

5. Recognize macro-level, public policy concepts such as family preservation, family support, and permanency planning and explain the impact of such policies on children and families.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = **4.75**  
Spring 2013 Mean Score = **4.00**

6. Develop a working understanding of services such as day care, school programs, counseling, court services, protective services, services to teen parents, foster care, adoption, and residential services and the psychological impact of these on those served.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = **4.62**  
Spring 2013 Mean Score = **4.30**

7. Demonstrate knowledge of future global trends and services to children and families given current societal attitudes and political climate in the United States as well as internationally.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = n/a  
Spring 2013 Mean Score = **3.95**

8. Understand the need for a strong valued and ethics base, be able to explain the roles and implications of social workers and helping professionals in various types of child welfare practice settings

Spring 2012 Mean Score = **4.75**  
Spring 2013 Mean Score = **4.43**

9. Develop knowledge and skills to understand how faith is integrated into child welfare practice both currently and historically.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = **5**  
Spring 2013 Mean Score = **4.43**
Part B SWK/PSY/SOC/SWK 346. Please provide comments below regarding the objectives and any other information helpful to the strengthening of this class in the future.

Student comments:

- Nola is always an outstanding professor
- The class was really large and that I think took away from opportunities. I would have preferred more organization when lectures and information were given.
- Less time on book reviews; keep the guest speakers
- I enjoyed Prof Carew. Keep up your enthusiasm and creativity. This was the only class I had that I was sad when class was over every day. The material and discussions were so interesting. I learned so much.
- Nice job Nola!
- I loved it! The book discussions could have been more organized
- Dr Perry’s book is very insightful. There is much to cover in a short amount of time.
**SOC/SWK 417 – Human Diversity (Fall 2012)**

Number of students in class: 18  
Number of forms completed: 18

**Part A:** Below are the Course Objectives for Human Diversity. Please use the scales below to rate the degree to which you believe the objectives were achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Successfully achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Explain the historical experience of various ethnic minority groups using the themes of the text: identifiability, stratification, resource shares, discrimination, and stereotypes. (EPAS 2.1.4/SWPG 1d)

   Fall 2011 Mean Score: **4.8**  
   Fall 2012 Mean Score: **4.5**

2) Explain the oppression of ethnic minority groups using the Unified Model. (EPAS 2.1.4, 2.1.5/SWPG 1d, 1e)

   Fall 2011 Mean Score: **5**  
   Fall 2012 Mean Score: **4.16**

3) Define, explain and provide historical examples of key terms using African-Americans, Asian-Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, and women as examples. (EPAS 2.1.4/SWPG 1d)

   Fall 2011 Mean Score: **4.3**  
   Fall 2012 Mean Score: **4.22**

4) Compare and contrast the subcultures of the ethnic minority groups cited above. (EPAS 2.1.4/SWPG 1d)

   Fall 2011 Mean Score: **4.83**  
   Fall 2012 Mean Score: **4.33**

5) Delineate the implications of subcultural differences for multicultural practice settings. (EPAS 2.1.4/SWPG 1d)

   Fall 2011 Mean Score: **5**  
   Fall 2012 Mean Score: **4.33**

6) Demonstrate an increased his/her self-awareness of personal prejudices and values. (EPAS 2.1.4/SWPG 1d)

   Fall 2011 Mean Score: **5**  
   Fall 2012 Mean Score: **4.88**

7) Develop a biblical perspective of human diversity. (EPAS 2.1.4/SWPG 1d)

   Fall 2011 Mean Score: **4.5**  
   Fall 2012 Mean Score: **4.77**
Part B:
Please provide comments below regarding to the strengthening of this class in the future (use additional paper as necessary). This is not an evaluation of the professor or the entire program, but rather of this individual course the objectives and any other information helpful.

1. What was most helpful/beneficial for you in this course?

Student comments:

- This class was one of the most beneficial classes I have ever taken. The assignments were helpful and relevant. The final project itself was a really great project. It really helped me to take all the things I have learned and put them together visually which is awesome. However, the final paper was too much. There were so many things that were required. If the paper was just an explanation like the syllabus initially made it sounded like (“A detailed explanation of how the project meets each objective should be included with the project”), it would have been more manageable. However, the rubric required so many things that it was overwhelming and nearly impossible to put into a coherent paper. (Perhaps this should be taken into account when grading). Otherwise, great class. Thank you, Dr. King.
- I felt that our assignments and class discussions matched the objectives well. The only thing I would like to change is the final assignment. From my conversations with other students, it would seem that each competency really warrants its own lengthy paper. It would encourage further reflection and increase competency if we were assigned to reflect on each objective individually and not in one paper at the end of the semester.
- I really enjoyed this class overall. I think it was very eye opening about the stereotypes and the discrimination that many people face in our world on a daily basis. I like the books we read. The final project I don’t think was explained well enough. When talking to other students they did not know what to do exactly. I did not know the rubric was in Odyssey.
- I loved this class. Probably the best Dr. King class I have taken at Cornerstone! I learned so much. The one comment I have is that the final paper is too big. I felt like I had to include so much that I ended up slimming down what I talked about and it ended up being very broad. Overall, great class!
- I really enjoyed the eye opening experience that this was. I learned a lot about the discrimination that takes place and that was very eye opening and beneficial.

2. What was least helpful/beneficial for you in this course?

Student comments:

- Journaling (3)

3. Please give any constructive criticism or comments regarding the course.

Student comments:

- I would have loved to have even more discussion about the Biblical perspective of the LGBT community. I think that is something that we are going to need to understand and wrestle with in order to work in social work. (2)
- More lecturing (2)
1. Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly. The student through field practicum experience & practicum seminar participation will demonstrate beginning level competency as evidenced by (SWPG 1 / EPAS 2.1.1)
   a. Advocating for client access to the services of s.w. as demonstrated in their field practicum
   b. Practicing personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development through supervision and consultation as well as personal journals
   c. Attending to professional roles and boundaries as demonstrated in their practicum experience
   d. Demonstrating professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication in the practicum setting
   e. Engaging in career-long learning by reading course materials and participating in course discussions related to licensure, professional social work memberships, and social work trainings in the community
   f. Utilizing supervision and consultation in the practicum setting

Spring 2012 Mean Score = 5       Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.57

**Student comments:**
- Able to learn more about professionalism through(4)

2. Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice as evidenced by (SWPG 1 /EPAS 2.1.2)
   a. Recognizing and managing personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice as demonstrated in the practicum setting
   b. Making ethical decisions by applying standards of the NASW Code of Ethics and, as applicable, of the IRSW/IASSWE in S.W., Statement of Principles as demonstrated through a course assignment of ethical decision making and through utilization of ethical standards in the practicum setting.
   c. Tolerating ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts as demonstrated through a decision making assignment and in the practicum setting
   d. Applying strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions in the practicum setting

Spring 2012 Mean Score = 5       Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.42

**Student comments:**
- Internship and supervision (4)
- The discussion board, journals (3)
- Ethical dilemma assignment (2)
3. Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments as evidenced by (SWPG 1/ EPAS 2.1.3)
   a. Distinguishing, appraising, & integrating multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge & practice wisdom through practicum experiences related to research and development.
   b. Demonstrating effective oral and written communication in working w/individuals and families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues through completion of an integrative case study course assignment as well as practicum experiences with clients at multi-levels.

   Spring 2012 Mean Score = 5       Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.64

Student comments:
- Multiple assignments (5)

4. Engage diversity and difference in practice as evidenced by (SWPG1/ EPAS 2.1.4)
   a. Recognizing the extent to which a culture’s structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create or enhance privilege and power through practicum experiences with diverse clients as well as case studies and discussions in the practicum seminar
   b. Gaining sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups through journal self-exploration, supervision in the field and seminar discussions
   c. Recognizing and communicating understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences through seminar journals and practicum activities
   d. Viewing themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants in the practicum setting working with various client populations as well as in seminar discussions.

   Spring 2012 Mean Score = 5       Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.92

Student comments:
- Internship, presentations (7)

5. Advance human rights and social and Economic justice as evidenced by (SWPG 1/ EPAS 2.1.5)
   a. Understanding the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination observed in the practicum setting through supervision and journaling.
   b. Advocating for human rights and social and economic justice in the practicum setting or observing this process
   c. Engaging in practices that advance social and economic justice in the field practicum setting

   Spring 2012 Mean Score = 5       Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.57

Student Comments:
6. Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research as evidenced by (SWPG 1 / EPAS 2.1.6)
   a. Using practice experience to inform scientific inquiry in the practicum setting by applying knowledge from education to practicum and journaling regarding the application.
   b. Using research evidence to inform practice and understanding the concept of evidence based practiced and how this is utilized in the practicum setting through supervision and training in the practicum setting.

   Spring 2012 Mean Score = 5   Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.14

**Student comments:**
- Internship (5)

7. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment as evidenced by (SWPG 1 / EPAS 2.1.7)
   a. Utilizing conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation as demonstrated through an integrative case study assignment.
   b. Critiquing and applying knowledge to understand person and environment through integrative case study assignment, journaling, and social work portfolio development.

   Spring 2012 Mean Score = 5   Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.57

**Student comments:**

8. Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services as evidenced by (SWPG 1 / EPAS 2.1.8)
   a. Analyzing, formulating, and advocating for policies that advance social well-being as well as observing the organizations role in this process in the practicum setting.
   b. Collaborating with colleagues and clients for effective policy action by utilizing supervision in the practicum setting as well as in seminar discussions and discussion board posts.

   Spring 2012 Mean Score = 5   Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.07

**Student comments:**

9. Respond to contexts that shape practice as evidenced by (SWPG 1 / EPAS 2.1.9)
   a. Continuously discovering, appraising, and attending to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services through completion of an agency analysis assignment.
b. Providing leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services while engaged in the practicum seminar as well as observing this process in action in the field.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = 5      Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.42

Student comments:

10. Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities as evidenced by (SWPG 1/EPAS 2.1.10)
   a. Identifying, analyzing, and implementing evidence-based interventions designed to achieve client goals while in the practicum setting as well as demonstrating this through an integrative case study assignment
   b. Using research and technological advances in the practicum setting as well as in practicum seminar through completion of an agency analysis and senior social work portfolio.
   c. Evaluating program outcomes and practice effectiveness in the practicum setting.
   d. Developing, analyzing, advocating, and providing leadership for policies and services in the practicum setting
   e. Promoting social and economic justice in the practicum setting as well as through observation of this process in the practicum setting and discussions with field supervisor and in practicum seminar.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = 5      Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.53

Student comments:

11. The student will identify and integrate biblical principles and truths to social work practice in contemporary society (SWPG 2)
   a. Sensitively and ethically applying Christian values and biblical principles to the professional practice of social work in the practicum setting and in the practicum seminar discussions.

Spring 2012 Mean Score = 5      Spring 2013 Mean Score = 4.42

PART B: Please provide comments below regarding the objectives and any other information helpful to the strengthening of this class in the future.

1. What was most helpful/beneficial for you in this course?

Student comments:
- Journals and communication with supervisor and professor (7)
- Having a learning contract to follow & set goals (2)
- Receiving consistent feedback and support from Nola (3).
- The hands-on experience of working with clients (2)
- Senior Seminar group discussions with other students (3)
2. What was least helpful/beneficial for you in this course?

**Student comments:**
- Agency analysis presentations (2 comments)
- The 5 assignments (pick 3 out of 5) (2 comments)

3. Please give any constructive criticism or comments regarding this course.

**Student comments:**
- I loved how the class was structured to be supportive and hands on. Thank you (5)

---

**SWK 454 – Integrated Statistics and Research II**

Not Available! Collect for 2014

**SWK 462 – Capstone Seminar (Fall 2012)**

Number of Students in Class: 17
Number of Forms Completed: 17

1. Be able to apply critical thinking to inform professional judgments (SWPG 1c / EPAS 2.1.3/SS 8,9) by identifying, researching, and presenting (both orally and in written form) on learning issues pertinent to assessment and intervention options associated with a sample case discussed in class.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score = n/a  
   Fall 2012 Mean Score = **4.41**

**Student comments:**
- PBL was a good way of showing this (11 comments)
- Ethics paper (3 comments)
- Power points (2 comments)

2. Act is accordance with the values of the social work profession. Be able to demonstrate ability to identify ethical issues in a case as measured by an ethical sensitivity test. Apply ethical decision making framework to determine and defend the best course of action demonstrated through a written paper. (SWPG 1b/EPAS 2.1.2/ SS8,9)

   Fall 2011 Mean Score = n/a  
   Fall 2012 Mean Score = **4.29**

**Student comments:**
- Ethics paper (9 comments)
- Discussions and readings (4 comments)
- PBL (2 comments)
3. Engage in research informed practice and practice informed research (SWPG 1f / EPAS 2.1.6 / SS 6,7,9) by utilizing research of the literature to inform best practices as it pertains to assessment and intervention related to a specific case study.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score = n/a   Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.41

Student comments:
- PBL (12 comments)

4. Apply the generalist problem solving model (SWPG 1j/EPAS 2.1.10 /SS 9) by selecting and presenting appropriate intervention strategies based on evidence based research.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score = n/a   Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.0

Student comments:
- PBL – Case studies (7 comments)

5. Integrate Christian worldview (SWPG2 /SS 1) by discussing how one’s beliefs influence the application of an ethical framework in ethical decision-making through completion of an ethics paper.

   Fall 2011 Mean Score = n/a   Fall 2012 Mean Score = 4.29

Student comments:
- Discussions in class (2 comments)
- Ethics paper (5 comments)

Part B: Please provide comments below regarding to the strengthening of this class in the future.
- Overall liked the class, very beneficial (4)
- The assessments were good but the overall structure of the class did not create continual engagement (2)
II. **ACAT (Linked to Program Objectives 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9)**

**Method:** The ACAT is distributed annually by Cornerstone’s department of institutional effectiveness. Outcomes specific to the Social Work Program’s Objectives are provided annually.

**BENCHMARK:** *Any standard score that is at or falls below the Standard Average (500) will merit a Program response Percentiles are in parentheses.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity (SWPG1d)</td>
<td>576 (78)</td>
<td>590 (82)</td>
<td>552 (71)</td>
<td>576 (78)</td>
<td>532 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS Obj.4,9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populations-at-Risk (SWPG 1d)</td>
<td>587 (80)</td>
<td>581 (79)</td>
<td>633 (93)</td>
<td>575 (77)</td>
<td>505 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS Obj.4,9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Economic Justice (SWPG 1e)</td>
<td>532 (63)</td>
<td>541 (66)</td>
<td>536 (64)</td>
<td>586 (81)</td>
<td>540 (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS Obj. 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Ethics (SWPG 1b)</td>
<td>572 (77)</td>
<td>587 (81)</td>
<td>615 (87)</td>
<td>562 (73)</td>
<td>508 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS Obj. 8, 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Services (SWPG 1h)</td>
<td>547 (70)</td>
<td>506 (52)</td>
<td>551 (71)</td>
<td>534 (63)</td>
<td>504 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HSS Obj. 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Practice (SWPG 1j)</td>
<td>586 (81)</td>
<td>605 (85)</td>
<td>574 (77)</td>
<td>563 (74)</td>
<td>527 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HSS Obj. 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSE (SWPG 1g)</td>
<td>539 (64)</td>
<td>553 (74)</td>
<td>538 (64)</td>
<td>542 (66)</td>
<td>515 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HSS Obj. 5, 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (SWPG 1f)</td>
<td>602 (81)</td>
<td>618 (88)</td>
<td>617 (88)</td>
<td>594 (83)</td>
<td>531 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HSS Obj. 6,7,9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL PERFORMANCE** 603 (81) 602 (81) 606 (83) 591 (82) 531 (63)
### III. SW Field Education Learning Contract    Spring 2013 = 16 students

A student is evaluated based upon skill level of a beginning bachelor’s level social worker. Rate 0-4 (0 is not meeting expectations, 1 student meets some but not all exp., 2 student meets basic expect.; 3 student consistently meets exp. and 4 student exceeds expectation).

* **BENCHMARK** - Any final score below 3.00 will merit a program response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Final Spring 2012 Mean score =</th>
<th>Final spring 2013 Mean score =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG1a:</strong> Identify as a professional social worker (EPAS2.1.1 / SS 2,3,9)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG1b:</strong> Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice (EPAS 2.1.2 / SS 8,9)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG1c:</strong> Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments (EPAS 2.1.3 / SS 9)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG1d:</strong> Engage diversity and difference in practice (EPAS 2.1.4 / SS 4,9)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG1e:</strong> Advance human rights and social and economic justice (EPAS 2.1.5 / SS 9)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG1f:</strong> Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research (EPAS 2.1.6 / SS 6, 7, 9)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG1g:</strong> Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment (EPAS 2.1.7 / SS 4,5,9)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG1h:</strong> Engage in policy practice and deliver effective social work services (EPAS 2.1.8 / SS 9)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG 1i:</strong> Respond to contexts that shape practice (EPAS 2.1.9 / SS 9)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG 1j:</strong> Engagement (EPAS 2.1.10a / SS 9)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG 1j:</strong> Assessment (EPAS 2.1.10b / SS 9)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG 1j:</strong> Intervention (EPAS 2.1.10c / SS 9)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPG 1j:</strong> Evaluation (EPAS 2.1.10d / SS 9)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Social Work Values Inventory-2 Scales (2012/2013)
(EPAS 2.1.2 / SWPG 1b / SS Objective 8,9)

*BENCHMARK: Post Test Mean Scores that fall 2 standard deviations below the national mean merit a program response

Pre Test Info for Cornerstone University Students

Descriptive Statistics for the Three Social Work Values Inventory–2 Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Confidentiality</th>
<th>Self Determination</th>
<th>Social Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012pre</td>
<td>2013pre</td>
<td>2012pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>64.39</td>
<td>57.6000</td>
<td>47.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>57.0000</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>149.059</td>
<td>116.686</td>
<td>99.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>69.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post Test Info for Cornerstone University Students

Descriptive Statistics for the Three Social Work Values Inventory – 2 Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Confidentiality</th>
<th>Self-Determination</th>
<th>Social Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (nat'l)</td>
<td>77.6667</td>
<td>71.0000</td>
<td>56.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>71.5000</td>
<td>80.0000</td>
<td>60.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation (nat')</td>
<td>15.39697</td>
<td>17.51571</td>
<td>10.50238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>237.067</td>
<td>306.800</td>
<td>110.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Ethical Sensitivity Test (Fall 2011) and (Fall 2012):
(EPAS 2.1.2 / SWPG 1b / Objective 8,9)

*BENCHMARK - A Mean Difference that is negative merits a program response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pre Mean</th>
<th>Post Mean</th>
<th>Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>+50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>+50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>+50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>+120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>+65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>+30.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Student Portfolios

Students complete a social work portfolio as part of their graduation requirements. They must supply evidence that demonstrates proficiency in the following competencies: Professionalism; Social Work Ethics; Critical Thinking; Engaging Diversity; Advancement of Human Rights and Social / Economic Justice; Research; Human Behavior in the Social Environment; Policy; and Social Work Practice Skills.

*Students must get at least 6 proficient ratings and 3 intermediate ratings to be eligible for graduation.*

*BENCHMARK - A mean score at or below 2 merits a program response.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Novice =1</th>
<th>Intermediate =2</th>
<th>Proficient =3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring ’12 Mean</td>
<td>Spring ’13 Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Professionalism (EPAS 2.1.1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Work Ethics (EPAS 2.1.2)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Critical Thinking (EPAS 2.1.3)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engage Diversity (EPAS 2.1.4)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advance human rights…(EPAS 2.1.5)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Engage in Research (EPAS 2.1.6)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Apply knowledge of human behavior..(EPAS 2.1.7)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Engage in policy practice (EPAS 2.1.8)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Respond to contexts that shape practice (EPAS 2.1.9)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VII. Signature Assignments

*BENCHMARK - A mean score < 8.1 merits a program Response.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Core Competencies</th>
<th>Original Mean / Revised Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWK 462 Senior Seminar</td>
<td>Ethics paper</td>
<td>SWPG 1b / EPAS 2.1.2 Ethical sensitivity</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPAS 2.1.2 Moral reasoning</td>
<td>8.05 /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWPG 1c / EPAS 2.1.3 Readability</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWPG 1f / EPAS 2.1.6 Research</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWK 311 Social Policy</td>
<td>Policy Brief Assignment</td>
<td>SWPG 1e / EPAS 2.1.5 Scope of Problem</td>
<td>9.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWPG 1e / EPAS 2.1.5 Proposed Solution</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWPG 1h / EPAS 2.1.8 Past Policy/Program Models</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPAS 2.1.8 Analysis of Existing or Proposed Policy/Program</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWPG 1h / EPAS 2.1.8 Proposed Solution</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWK 417 Diversity</td>
<td>Final Project</td>
<td>SWPG 1e / EPAS 2.1.5 Define privilege and oppression</td>
<td>6.68 /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWPG 1d / EPAS 2.1.4 Define, explain &amp; provide historical examples of key terms from course</td>
<td>6.89 /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWPG 1d / EPAS 2.1.4 Delineate subcultural differences for various ethnic groups</td>
<td>6.44 /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWPG 1d / EPAS 2.1.4 Delineate implications of subcultural differences for culturally competent multicultural settings</td>
<td>6.50 /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWPG 2 / EPAS 2.1.4 Articulate a biblical perspective of &amp; response to diversity</td>
<td>6.25 /</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Missing Signature Assignment Summaries from the following:

- SWK 221 Developmental Paper
- SWK 222 Adult in Society Paper
- SWK 332 Group Facilitator Paper
- SWK 333 Macro Project / Paper
- SWK 353/354 Research Project
- SWK 361 Policy Advocacy
- SWK 450-51 Reflection Paper
- SWK 460-461 Integrative Case Study
- SWK 462 Book Review of The Call

**VIII. Social Work Alumni Survey (8 returns /39 alumni 2008-2012)**

No Benchmark for this measure.

**Social Work Competencies-Social Work Prepared Me To:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree =5</td>
<td>=4</td>
<td>=3</td>
<td>=2</td>
<td>=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Conduct myself in a professional manner | 4.33 |
2. Conduct myself in accordance with the values of the social work profession | 4.33 |
3. Apply critical thinking in my professional judgments | 4.22 |
4. Competently engage with diverse populations | 4.50 |
5. Advance human rights and social justice | 4.44 |
6. Utilize research to inform practice | 3.87 |
7. Apply knowledge of human behavior in the social environment | 4.37 |
8. Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic justice | 4.25 |
9. Respond to various contexts that influence & shape social work practice | 4.37 |
10. Apply the generalist solving problem models in a variety of settings with individuals, groups, families and communities | 4.62 |
11. Apply a Christian Worldview to Social Work Practice | 4.50 |

- **Are you currently employed as a Social Worker:** 85% yes 15% no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Position</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Manager at Alpha</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Support Staff w/Lutheran Social Services</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In graduate school</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care Licensing Supervisor</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Specialist</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families First Worker</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption Specialist</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Income:** $27,000
- **Completed or in MSW Program:** 28% yes  72% no
- **Any other graduate education:**
  - University of MI grad school
  - MSW program at Western MI University

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree=1</td>
<td>Disagree=2</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree=3</td>
<td>Strongly Agree=5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. BSW courses helped prepare me for my first social work position 4.85
2. My BSW field experience helped prepare me for my first social work position 4.71
3. My undergraduate degree helped prepare me for graduate school 3.25

- **Overall, what did you like MOST about Cornerstone’s Social Work Program?**
  - The classes helped challenge me and loved the interaction with the professors; I learned from them and loved hearing about their experiences.
  - I liked the specific attention we each received and making sure each student understood what was expected of them in the classroom and in the profession.
  - Learning about organizations in the community. There were a lot of opportunities in the coursework to be involved and to work with organizations in Grand Rapids and it was great to get that experience. I also liked the open discussions that happened in the classes. It was a great way to work through questions and situations. The professors made it a safe environment and a great place to learn.
  - My classmates and professors; I also appreciated volunteer and internship opportunities which gave me a taste of the field.
  - Experienced professors with first-hand knowledge who were open and caring with the students.
  - The professors, Scott and Nola, were great. I feel that each of them taught me very practical and valuable skills that I use every day. They were very supportive of me. They helped me to highlight my strengths as well as develop my weaknesses. I really enjoyed working with them. Cornerstone’s Social Work Program is probably the biggest reason for me staying at CU.
  - My professors! I also liked the wide variety of courses available to me as part of the program. I did not enjoy Stats/Research with Dr. McDonald, but I feel it was helpful in terms of critical thinking and evaluation. Furthermore, the opportunity to complete the program with a Christian lens and emphasis was extremely meaningful to me.

- **Overall, what did you like LEAST about Cornerstone’s Social Work Program?**
  - I would probably just have to say the Policy class because I don’t find policy very interesting.
  - Classroom locations and not enough out of classroom experiences.
  - In our senior year we completed 40 hours of our internship first semester, and 400 in the second as opposed to 200 each semester. This made it difficult for me as I was also working full time. Saying that however, I do think that the immersiveness of that style did help me greatly, it just made me very busy and tired.

- **What recommendations would you like to make to improve the Social Work Program?**
  - More focus on instructing students about State Licensing
Honestly this is a fantastic program! I really can’t think of anything I would change. I don’t believe I could have been more prepared for my first social work job or for grad school.

I think the coursework could be more rigorous although I do feel adequately prepared for grad school.

Make the program more visible to all students; Cornerstone highlights other program, why not social work?

I feel that each class prepared me for my profession in different ways. I also enjoyed the community aspect.

One suggestion: Cornerstone’s Social Work Program explored working with various individuals and groups, being sensitive to race/national origin/age/background/ethnicity. Gender and sexuality were not discussed as readily and are things that might be more heavily incorporated. Those things may have helped to better prepare me for working with some of my clients, particularly as I work with several same sex couples and individuals that have experienced the effects of defying gender stereotypes.
PART B: IMPLICIT CURRICULUM MEASURES

IX. Student Evaluation of Practicum Agency  (14 students 2013)

The Final Student Evaluation is a fifteen item scale used to assess student’s perception of their respective Field agency. Students indicate their level of satisfaction from 1 – very dissatisfied to 4 – very satisfied. Out of 6 students, 4 completed forms were turned in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN 2011</th>
<th>MEAN 2012</th>
<th>MEAN 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The orientation to the agency.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The knowledge obtained about your agency.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The work space provided.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The tasks assigned.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The caseload assigned.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The degree to which you were accepted and treated as part of the agency staff or team.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The frequency of supervisory meetings.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The accessibility of your supervisor when problems or questions arose.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The quality of the supervision received.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The level of new social work knowledge and skill obtained while in the practicum.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The level of competency gained as a helping professional with agency clients.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Knowledge gained about community systems/resources.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The degree to which the learning contract objectives were met.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The support received from the faculty liaison.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Overall, how would you rate your level of satisfaction with your field practicum.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student comments:
- Supervision issues noted by 5 students
- Great experience and supervision noted specifically by 5 students.

Would you recommend this placement to future social work students?

(SPRING 2013) YES = 78% NO = 22%
X. Field Instructor’s Evaluation of the Social Work Program.

Field instructors are asked to complete a 17 item questionnaire to provide feedback for the Program with regards to its preparation of students for the field and the Program’s ability to support the work of the Field instructor. The first 15 items asks the respondent to rate aspects of Cornerstone’s social work program on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest). Field Instructors are also asked to provide written feedback to the program providing written responses to two final questions. **10 out of 13** Field Instructor Evaluation forms were returned to the Social Work Program.

**BENCHMARK** Any mean scores that are below 3.5 merits a program response as do any critical feedback from field supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 MEAN</th>
<th>2012 MEAN</th>
<th>2013 MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Practicum coordinator clearly articulated s.w. program expectations.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Practicum coordinator provided support…</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Practicum coordinator available for consultations…</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I felt adequately prepared and supported by s.w. dept.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Program encouraged input for improving field instruction</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Program encouraged input for curriculum</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Field instructor orientation luncheon met my field instructor needs.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Field instructor orientation was held at a convenient time</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Program adequately prepares its students…</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Program demonstrates a commitment to promoting social justice and working with diverse populations.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Field practicum block placement (1 sem.) of 400 hours provides adequate time for students to be trained at our agency setting.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Field practicum block placement best supports the needs of our agency in taking on student interns.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I would prefer a 1 semester placement of 400 hours for students placed in our agency</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td><strong>2.55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I would prefer a 2 semester placement of 200 hours for students…</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would prefer a 1 semester placement of 400 hours with a 40 hour pre-practicum placement in our agency.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify what the Social Work Program at Cornerstone University could do to help assist and support you in your role as field instructor?

**Field Supervisor comments:**

- Great support system (2)
- Communicate more in the beginning – I really did not know much about expectations of the school for the students and myself.
- I did not get information about the training/orientation (I came into the supervising role late in the game so maybe I missed it) but I think more training of how CU wants supervision conducted is needed.
- You do a fine job. (2)
Please share your feedback on the newly revised learning contract/evaluation that was established to align with the new CSWE core competencies.

- An easier format to evaluate – online?
- It went fairly well- might have been helpful to have ideas of what the school would like to see in the specific areas. Maybe have requirement for students to bring to supervision?
- There wasn’t a lot of room for comments – some of it I felt was repetitive
- I think it is excellent!
- Seems to work great; same as Calvin and GVSU programs now.

Please share any other comments you have regarding field instruction at CU

- Very difficult to have such limited time 1st semester and then TONS of time commitment for 2nd semester. Great for immersion but could have done a lot more if had it stretched over longer period of time to gain confidence, knowledge, etc.
- It’s been a great experience! Thank you.

Perception of fit between personal values, Christian Worldview, & social work values

- They go hand in hand. I’ve been able to see how social work strives to make a better life for others. I’ve broadened my worldview and can see how Christian Social Workers can do this.
- It makes perfect sense. It is kind of what Jesus did. There is no way that this could be separate.
- It is a good fit (service, integrity and respect). Internship has clearly demonstrated the fit between Christian Worldview and values of the profession. God is a relational God and our work in the profession demonstrates this.
- Greatest perception of fit comes from seeing the application of the strengths perspective.
- I was drawn to SW as it is a good fit to what we are called to do; we are Jesus’ hands and feet and that’s what I like about SW.
- My values have not changed but I also have a better awareness of where people are at and have a desire to have clients work at what they want to work on and see from their perspective (self-determination, dignity, and worth)
- I may disagree with some client choices or lifestyle, but that doesn’t mean I can’t practice within the context of social work values.
- My Christian values are important to me and there are some ‘hot topics’ but having a bigger understanding of issues is important and how to best help to support people. It is important to advocate for clients and meeting them where they are at, respecting dignity and worth of clients.
• I feel that both personal values and professional values mesh quiet well. My faith and morals are important tome but I understand there are areas where I am working in a secular context and need to be sensitive to client needs and where they are at.
• I’ve realized even more in my internship how spiritual people are and how important it is for us to see them in a more holistic way and meet them where they are at. I have more of an awareness of my personal faith and how that strengthens me yet separate personal values from client’s values and beliefs.

• The program has helped me to process how social work values connect to my practice and also to process what is occurring in my practicum and how to be more effective.

Program Strengths
• I liked Policy class
• It is important for college students to have a well-rounded perspective and see multiple perspectives (2 comments).
• Well-structured classes
• I like debating – it was good to be able to have to work together
• I feel equipped with education received to apply in the field and be helpful in our work.
• Looking back I can see how the things I have learned with help in my work in the field.
• Liked balance of practical application with papers and assignments in classes.
• Learning context of classes was beneficial
• Safe environment to discuss feelings and thoughts
• You want us to wrestle through things in the context of our classes.
• Appreciated that you do care about your students personally and academically. You want to see academic excellence but also address Christian Worldview. Our mission statement at CU says that and in our social work classes you really do address this.
• Phenomenal program. I really enjoyed sociology classes and macro level courses.
• Appreciated the structure of the program as well as hands on experiences.
• I feel that the 2 semester format will be beneficial so seniors can also be engaged on campus.
• Felt comfortable asking questions in classroom; felt free to struggle; professors were open to giving and receiving feedback in a timely manner
• Group presentations were helpful
• Appreciate emphasis of community involvement/role plays
• Liked accessibility of professors
• Felt a sense of consistent mentorship and learning. Feeling understood and supported. Felt grace and supported personally and academically.
• Program brought together people that wouldn’t normally have conversations
• Repetition of certain concepts was very helpful
• Feeling like I can be part of the solution
• Internship was a huge strength to be able to apply what I have learned.
• Smaller class sizes were helpful
• Appreciated advising process
• I liked the one semester internship, felt it was a good transition.
• Last semester in field was very empowering
• Appreciate respect and confidence that faculty impart to students
• Really liked the ‘signature assignments’; reinforce importance of competencies; helped organize portfolio
• Loved group’s class
• SW faculty help point out strengths of students; also helpful correction
• Everyone should have to take Diversity course

Growth Areas:
• Hold students more accountable to reading (2)
• Papers and assignments were great, but keeping up with reading would be beneficial by quizzes or asking about reading.
• I feel the internship should be a two semester placement
• Refine communication on Portfolio expectation
• Would be nice if there was money available to reimburse for mileage in special internship situations
• Macroeconomics course- hard to see how some of it applies to social work
• Stats (research requires a lot) consider adding a lab or expanding credits
• More exposure to agencies in the area throughout social work curriculum
• Would like more feedback on issues and professional development-Senior Capstone
• Intro class needs more hands on experiences/activities
XII. AVENUES OF RENEWAL.

A. Scott Sanders – Program Director
   
   o Conducted a site visit for CSWE at LaSalle University in Feb. of 2013
   
   o Attended Baccalaureate Program Director’s Meeting in Myrtle Beach, SC, March of 2013
   
   o Presented a 5 hour ethics workshop in April of 2013 for Grand Valley State University
   
   
   o Board Member: Alternative Pathways Inc.
   
   o Volunteer Men’s Group Leader at Guiding Light Mission

B. Nola Carew – Field Coordinator

Completed PhD comprehensive examinations
Attended CEU seminars on pain management, ethics, & culture and trauma.
Participated in an international trip to Ghana to visit student interns and develop greater understanding of international child welfare
Participated in training on delivering online education

Provided trauma trainings for refugee foster parents at Bethany Christian Services
Provided self-care trainings for foster parents at Bethany Christian Services
Provided trauma training for staff at Bethany Christian Services Ghana
Section III

Part A: Discussion of Data as it relates to the Program Goals, Division Objectives, and CSWE Competencies

Part B: 2012-2013 Work Plan
**Part A: Discussion of Data as it relates to the Program Goals, Division Objectives, and CSWE Competencies**

**Explicit Curriculum**

**Goal 1:** Demonstrate mastery of core competencies necessary for both competent entry-level generalist social work practice and advanced graduate social work education. These competencies include:

| 1a. | identifying as a **professional** and conducting oneself accordingly (EPAS 2.1.1 / SS Objective 2, 3, 9) |

**Discussion:**

*Student Evaluation of Course Objectives* indicates student perception related to the achievement of particular course objectives (practice behaviors) associated with this competency. On a scale of 1-5 (5 = Successfully Achieved), Mean Scores exceeded the benchmark of 3 for all course objectives related to this competency.

The *Field Education Learning Contract* summary indicated that social work students in their field placement were overall proficient in demonstrating the competency of professionalism. The mean score was 3.82 on a scale of 1-4. This exceeds the benchmark of 3.0.

*Portfolios* not tallied

*Signature Assignment* not collected and tallied

| 1b. | acting in accordance with the **values** of the social work profession (EPAS 2.1.2 / SS Objective 8, 9) |

**Discussion:**

*Student Evaluation of Course Objectives*, indicates student perception related to the achievement of particular course objectives (practice behaviors) associated with this competency. All mean scores for course objectives related to this competency ranged exceeded the benchmark of 3.00.

The *ACAT* score for Values and Ethics was 572, placing our students in the 77th percentile nationally. This exceeded the required benchmark of 500.

Students evaluated on their ability to complete practice behaviors associated with this competency in the Field (*Field Education Learning Contract*) had a mean score of 3.65 on a scale of 1-4 (4 = exceeds expectations), exceeding the benchmark of 3.00.
In their Senior Exit Interviews, students overall reported a strong fit with their personal values and the Social Work Code of Ethics.

**The Social Work Values Inventory** attempts to measure students' ability to practice social work within the context of three areas relevant to social work values and ethics. These areas are confidentiality, self-determination, and social justice. The Pretest Mean Score (distributed to students just beginning the social work program) in the area of confidentiality was 57.60 and the Post Test Mean Score (distributed to senior social work students) was 71.00, indicating an improved perception and understanding of confidentiality among our seniors as compared to Intro level social work students. The post test score was also just shy of the national average by about 4 points and fell within one standard deviation (Mean=75.28, SD 11.66), meeting the program’s benchmark in this area.

In the area of self-determination, student understanding of this concept increased from 40.53 to 61.73 and was again just 5 points shy of the national average of 66.51, meeting the program’s benchmark, falling within the national standard deviation of 11.95.

Finally, in the area of social justice, not only did students demonstrate an increase from Intro students to senior student means (82.46 to 93.90), the senior score in this area also exceeded the national mean (87.80) by approximately 6 points.

**Portfolio** not tallied.

The **Signature Assignment** for this competency is given in SWK 462 Senior Seminar and it divides the ethics competency in two parts: ethical sensitivity and moral judgment. Both concepts are related to being aware and problem-solving an ethical dilemma. The overall mean score for ethical sensitivity was 8.1 indicating an acceptable level of proficiency. However, in the area of moral judgment, the overall score was 8.05 indicating that some students fell below the benchmark of 8.1.

Seniors completing the **Ethical Sensitivity Test** demonstrated gains in their ability to identify ethical issues as evidenced by an increase from their overall pretest mean of 15.93 to their post test mean of 46.56. The mean difference was +30.63 meeting the benchmark for this measure.

| 1c | applying critical thinking to inform professional judgments (EPAS 2.1.3 / SS Objective 9) |

**Discussion:**

*Student Evaluation of Course Objectives*, indicates student perception related to the achievement of particular course objectives (practice behaviors) associated with this
competency. On a scale of 1-5 (5 = Successfully Achieved), Mean Scores exceeded the benchmark of 3.00.

Students evaluated on their ability to complete practice behaviors associated with this competency in the Field (*Field Education Learning Contract*) had a mean score of 3.68 on a scale of 1-4 exceeding the benchmark minimum of 3.00.

Feedback from the *Senior Exit* interviews indicated that students felt challenged to learn and apply content in social work practice.

*Portfolios* not tallied.

The *Signature Assignment* results for the critical thinking competency indicated proficiency as demonstrated in student ability to articulate a coherent argument in identifying and working through ethical issues in an ethics paper for SWK 462 (Mean = 8.5). This exceeds the benchmark of 8.1).

| 1d | understanding and engaging with diverse populations (EPAS 2.1.4 / SS Objective 4, 9) |

**Discussion:**

*Student Evaluation of Course Objectives*, indicated that student perception related to the achievement of particular course objectives (practice behaviors) associated with this competency exceeded the benchmark of 3.0.

Students evaluated on their ability to complete practice behaviors associated with this competency in the Field (*Field Education Learning Contract*) had a mean score of 3.65 on a scale of 1-4 (4 = exceeds expectations).

The *ACAT* score for Diversity was 576, which placed our students in the 78<sup>th</sup> percentile nationally, a slight decrease from last year’s score, but still well above the benchmark of 500.

In the *Field Instructor’s Evaluation of the Social Work Program*, Field Instructor’s overall mean for ranking the program in terms of their perception of the students’ ability to work with diverse populations (based on a 1-5 scale, 5 = strongly agree) was 4.75.

*Portfolios* not tallied.

The *Signature Assignment* for this competency is a Final project in SWK 417 Diversity. In three practice behaviors related to demonstrating competency the original mean scores were 6.89, 6.44, and 6.50 falling below the benchmark of 8.1.
Discussion:

**Student Evaluation of Course Objectives**, indicates student perception related to the achievement of particular course objectives (practice behaviors) associated with this competency exceeded the benchmark of 3.00.

The **ACAT** score for Social and Economic Justice was 532, which placed our students in the 63rd percentile nationally and exceeded the 500 cut-off score that would have merited a program response.

Students evaluated on their ability to complete practice behaviors associated with this competency in the Field (**Field Education Learning Contract**) had a mean score of 3.78 on a scale of 1-4 exceeding the benchmark of 3.00.

Students’ post test score (seniors) in the area of **social justice (Social Work Values Inventory)** was 93.91 which exceeded the national average by just more than 6 points.

**Portfolios** not tallied.

The **Signature Assignment** for this competency is a Final project in SWK 417 Diversity. As part of this assignment students had to define privilege and oppression as it related to the group they were presenting on. The overall mean score in this area was 6.68 falling below the benchmark of 8.1.

**If** utilizing and engaging in **research** to inform practice (EPAS 2.1.6 /SS Objective 6, 7, 9)

Discussion:

Mean Scores from the **Student Evaluation of Course Objectives** were not available for the 2012-2013 academic year.

The **ACAT** score for Research was 602 which placed our students in the 81st percentile nationally. This exceeded the benchmark for this measure.

Students evaluated on their ability to complete practice behaviors associated with this competency in the Field (**Field Education Learning Contract**) had a mean score of 3.81 on a scale of 1-4 (4 = exceeds expectations), placing them above the acceptable level of 3.00.

**Portfolios** not tallied.

**Signature Assignment** rubrics not collected and tallied.
Discussion:

**Student Evaluation of Course Objectives**, indicates student perception related to the achievement of particular course objectives (practice behaviors) associated with this competency exceeded the benchmark of 3.00.

The ACAT score for HBSE was 539 (64th percentile) and placed above the minimum required score of 500.

Students evaluated on their ability to complete practice behaviors associated with this competency in the Field (*Field Education Learning Contract*) had a mean score of 3.75 on a scale of 1-4 (4 = exceeds expectations). This exceeded the benchmark of 3.0.

*Portfolios* not tallied.

The *Signature Assignment* rubrics for this competency were not collected and tallied.

Discussion:

**Student Evaluation of Course Objectives**, indicates student perception related to the achievement of particular course objectives (practice behaviors) associated with this competency. Mean Scores for this competency exceeded the 3.00 benchmark.

The ACAT score for Social Policy was 547 (70th percentile), an increase from last year’s score of 506 and exceeding the benchmark of 500.

Students evaluated on their ability to complete practice behaviors associated with this competency in the Field (*Field Education Learning Contract*) had a mean score of 3.68 on a scale of 1-4 (4 = exceeds expectations). This exceeded the benchmark of 3.0.

*Portfolios* not tallied.

*Signature Assignment* rubrics for this competency not collected and tallied.
Student Evaluation of Course Objectives, indicates student perception related to the achievement of particular course objectives (practice behaviors) associated with this competency. Mean Scores exceeded the 3.00 benchmark.

Students evaluated on their ability to complete practice behaviors associated with this competency in the Field (Field Education Learning Contract) had a mean score of 3.78 on a scale of 1-4 (4 = exceeds expectations). This exceeded the 3.00 benchmark.

Portfolios not tallied.

Signature assignment rubrics not collected and tallied.

Discussion:

Student Evaluation of Course Objectives, indicates student perception related to the achievement of particular course objectives (practice behaviors) associated with this competency. Mean scores exceeded the bench mark of 3.00.

The ACAT score for Social Work Practice skills was 586 (81st percentile), a decrease from last year’s score of 605, but well above the benchmark of 500.

Students evaluated on their ability to complete practice behaviors associated with this competency in the Field (Field Education Learning Contract) had a mean score of: 3.75 (engagement); 3.68 (assessment); 3.71 (intervention); and 3.62 (evaluation) based on a scale of 1-4 (4 = exceeds expectations). This surpasses the 3.00 benchmark.

Portfolios not tallied.

Signature assignment rubrics not collected and tallied.
Program Goal 2. Integrate their Christian worldview confidently with social work practice in a global context (SS Objective 1)

Discussion:

*Student Evaluation of Course Objectives*, indicates student perception related to the achievement of particular course objectives (practice behaviors) associated with this competency. Mean scores exceeded the benchmark of 3.00.

In the *Senior Exit Interview*, students were asked to discuss their perception of the fit between their Christian Worldview and the values of the social work profession. Student comments indicated a positive fit overall.

**IMPLICIT CURRICULUM**

II. Additional data from other Measures – not specifically related to core competencies or program goals.

A. Student Evaluation of Practicum Agency

The overall findings of the student evaluation of practicum agency indicated that students were at least satisfied if not very satisfied with a range of variables related to the agency. These variables included: work space; agency orientation; tasks assigned; relations with other staff; new social work knowledge attained; and support from faculty liaison (Nola Carew). Some scores related to supervision in terms of frequency and quality indicated somewhat dissatisfied to satisfied. This was also true for “caseload assigned”. At least 5 out of 14 students commented on having supervision issues while another 5 (presumably) commented on having a great experience with great supervision. 78% of the students recommended their placement for future social work students while the remaining 22% did not.

B. Field Instructor’s Evaluation of the Social Work Program

The overall mean scores for the Field Instructor’s Evaluation of the Social Work Program indicate that Field Instructors either agreed or strongly agreed with all of the items related to the services and support provided by the Field Coordinator (Professor Carew). Additionally, the scores also indicate a strong level of agreement with regards to the level of preparation that Cornerstone students come to their respective agencies with. The majority of Field Supervisor comments indicated a strong level of support from the Field Coordinator. A couple of comments indicated a desire for greater clarity about expectations for the field.
Part B: Work Plan for Academic Year 2013-2014

The overall results from all the evaluative measures appear to support the notion that students are graduating the social work program demonstrating knowledge and abilities undergirding the required competencies reflected in the Program Goals. However, data from the Portfolios was not tallied for this evaluative document nor were all the signature assignments. Additionally, the overall mean scores related to diversity and social and economic justice competencies in the related signature assignment where below the benchmark mean of 8.1.

The following work plan is based on the above observation as well as other factors associated with the Program’s desire for continued growth and excellence:

1. With regards to Portfolios and Signature Assignments:

a. The Program Director will follow-up with all faculty responsible for assignments listed below to insure that graded rubrics are turned into the Administrative Assistant for tabulation at the end of each semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWK 221</td>
<td>Developmental Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWK 222</td>
<td>Adult in Society Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWK 332</td>
<td>Group Facilitator Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWK 333</td>
<td>Macro Project / Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWK 353/354</td>
<td>Research Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWK 361</td>
<td>Policy Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWK 450-51</td>
<td>Reflection Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWK 460-461</td>
<td>Integrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWK 462</td>
<td>Book Review of The Call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Completed? ____ Yes ____ No

Explanation.

b. Seniors will be given Portfolio instructions in SWK 451 Field Seminar in the Fall, instead of SWK 462 Senior Capstone to insure better continuity through SWK 461 Field Seminar II. The Portfolio will be due midterm Spring semester.

Task Completed? ____ Yes ____ No

Explanation.

c. Social Work Faculty will meet with Tech Support to discuss developing an electronic system for the compilation of portfolios and their respective signature assignments in August of 2013. Will also discuss the creation of a moodle block for social work
majors. This moodle block would contain: Practicum Manual, Student Handbook, Application to Program, Field, Portfolio stuff?

Task Completed? ____ Yes  ____ No

Explanation.

d. In SWK 211 Introduction to Social Work: Have students purchase a 3 ring binder for the purpose of starting their portfolio and collecting Signature Assignments.

Task Completed? ____ Yes  ____ No

Explanation.

e. In SWK 211 Introduction to Social Work and SWK 462 Senior Capstone, have students complete an essay “What does it mean to be a Christian Social Worker?” for the professionalism and Christian worldview competency and to be kept in student portfolios. The Senior Capstone paper will be a signature assignment. This will be implemented in the Fall of 2013.

Task Completed? ____ Yes  ____ No

Explanation.

2. With regards to diversity and social and economic justice (pg. 57, Signature Assignment):

Program Director will meet with SWK 417 Instructor to discuss the scores for Final Project and any concerns related to the designation as a signature assignment.

Task Completed? ____ Yes  ____ No

Explanation.
3. **With regards to ethics (pg. 56, Signature Assignment):**

Students that scored below proficiency completed remedial work before graduating. The original score does not reflect this. Will continue to monitor for next year.

Task Completed? ____ Yes  ____ No
Explanation.

4. **With regards to Research (Student Evaluation of Course Objectives and Signature Assignment):**

   a. Program Director will meet with Research Instructor in August of 2013, to insure follow-up on completion of Student evaluation of course objectives and signature assignment.

   Task Completed? ____ Yes  ____ No

   Explanation.

   b. Discuss in a division meeting the viability of an upper level research sequence that has more than 20 students in it – invite Academic Dean to this discussion.

   Task Completed? ____ Yes  ____ No

   Explanation.

5. **Regarding additional curriculum “tweaking”, the Field Coordinator (Nola) will:**

   a. implement the rubric for the signature assignment on professionalism in SWK 451 for the Fall 2013.

   Task Completed? ____ Yes  ____ No

   Explanation.

   b. revise the SWK 333 perspective paper rubric to incorporate: Christian worldview and “respond to contexts that shape practice” for the Fall of 2013.

   Task Completed? ____ Yes  ____ No

   Explanation.
c. upgrade the grading rubric for the Adulthood in Society paper in SWK 222 to more strongly reflect the HBSE competency by the end of the Fall semester.

Task Completed? ____ Yes ____ No

Explanation.

d. implement the Integrative Case Assignment in the SWK 461 as a signature assignment for the Spring of 2014.

Task Completed? ____ Yes ____ No

Explanation.

7. Finally, the Program Director will:

a. revise Social Work Student Handbook and make sure it is posted on website or moodle page by the end of the Fall semester.

Task Completed? ____ Yes ____ No

Explanation.

b. revise the Group Proposal assignment for SWK 332 to reflect practice competency (SWKPG 1j / EPAS 2.1.10Aa – engagement and EPAS 2.1.10Cb – intervention)

Task Completed? ____ Yes ____ No

Explanation.

c. work with Administrative Assistant and Faculty to insure that rubrics from signature assignments are collected and results are recorded.

Task Completed? ____ Yes ____ No

Explanation.