

Annual Assessment Report
Social Work Program

Luther College

Craig Mosher, Ph.D., Program Director

June 2016

Annual Assessment Report – Social Work Program

This annual report is prepared to assess student outcomes in the social work program at Luther College toward the end of continuously improving the quality of instruction and the level of student performance. The social work program's accreditation was reaffirmed for another full eight-year period by the Commission on Accreditation of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) in June 2013. This decision was taken after an eighteen-month reaffirmation process that included an exhaustive self-study (submitted as the Annual Assessment Report to Luther in August 2013) and a site visit in December 2012. This reaccreditation affirmed that the Luther Social Work Program met the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) of CSWE.

This report is based on data from three instruments provided by the Social Work Education Assessment Project (SWEAP) to assess student performance. These instruments were administered during students' senior practicum, near the end of their final semester before graduation. 1) Students completed the FCAI instrument—a 45 item multiple choice knowledge test. 2) Students completed the EXIT Survey to assess how prepared they felt in the nine competencies. 3) Field instructors (students' practicum supervisors in the agencies where they did their internships) completed the FPPAI instrument—rating students on their on-the-job performance. The instruments measured student performance and preparation on the nine competencies as operationalized by 31 behaviors that are specified by CSWE in the 2015 EPAS as constituting the knowledge, values, and skills that social workers need for professional practice. They also measured the social work program's implicit curriculum (program environment).

Social Work Program Mission and Goals

The Luther College social work program's *mission reflects the purposes and values of the social work profession* and the program's context within the college and its surrounding community and society. The program's mission and goals have remained relatively stable over the past decade; recent revisions reflect new areas of emphasis within the program and developments in social work education and practice.

The social work program fits well at Luther College given the college's history and long-standing mission to serve the community and the common good. The preparation of students for beginning level generalist social work practice is consistent with the college's preparation of other human service professionals, such as teachers, nurses and pastors.

Mission of the Luther College Social Work Program

The social work program at Luther College is grounded in the history, purposes, and philosophy of the social work profession including the concept of person-in-environment. It operates within the context of a small church-affiliated liberal arts college in a vibrant small town in the American upper Midwest. The program aims to assist students in developing ten professional core competencies and the knowledge, values, skills, and professional identity they need to practice as

competent professional entry level generalist social workers promoting human and community well-being in a diverse, complex, and changing global context; the elimination of poverty; social and economic justice; and quality of life for all.

The core values of the social work profession that shape the Luther social work program are: service, social justice, the dignity and worth of the person, the importance of human relationships, integrity, competence, human rights, and scientific inquiry.

Graduates are prepared to be culturally competent life long learners, active citizens, and advocates for social and economic justice who can think critically, use scientific research-based interventions, make sound ethical judgments, respect human diversity, and serve as leaders in strengthening the service delivery system, as they strive to empower people in their environments. The program and its faculty also contribute to knowledge in the field, provide leadership and expertise to strengthen the social service system, and work for the common good in an ever-changing society.

Purposes of the Social Work Profession

Consistent with the purposes of the social work profession, the mission of the Luther social work program includes commitments to:

- Promoting human and community well-being and the common good
- Working within a diverse, complex, and changing global context
- Working within the person-in-environment context
- Respecting human diversity in its many forms
- Utilizing scientific, research-based interventions
- Promoting social and economic justice, the elimination of poverty, and quality of life for all

Values of the profession

The social work program is shaped by the core values of the social work profession including: service, social justice, the dignity and worth of the person, the importance of human relationships, integrity, competence, human rights, and scientific inquiry. The program curriculum is based on these values, expecting that students will learn to practice with respect for all people and work for social and economic justice as professional social workers.

Program context

Luther College was founded in 1861 to educate pastors for Norwegian immigrant congregations. A strong commitment to the liberal arts has endured and remains the foundation for an expanding range of pre-professional and professional programs. Social work courses were first offered in the early 1970's, and the social work program was first accredited by CSWE in 1976. The addition of social work as a major was a logical extension of the long-standing commitment of the college to serve the common good. The college's emphasis on connecting freedom with responsibility, faith with learning and life's work with service directly influence, and are shaped by, the social work program at the college.

Throughout its history Luther College has provided a liberal arts curriculum that gives students a solid grounding in the humanities, social sciences, and physical sciences so that they will have the broad liberal education necessary to successful careers and effective citizenship. In particular, students learn about the economic, social, political, technological, cultural, and environmental contexts in which we all live. In *Healing the Heart of Democracy*, Parker Palmer summarizes well the importance of the liberal arts context for the Luther social work program, "Knowledge of this sort is liberating not only because it steepens us in the wisdom of the past; it also accustoms us to ambiguity and paradox, preparing us to find our way into an unpredictable future. A liberal education helps us embrace diverse ideas without becoming paralyzed in thought or action" (Palmer 2011, p. 84).

The following elements from the Luther College Mission and Goals provide a supportive context for the social work program mission and goals:

- The commitment to serve the common good and connecting life's work with service
- Luther's academic structure of "knowledge, abilities, and values," mirrors social work's focus on knowledge, values, and skills.
- Diversity and ethics show up repeatedly in the Luther statements
- Life long learning is referred to as continuing growth throughout their lives
- Critical thinking is referenced several times as "acquire, evaluate, and apply knowledge; analyze sources critically; and ability to reason"
- Scientific research is referred to with the words, "investigate a problem, analyze information, and communicate results"
- A focus on issues related to justice, peace, and the environment

The program is firmly rooted in the liberal arts, which is evidenced by reference to the following items as found in the college catalog: Goals for Student Learning, Requirements for the Degree, and Summary of All-College Requirements.

Social Work Requirements:

To qualify for the Bachelor of Arts degree, social work students must complete 128 semester hours of credit with a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 (C) or higher. The 128 hours must include the following:

- One January Term First Year Seminar: The social work program has offered two first year seminars (*Growing Old in America* and *Crisis Intervention: Interpersonal Violence*) which are open to all first year students at Luther College.
- A second January term course that includes one of the following experiences: study away, directed readings, student-initiated project. Social Work majors complete Social Work 102: Field Experience, which meets this requirement.
- At least 20 course equivalents (80 credits) outside the student's major discipline. 64 credit hours completed in residence.

The college is located in Decorah, a town of 8,000 in northeast Iowa. Luther is a small, private, liberal arts college, offering only the bachelors degree, which draws students from all states and 50 countries. The majority of Luther students come from four states: Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois. Most students come from urban or small city environments like Des Moines, Cedar Rapids, Minneapolis/St. Paul, Rochester, La Crosse, Madison, Milwaukee, Chicago, and Rockford. Therefore, the social work program prepares students for truly generalist practice settings and does not, in spite of its location, emphasize rural social work. College enrollment a little under 2500 with the largest majors being music, biology, and psychology. The social work program averages about 12 – 14 graduates a year, although last year we graduated 22 and this year, 19.

Goals Of The Social Work Program

Goal 1: Prepare students for competent and effective entry-level generalist professional social work practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities through mastery of the knowledge, values, and skills that inform the nine core competencies (EPAS 2015). Competencies: 1 – 9

Goal 2: Prepare students to think critically, using the values, codes of ethics, and research base of the profession. Competencies: 1, 4, 9.

Goal 3: Prepare students to use prevention and intervention methods to work effectively in changing contexts with diverse populations, drawing on people's strengths and resilience. Competencies: 2, 6, 7, 8, 9.

Table 1 EPAS Competencies and Social Work Program Goals

Competency	E.P. 2.1.1	E.P. 2.1.2	E.P. 2.1.3	E.P. 2.1.4	E.P. 2.1.5	E.P. 2.1.6	E.P. 2.1.7	E.P. 2.1.8	E.P. 2.1.9
Goal 1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Goal 2	X			X					X
Goal 3		X				X	X	X	X

The first broad primary goal of the Luther social work program, as stated above, is to prepare graduates for generalist practice with the full range of populations by helping them learn the knowledge, values, and skills that inform the nine core competencies (CSWE EPAS 2015). Graduates who have mastered all nine competencies will be prepared for generalist practice. Table 1 shows that Goal 1 involves all nine competencies.

Goal two focuses on the development of a solid grounding in the skills of critical thinking based on social work ethical principles and scientifically-based research knowledge so graduates can empower people and work for social and economic justice from a sound base of ethical principles and scientifically validated interventions.

The third goal is to prepare students to intervene directly and seek to prevent social problems—within their particular contexts—in order to enhance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice. This work involves understanding of the systemic nature of social problems, how policy affects people’s lives, the resources to be found in peoples’ strengths and resilience and the strength that diversity brings to communities and societies.

The program goals implement the general statements of the program mission and the mission is firmly grounded in the context of the college mission and goals, which support working for the common good and a life of service; a structure of knowledge, values, and service; life-long learning; ethics and critical thinking, scientific research based actions; and a commitment to justice and peace.

Current assessment efforts are focused on these goals, which have not changed since last year. In fact, these goals have remained relatively stable over recent years except for occasional updating of language.

Assessment of Luther College Social Work Program Outcomes

Social Work Competencies—Educational Policy Accreditation Standards (EPAS) 2015

The nine competencies and 31 behaviors (behaviors are bulleted) specified by CSWE in the new 2015 EPAS are the standards each social work program must meet as explained in the introductory paragraph and the list of competencies below—copied from CSWE.

The nine Social Work Competencies are listed below. Programs may add competencies that are consistent with their mission and goals and respond to their context. Each competency describes the knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes that comprise the competency at the generalist level of practice, followed by a set of behaviors (bullets) that integrate these components. These behaviors represent observable components of the competencies, while the preceding statements represent the underlying content and processes that inform the behaviors (CSWE, 2015, p. 6).

Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior

Social workers:

- make ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context;
- use reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations;
- demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication;
- use technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes; and
- use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior.

Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice

Social workers:

- apply and communicate understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels;
- present themselves as learners and engage clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences; and
- apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies.

Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice

Social workers:

- apply their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels; and
- engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice.

Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice

Social workers:

- use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research;
- apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative and qualitative research methods and research findings; and
- use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery.

Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice

Social workers:

- Identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services;
- assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services;
- apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.

Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Social workers:

- apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies; and
- use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies.

Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Social workers:

- collect and organize data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies;
- apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies;

- develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies; and
- select appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies.

Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Social workers:

- critically choose and implement interventions to achieve practice goals and enhance capacities of clients and constituencies;
- apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies;
- use inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to achieve beneficial practice outcomes;
- negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies; and
- facilitate effective transitions and endings that advance mutually agreed-on goals.

Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Social workers:

- select and use appropriate methods for evaluation of outcomes;
- apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes;
- critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate intervention and program processes and outcomes; and
- apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. (CSWE, 2015, pp. 7-9)

Competencies (summary)

- 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior
- 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice
- 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice
- 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice
- 5: Engage in Policy Practice Competency
- 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
- 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
- 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
- 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Luther College social work program Assessment Plan

The Luther College social work program *Assessment Plan*, to evaluate the attainment of the nine student competencies (shown in column one), is outlined in Table 2 below. The plan specifies the use of three measures. 1) The SWEAP FCAI instrument is a 45 item multiple-choice knowledge test that seniors complete just before graduation. Scores on the FCAI are only available in seven categories that roughly correspond to the nine competencies, not for each behavior, so they are reported by competency. The FCAI instrument used was based on the earlier 2008 EPAS since the revised instrument was not available at the time of administration. The FCAI is shown in separate rows for the relevant competencies in Table 2.

2) The SWEAP EXIT Survey gathers demographic data, student ratings on their level of preparation for social work practice, and student ratings on the implicit curriculum. There are 34 items on the EXIT Survey because SWEAP broke down some of the competencies.

3) The SWEAP FPPAI instrument, which field instructors complete to rate the performance of the students they supervise in senior practicum—for each of the thirty-one behaviors that operationalize the nine competencies. There are 48 items on the FPPAI because SWEAP broke down some of the competencies.

The plan describes the procedures for analyzing the data, and the benchmarks for determining attainment of competency for each of the nine competencies. The plan also notes the items on the EXIT Survey and the FPPAI that measure each behavior. Further explanations follow the table regarding the instruments and data analysis.

Table 2 Luther College Social Work Program Assessment Plan 2015-2016

2015 EPAS Competencies	Competency Benchmark	Behavior	Measures	Analysis Procedures
EP 2.1.1 – EXIT and FPPAI Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	Mean of 3.00 out of 5 on FPPAI These benchmarks are the same for all competencies.	1. make ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context	Cohort average of EXIT item scores (student ratings of preparation) Cohort average of FPPAI item scores (Field Instructors ratings) EXIT (EX) Item 1 FPPAI (FP) Item 1	Competency mean of EXIT item ratings for cohort Competency mean of FPPAI item ratings for cohort % of students exceeding benchmark mean competency score (3.00). Procedures the same for all competencies
		2. use reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations	EX Item 2 FP Item 2	
		3. demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication	EX Item 3 FP Items 3-7	
		4. use technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes	EX Item 4 FP Item 8	
		5. use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior	EX Item 5 FP Item 9	
FCAI Ethics	60% correct	The FCAI measure is not related to the behaviors.	Cohort average of % correct items on FCAI knowledge test for each competency.	Competency mean of number of items correct on each competency for cohort.

EP2.1.2 - EXIT and FPPAI Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice #7 & #8 are combined in the EPAS		6. apply and communicate understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels	EX Item 6 FP Items 10-12	
		7. present themselves as learners to clients and constituencies	EX Item 7 FP Item 13	
		8. engage clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences	EX Item 8 FP Item 14	
		9. apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies.	EX Item 9 FP Item 15	
FCAI Diversity	60% correct	The FCAI measure is not related to the behaviors.	Cohort average of % correct items on FCAI knowledge test for each competency.	Competency mean of number of items correct on each competency for cohort.
P2.1.3 - EXIT and FPPAI Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice. #10, 11, 12 are combined in the EPAS.		10. apply their understanding of social justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels	EX Item 10 FP Item 16	
		11. apply their understanding of economic justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels	EX Item 11 FP Item 17	
		12. apply their understanding of environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels	EX Item 12 FP Item 18	
		13. engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice.	EX Item 13 FP Items 19-21	
FCAI Social and Economic Justice	60% correct	The FCAI measure is not related to the behaviors.	Cohort average of % correct items on FCAI knowledge test for each competency.	Competency mean of number of items correct on each competency for cohort.

EP2.1.4 - EXIT and FPPAI Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice #14 & 15 are combined in the EPAS. # 16 & 17 are combined in the EPAS		14. use theory to inform scientific inquiry and research	EX Item 14 FP Item 22	
		15. use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry and research	EX Item 15 FP Item 23	
		16. apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative research methods and research findings	EX Item 16 FP Item 24	
		17. apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of qualitative research methods and research findings	EX Item 17 FP Item 25	
		18. use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery.	EX Item 18 FP Item 26	
FCAI Research	60% correct	The FCAI measure is not related to the behaviors.	Cohort average of % correct items on FCAI knowledge test for each competency.	Competency mean of number of items correct on each competency for cohort.
EP 2.1.5 - EXIT and FPPAI Engage in Policy Practice #21, 22, 23 are combined in the EPAS.		19. Identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services	EX Item 19 FP Item 27	
		20. assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services	Ex Item 20 FP Item 28	
		21. apply critical thinking to analyze policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	EX Item 21 FP Item 29	
		22. apply critical thinking to formulate policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	EX Item 22 FP Item 30	
		23. apply critical thinking to advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	EX Item 23 FP Item 31	
FCAI Policy	60% correct	The FCAI measure is not related to the behaviors.	Cohort average of % correct items on FCAI knowledge test for each competency.	Competency mean of number of items correct on each competency for cohort.

EP2.1.6 - EXIT and FPPAI Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities		24. apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies	EX Item 24 FP Item 32	
		25. use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies	EX Item 25 FP Item 33	
FCAI Practice	60% correct	The FCAI measure is not related to the behaviors.	Cohort average of % correct items on FCAI knowledge test for each competency.	Competency mean of number of items correct on each competency for cohort.
EP2.1.7 - EXIT and FPPAI Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities		26. collect and organize data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies	EX Item 26 FP Item 34	
		27. apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies	EX Item 27 FP Item 35	
		28. develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies	EX Item 28 FP Item 36	
		29. select appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies	EX Item 29 FP Item 37	
FCAI Human Behavior in the Social Environment (Not included in 2015 competencies.)	60% correct	The FCAI measure is not related to the behaviors.	Cohort average of % correct items on FCAI knowledge test for each competency.	Competency mean of number of items correct on each competency for cohort.

EP2.1.8 - EXIT and FPPAI Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	30. critically choose and implement interventions to achieve practice goals and enhance capacities of clients and constituencies	EX Item 30 FP Item 38	
	31. apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies	EX Item 31 FP Item 39	
	32. use inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to achieve beneficial practice outcomes	EX Item 32 FP Item 40	
	33. negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies	EX Item 33 FP Item 41	
	34. facilitate effective transitions and endings that advance mutually agreed-on goals	EX Item 34 FP Item 42	
EP2.1.9 - EXIT and FPPAI Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	35. select and use appropriate methods for evaluation of outcomes	EX Item 35 FP Item 43	
	36. apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes	EX Item 36 FP Item 44	
	37. critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate intervention and program processes and outcomes	EX Item 37 FP Item 45	
	38. apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels	EX Item 38 FP Items 46-48	

Description of Instruments

A set of instruments created by the Social Work Education Assessment Project (SWEAP)—formerly known as BEAP—was used for this assessment. SWEAP is a group of volunteer social work faculty that has been working for thirty years to develop and refine assessment instruments for social work education. As of 1999, 9,000 students had completed the instruments creating a database for further research. Since that time many more have taken it. The group has published twenty-two juried publications and many other reports and presentations based on the data.

The current SWEAP package consists of six instruments appropriate for assessment of undergraduate and graduate social work programs:

- Entrance Survey
- Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument @ Entrance (FCAI)
- Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument @ Exit (FCAI)
- EXIT Survey
- Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI)
- Alumni Survey
- Employer/Supervisor Survey

Three of these instruments were used for this assessment: 1) the FCAI knowledge test (at exit from the program), 2) the Exit Survey and 3) the FPPAI practicum instrument. Each of these three instruments provides a measure of the competencies students are expected to learn. Copies of these three instruments are in Appendix F, G, H, respectively, following p. 65 XXXX of the hard copy version of this report. They are not included in the online version to protect the security and copyright of the instruments.

1) The Curriculum Assessment Instrument @ Entrance/Exit (FCAI) is a 45 item multiple choice knowledge test administered at entrance to the program and at exit (graduation). It measures student knowledge related to most of the nine competencies. The FCAI knowledge test was based on the 2008 EPAS since the revised version for the new (2015) EPAS was not yet available. The 45 multiple-choice questions cover the ten (2008) competencies, which are similar to the nine 2015 competencies. The questions do not duplicate the EPAS language but are designed to cover the EPAS competencies. Reliability on the FCAI was tested in two practice classes (n=415) two weeks apart and yielded a Cronbach's alpha = .784, with an effect size of $d=6.87$, and a Pearson's correlation coefficient of $r = .86$. Item Difficulty Testing for the FCAI yielded a value of .523 for the $n = 415$. This is a good difficulty level for the test. It is not likely to misrepresent the knowledge level of test takers. (Krase, 2016)

2) The EXIT Survey gathers demographic data and information about GPA, work experience, and financial aid. The EXIT Survey also solicits student ratings of their preparation for each of the nine competencies by asking them to rate their preparation on each of the 38 behaviors (in Table 2) that operationalize the competencies. And the EXIT

Survey assesses the implicit curriculum (program environment).

3) The FPPAI field practicum instrument used for this study was based on the new 2015 EPAS. It asked field instructors (practicum students' supervisors) to rate each student on the behaviors that operationalize the nine competencies (CSWE, 2015) using a 5 point Likert scale from 5 = mastered to 1 = lacking, as shown in Table 3 below—at the end of their senior practicum. There are more behaviors rated on the FPPAI (48) than in the EPAS (31) because SWEAP broke some of the 31 behaviors down to get more specific measures but the wording and organization of the SWEAP items is copied directly from the EPAS and, therefore, covers all the same behaviors and competencies.

The 2008 version of the FPPAI is currently being used by 92 social work programs nation-wide with more than 4,391 administrations as of June 2016. Twenty-one programs are using the 2015 version of the FPPAI, with 274 administrations completed to date. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability test of internal consistency for the 2015 version used in this study, based on the pilot and first two years of testing, is 0.975 indicating a high degree of reliability (Krase, 2016).

The FPPAI can be considered a strong valid measure because the field instructors are relatively objective, knowledgeable, and skillful observers who have had at least 400 hours to observe the students' behavior throughout the spring semester during their senior field placement.

The number of students (N=16 for the EXIT Survey and the FCAI, N=17 for the FPPAI) is relatively low because this is a small program. These small Ns decrease both validity and reliability. Both measures were weighted the same.

Table 3 FPPAI Field Instrument – Likert Rating Scale Categories

Scale	Performance Measure	Description	Definition
5	Mastered	The intern/student shows effective and innovative application of the knowledge, values, and skills related to the performance of the practice behavior.	Mastered: "somebody highly skilled at something." Mastered performance is demonstration of knowledge, values, and skills of the practice behavior at high levels
4	Superior	The intern/student shows superior application of the knowledge, values, and skills related to the performance of the practice behavior.	Superior: "surpasses competent in one or more ways." Superior performance is demonstration of knowledge, values, and skills where all components of the practice behavior are included.
3	Competent	The intern/student shows competent application of the knowledge, values, and skills related to the performance of the practice behavior.	Competent: "having enough skill or ability to do something well." Competent performance is demonstration of knowledge, values, and skills where all components of the practice behavior are included, but at the beginning or rudimentary level.

2	Inadequate	The intern/student shows beginning application of the knowledge, skills, or dispositions related to the performance of the practice behavior.	Inadequate: "failing to reach an expected or required level or standard." Inadequate performance is demonstration of knowledge, values, and skills where one or more of the components of the practice behavior are missing.
1	Lacking	The intern/student has not demonstrated application of the knowledge, values and skills related to the performance of the practice behavior.	Lacking: "missing, not present or available." Lacking performance is the inability to demonstrate any of the components of the knowledge, values, or skills related to the practice behavior.
N/O	Not Observed	The intern/Student has not had the opportunity to demonstrate the knowledge, values, and skills related to the performance of the practice behavior.	Observed: "to see or notice something, especially while watching carefully." There was no observation of the performance of the practice behavior.

Measurement Procedures

1) The FCAI knowledge test was administered to students when they began the program (entrance) and it was distributed again electronically to the nineteen graduating seniors who completed it online in May 2016. Sixteen of the nineteen returned the FCAI for a response rate of 84%. It was not possible to compare scores on the Entrance/EXIT Survey and the FCAI from entrance and exit because student ID numbers were not used at entrance.

2) The EXIT Survey was administered to this cohort when they began the program and in May 2016 as they were finishing their practicum placements and preparing to graduate—to gather demographic data as well as student ratings of their preparation and their ratings on aspects of the implicit curriculum. Sixteen of the nineteen returned the EXIT Survey for a response rate of 84%.

3) The FPPAI was sent to each student, who passed it on to their supervisor/field instructor. Seventeen out of nineteen field instructors completed the FPPAI online during the closing weeks of students' practicum placements in early May 2016 for a response rate of 90%. This was the senior class cohort of nineteen students who graduated in social work from Luther in May 2016.

The benchmark for the FCAI and FPPAI instruments was set at 60%, which represented 60% of items correct on the FCAI and a mean of 3.00 on the FPPAI's five point scale. This 60% benchmark was used in the SWEAP analysis of the FPPAI and FCAI data. The data were analyzed by SWEAP as described and presented below.

Measurement Procedures – Implicit Curriculum

In CSWE parlance, the implicit curriculum (also know as program environment) includes program elements—other than specific courses—such as teaching quality, facilities, advising, admissions, program policies, student participation, grading, and

diversity. The implicit curriculum was assessed using the SWEAP EXIT Survey instrument, which gathered student ratings of the implicit curriculum.

Data collection from earlier years

In the self-study for reaccreditation of the program (submitted to CSWE in August 2012) and the previous four years of this Luther College assessment report (2011-2015) an instrument similar to the FPPAI was used to gather data from both field instructors and students at the end of the students' senior practicum, just before graduation. Like the FPPAI, this instrument, known as the P&Z Field Instructor and P&Z Student (by Petracchi and Zastrow), asked the field instructors to rate students on their performance during practicum using the EPAS competencies and behaviors. In those years, students also rated their own performance using the same instrument. The results from the FPPAI, used in 2016, will be compared to the results from the four earlier years of the P&Z instrument (Petracchi & Zastrow, 2010).

Mechanism to Review Findings and Make Changes

The social work program faculty uses program faculty meetings to develop the assessment plan, discuss and analyze the data, problem-solve the problematic findings and make changes to improve students experience and performance on each practice behavior and competency. Since the program faculty is small, all are involved in all of these discussions whenever possible. Some changes can be made by the program faculty themselves, others require going through college procedures to establish or modify a course, for example. Some changes may require discussions with the Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work Department; the Dean; President; and Board of Regents. Many changes are discussed with students and Advisory Board members as well as other constituencies as described below.

This process is on going. On an as-needed basis, the social work faculty reviews information at its regular meetings from a variety of sources: assessment data; course evaluations; feedback from meetings and conversations with students, field instructors, agency workers, and others; correspondence with alumni; and Social Work Advisory Board meetings. In some cases this on-going review affirms the way things are being done, in other cases changes are made in an on-going process to continually improve the quality of the program. Specific recommendations based on this assessment are discussed following the findings and conclusion below. At a minimum, these reviews are discussed at each Advisory Board meeting (usually one per semester) and at meetings with the Social Work (student) Association to gather input and report on decisions.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Results #1—Foundation Curriculum at Exit (FCAI)—Knowledge Test

Table 4 shows the SWEAP report of results from the FCAI knowledge test taken by 16 graduating social work students in May 2016 at the end of their practicum experience.

Table 4 FCAI Results—Foundation Curriculum @ Exit—2016 N=16

Part I. Luther Program Cumulative Scores Compared with National Student Scores

N = 16	Score Average (out of 100)	Score Range	Standard Deviation	t-test Value	p-value
Luther Program	39.63	24.00 - 51.00	6.38	-0.60	0.50
National Mean	40.59	9-58	7.43		

Part II. Luther College program section (competency) scores compared with national FCAI section scores

Curricular Area (Section/Competency)	Primary Competency	Mean Program Section Score # Q Correct	Mean % students with correct scores	Standard Deviation	Mean National Section Score # Q Correct	t-test value	p-value
Practice	2.1.1	9.00 / 13	69.2	1.58	9.5	-1.26	0.20
HBSE	2.1.7	6.44 / 10	64.4	2.45	6.63	-0.31	0.70
Policy	2.1.8	4.56 / 9	50.7	2.00	4.72	-0.32	0.70
Research	2.1.6	5.63 / 9	62.6	1.41	4.83	2.26	0.02 *
Ethics & Values	2.1.2	4.56 / 8	57.0	0.86	5.45	-4.11	< 0.001 **
Diversity	2.1.4	4.13 / 8	51.6	1.45	4.71	-1.61	0.10
Social & Econ Justice	2.1.5	5.31 / 7	75.9	1.16	4.74	1.98	0.04 *

Notes: * indicates the difference is significant at the $p < .05$ level

** indicates the difference is significant at the $p < .01$ level

Analysis was provided by SWEAP.

Findings—FCAI

As shown in Part I of Table 4, the mean overall score for the 16 students on the FCAI knowledge test was 39.63 out of 100 compared to the national norm of 40.59. The Luther students' scores had a smaller range and standard deviation as might be expected from the smaller sample size. While a little bit lower than the norm, the difference in these means was not statistically significant (p -value = 0.50). This suggests that, as measured by the FCAI, Luther students are learning the basic knowledge they need for social work.

In Part II of Table 4, the FCAI scores are broken down in “sections” by seven of the ten EPAS 2008 competencies: practice, HBSE, policy, research, ethics and values,

diversity, and social and economic justice. In two of these competency curricular areas (research, and social and economic justice), Luther students scored better than the national norms and both of these differences were statistically significant (research: difference is significant at the $p < 0.5$ level [0.02] and social and economic justice: difference is significant at the $p < 0.5$ level [0.04]). So these results indicate that this 2016 cohort of students scored significantly higher than the national FCAI norms on their knowledge of research and on their knowledge of social and economic justice.

Out of the five competency curricular areas where the 2016 Luther students scored below the national FCAI norms (practice, HBSE, policy, ethics, and diversity) only one (ethics) was statistically significant but at the very significant $p < 0.01$ level [< 0.001]). See discussion in the recommendations section.

Three of the competency curricular area means fell below the 60% correct benchmark on the 2016 FCAI knowledge test: policy, ethics, and diversity (means shown in bold in Table 4, Part II, column 4). Although it is not known whether these differences are statistically significant they do suggest that the program might include all three areas (and ethics) in it's review of knowledge being taught. See recommendations below. The full report on the FCAI results in Appendix B (p. 35 XXXX) shows which specific items were most difficult for this cohort.

Results #2—EXIT Survey

The EXIT Survey asked students to assess their preparation for each of the 38 behaviors that operationalize the nine competencies, on a 9-point Likert scale. Each competency was measured by from two to five behaviors. Each student scored his or her preparation for each behavior. The cohort mean was calculated for each behavior. Then the cohort means for the behaviors operationalizing each competency were averaged to get a competency mean for the cohort as a whole. The EPAS competencies and behaviors are shown in Appendix A (p.29 XXXX).

These competency means, based on the 9-point scale, were converted to a 5-point scale so they could be compared more easily to the FPPAI scores, which used a 5-point scale. These calculations are shown in Appendix C (p. 39 XXXX). Table 5 shows the competency means for the Exit Survey. Sixteen out of the 19 students completed the EXIT instrument for a completion rate of 84%. $N=16$ for this instrument.

Table 5 EXIT Survey—Student ratings of their preparation for each competency

Competency	Mean
C1 Ethics	4.62
C2 Diversity	4.57
C3 Human Rights/Justice	4.53
C4 Research	4.44
C5 Policy	4.56
C6 Engage with Clients	4.67
C7 Assess Clients	4.52
C8 Intervene with Clients	4.56
C9 Evaluate Practice	4.54

Findings—EXIT Survey

These results show that students rated their preparation quite well. The small range was 4.44 – 4.67 on a 5 point scale. The lowest score was for the research competency (4.44) and the highest was for engaging with clients (4.67) The highest three means were: engage with clients, ethics, and diversity. The breakdown by behaviors within the research competency shows that students felt better prepared in qualitative methodology than in quantitative. Ethics was the second highest rated competency at 4.62. The others were all within a narrow range of 4.52 – 4.57.

Results #3—Field-Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument @ Exit (FPPAI)—Field Instructors’ Ratings of Student Performance in Practicum

Table 6 below shows the SWEAP report on the cohort means of field instructors’ ratings of student performance during practicum, using the FPPAI, for each competency using the 5-point Likert scale.

Table 6 FPPAI Results—Field Instructors Ratings—2016 N=17

Competency	Average (Mean) Score	# Meeting All Competency benchmarks	# Exceeding All Competency benchmarks
C1 - Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior	4.29 / 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
C2 - Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	4.28 / 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
C3 - Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	4.12 / 5	17 (100%)	12 (71%)
C4 - Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	3.88 / 5	16 (94%)	12 (71%)
C5 - Engage in Policy Practice	3.99 / 5	17 (100%)	12 (71%)
C6 - Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	4.38 / 5	17 (100%)	15 (88%)
C7 - Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	4.12 / 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
C8 - Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	4.04 / 5	17 (100%)	12 (71%)
C9 - Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	3.87 / 5	17 (100%)	11 (65%)

Note: 3 = competent. Analysis by SWEAP

Findings—FPPAI

SWEAP sets the competency benchmark at 3 out of 5 on the Likert scale. The third column shows that all 17 students met the benchmark on all nine competencies with the exception of one student on competency 4, research. The number of students exceeding the benchmark varied from 11 to 15 (65% to 88%) as shown in the last column. On this measure there is considerably more variation although it is not known whether any of these differences are statistically significant, making it problematic to draw any meaningful conclusions. It is noted that the lowest competency on the number exceeding all competency benchmarks (last column) was competency nine, evaluate practice, and the highest competency was engaging with clients. This was also true of the competency means, of course. The highest competency means were engage with clients, ethics, and diversity. The lowest competency means were: research, policy, and evaluating practice. The latter may be related to research.

Comparison of three instruments

With some limitations, it is interesting to compare the results from the three instruments used in this study. The comparability of the FCAI knowledge test to the other two instruments is limited because it used the older 2008 EPAS definitions of the competencies and measured only seven of those ten competencies. However, the 2008 competencies were similar to the 2015 version so some comparisons can be made. The EXIT Survey instrument measured how well prepared students thought they were at graduation on the nine 2015 EPAS competencies. The FPPAI measured how well field instructors thought the students had performed in practicum at the same time—the last semester before graduation. Table 7 shows which competencies were highest and lowest on each of the instruments.

Table 7 Highest and Lowest Scores on Three Instruments

Instrument	Highest competency	Lowest competency
FCAI – Knowledge test	Practice, HBSE, Social and Economic Justice*	Ethics*, Diversity, Policy
EXIT – Student ratings of preparation	Ethics, Diversity, Engage with clients	Research
FPPAI – Field Instructors ratings of student performance	Ethics, Diversity, Engage with clients	Research, Policy, Evaluate Practice

* Statistically significant

Looking at the results in Table 7 one can see the strong agreement between the FCAI (how well prepared students felt) and the FPPAI (how well they performed during practicum) on three key competencies: ethics, diversity, and engaging with clients. These three competencies were scored highest on both instruments. This result suggests that students felt confident and performed well in the areas of ethics and diversity even though those were areas where they scored low on the FCAI knowledge test. The closest the FCAI could come to measuring engagement with clients is the practice competency, which students scored high on, providing some confirmation of the results on the other two instruments. Also, while it wasn't one of the highest among the other Luther College cohort scores, students scored significantly higher than the national norm on research on the FCAI knowledge test.

Low scores were obtained on research on the EXIT Survey (student) and FPPAI (field instructors) as well as evaluating practice—a research-related skill—on the FPPAI. Policy was low on the FPPAI and the FCAI knowledge test. See below for historical comparisons.

Comparison to previous years data

Some tentative comparisons can be drawn between the FPPAI field instructors' ratings and the results from the past four years, which used the P & Z instrument. The P & Z instrument was similar to the FPPAI in that field instructors rated student performance on the competencies and behaviors during the semester-long senior practicum using a 5-point Likert scale. The P & Z was based on the ten competencies in the 2008 EPAS, which were similar to the nine competencies in the 2015 EPAS.

The three lowest competency means on the FPPAI (policy, research, and practice evaluation) were very similar to the two competency means (policy and research) that were below the benchmark over the last four years with the similar P & Z instrument. See Appendix E (p. 64 XXXX) for table of scores for four previous years.) Although the P & Z didn't measure practice evaluation; it could be related to research. Again, it is not known if these differences are statistically significant. As noted in earlier reports policy and research have historically been areas of low student interest and achievement at programs around the country. Based on the FPPAI data, research/evaluation and policy continue to be areas where the program could focus on increasing student performance.

Implicit Curriculum

Implicit Curriculum and EXIT Survey Data

The SWEAP EXIT Survey instrument provided the following data. 87% (14 of the 16) students received financial aid broken down as shown in Table 8.

Table 8 Types of Financial Aid Received N=16

Type of Financial Aid	Count	% of Total
Grant	7	58%
Loan	11	92%
Work	5	42%
Scholarship	3	25%

87% worked during their time in the program. 30% worked 20 or more hours per week. 57% worked 10 hours or less. Only one of these working students was employed in the social work field since these were mostly work-study positions. 62% plan to work after graduation and 73% of these expect to work in the social work field. Three of the graduating students (27%) already had a job and these were all full-time.

64% said the Luther social work program provided preparation for further education that was good or very good. All of them plan on getting their MSW at some point and two said they were planning on doctoral study in social work. Two had already applied and been accepted—both at full-time campus-based MSW programs.

Students were asked on the EXIT Survey to rate their experiences with, or perceptions of, the environment (what CSWE calls the “implicit curriculum”) of the social work program at Luther. Table 9 shows their responses—converted from a 9-point to a 5-point scale.

Implicit Curriculum—Student Ratings

Table 9 Student Ratings of Implicit Curriculum (SW Program Environment)

Students Experiences with or perceptions of:	Score
Learning environment respected all persons	4.72
Program models respect for difference	4.67
Student opportunities to participate in program policy	4.00
Faculty models commitment to advance SW profession	4.56
Opportunities to participate in student organizations	4.56
Quality of advising	4.56

These implicit curriculum (program environment) items all fell above 4.0 on the 5-point scale and all but one fell above 4.50 which speaks well for the environment in the social work program at Luther. The two highest items were: “learning environment respected all persons” (4.72) and the “program models respect for difference,” (4.67) indicating an accepting and supportive environment for diverse students ideas, and practices. The lowest item was, “student opportunities to participate in program policy,”

which was also low on an implicit curriculum assessment in an earlier year. The other three items were all in the middle but with a relatively high score (4.56) indicating these are strengths of the program. It is important that quality of advising was rated highly since program faculty work to make this a priority and it has been an area of college-wide emphasis in recent years.

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from the data presented above.

1. The Luther College cohort of 2016 graduating seniors overall score on the FCAI knowledge test was a little lower than the national norm but this difference was not statistically significant. So Luther students are demonstrating satisfactory knowledge about social work.
2. Among this 2016 cohort the three competencies rated highest on both the EXIT Survey (student ratings of preparation) and the FPPAI (field instructors ratings of students performance) were: ethics, diversity, and engaging with clients. These are all important competencies for social work practice. These results support the effectiveness of the social work program.
3. On the FCAI knowledge test, the three highest scoring competencies were: practice, HBSE, and social and economic justice. The latter was statistically significant. These, also, are key competencies for social work. While not one of the three highest among this cohort on the FCAI, research was significantly higher than the national norm, largely on the strength of a high score on qualitative research methods.
4. There are several points to be noted regarding scores and ratings that were among the three lowest among students in this cohort.
 - *Policy* was rated low on both the FCAI (knowledge) and FPPAI (field instructors) and in the mid range on the EXIT Survey (students) where the range was quite small (4.51 – 4.62). This likely represents a combination of lack of knowledge and skills as well as generally lower levels of interest in policy issues among social work students at Luther and nationwide. Field instructors also generally have less interest in policy and, hence, may not provide as many opportunities for students in this area.
 - *Ethics* scores were low on the FCAI knowledge test but, interestingly, high on both the EXIT Survey and the FPPAI indicating that, while students may lack some knowledge in this area they feel well prepared and they performed well in practicum.
 - *Diversity* was also low on the FCAI but rated highly on the EXIT Survey and FPPAI indicating, again, some possible deficiencies in knowledge but good scores on preparation and on-the-job performance.
 - *Research* was low on the EXIT Survey and FPPAI, with a wide range on the EXIT Survey (4.17 – 4.83) where the lowest behaviors were research theory and quantitative methods, while the highest was qualitative methods. As with policy, research has traditionally been an area of low student interest and less active work by field instructors nationwide.
5. These findings of relatively lower performance on the policy and research competencies were also found in the four previous years assessment reports

(Appendix E, p. 64 XXXX) indicating that this is an ongoing area where students struggle and the program can continue to work to enhance preparation.

6. Student ratings on the “implicit curriculum” (program environment) were generally high with the highest being “respect for difference” and “modeling respect” indicating students see the program as accepting and supportive of diversity. The lowest rating on this measure was “student opportunities to participate in program policy,” which is an area for improvement.

Recommendations

1. The program can review ways to strengthen students’ knowledge, skills, and interest levels in the policy area through revisions in the two policy courses. This may also include working with field instructors to encourage them to involve practicum students in policy-related activities, even if this means starting new policy projects in the agency.
2. The curriculum can be reviewed to identify courses where ethics knowledge can be enhanced to match the high levels of performance and student preparation for the ethics competency.
3. The program can work to strengthen students’ research skills and interest in research so that students feel better prepared and can also perform better on research tasks. Like policy, this may also involve working with field instructors to enhance their knowledge, skills, and interest in research so they can be more comfortable creating opportunities for students to do research during practicum placements.
4. Since students don’t feel like they have enough opportunities to be involved in program policy-making the program can consider ways to create more such opportunities. Examples are: more frequent meetings of the Advisory Board that includes students and program director or faculty meetings with the Social Work Association (SWA) to discuss program policy issues. Both of these happened more during the period the program was working on the last reaccreditation when there were more topics to discuss. These annual assessment reports have been discussed with SWA and the Advisory Board in the past and can be again.

References

- CSWE, (2015). 2015 Educational policy and accreditation standards.
- Krase, K. (2016). SWEAP psychometric data, personal communication via email 6/13/16.
- Palmer, P.J. (2014). *Healing the heart of democracy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Petracchi, H.E. & Zastrow, C. (2010). Suggestions for Utilizing 2008 EPAS in CSWE Accredited Social Work Baccalaureate and Masters Curriculum: Reflections from the Field. Part One–The Explicit Curriculum. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, Vol. 30 (2).

Appendices
Table of Contents

	Page
A. CSWE Competencies and Behaviors (EPAS 2015)	29
B. FCAI (knowledge test) Results Report	35
C. EXIT Survey (student ratings) Results	39
D. FPPAI (field instructors ratings) Results	59
E. 2011-2015 Assessment Results	64

Copies of the three instruments follow these appendices in the hard copy version only.

Appendix A — Educational Policy Accreditation Standards (EPAS) 2015

Competency-Based Education

In 2008 CSWE adopted a competency-based education framework for its EPAS. As in related health and human service professions, the policy moved from a model of curriculum design focused on content (what students should be taught) and structure (the format and organization of educational components) to one focused on student learning outcomes. A competency-based approach refers to identifying and assessing what students demonstrate in practice. In social work this approach involves assessing students' ability to demonstrate the competencies identified in the educational policy.

Competency-based education rests upon a shared view of the nature of competence in professional practice. Social work competence is the ability to integrate and apply social work knowledge, values, and skills to practice situations in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner to promote human and community well-being. EPAS recognizes a holistic view of competence; that is, the demonstration of competence is informed by knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes that include the social worker's critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment in regard to unique practice situations. Overall professional competence is multi-dimensional and composed of interrelated competencies. An individual social worker's competence is seen as developmental and dynamic, changing over time in relation to continuous learning.

Competency-based education is an outcomes-oriented approach to curriculum design. The goal of the outcomes approach is to ensure that students are able to demonstrate the integration and application of the competencies in practice. In EPAS, social work practice competence consists of nine interrelated competencies and component behaviors that are comprised of knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes.

Using a curriculum design that begins with the outcomes, expressed as the expected competencies, programs develop the substantive content, pedagogical approach, and educational activities that provide learning opportunities for students to demonstrate the competencies.

Assessment of student learning outcomes is an essential component of competency-based education. Assessment provides evidence that students have demonstrated the level of competence necessary to enter professional practice, which in turn shows programs are successful in achieving their goals. Assessment information is used to improve the educational program and the methods used to assess student learning outcomes.

Programs assess students' demonstration of competence. The assessment methods used by programs gather data that serve as evidence of student learning outcomes and the demonstration of competence. Understanding social work practice is complex and multi-dimensional, the assessment methods used by programs and the data collected may vary by context.

Social work competence is the ability to integrate and apply social work knowledge, values, and skills to practice situations in a purposeful, intentional, and professional manner to promote human and community well-being.

2015 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards

Social Work Competencies

The nine Social Work Competencies are listed below. Programs may add competencies that are consistent with their mission and goals and respond to their context. Each competency describes the knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes that comprise the competency at the generalist level of practice, followed by a set of behaviors that integrate these components. These behaviors represent observable components of the competencies, while the preceding statements represent the underlying content and processes that inform the behaviors.

Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior

Social workers understand the value base of the profession and its ethical standards, as well as relevant laws and regulations that may impact practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Social workers understand frameworks of ethical decision-making and how to apply principles of critical thinking to those frameworks in practice, research, and policy arenas. Social workers recognize personal values and the distinction between personal and professional values. They also understand how their personal experiences and affective reactions influence their professional judgment and behavior. Social workers understand the profession's history, its mission, and the roles and responsibilities of the profession. Social Workers also understand the role of other professions when engaged in inter-professional teams. Social workers recognize the importance of life-long learning and are committed to continually updating their skills to ensure they are relevant and effective. Social workers also understand emerging forms of technology and the ethical use of technology in social work practice.

Social workers:

- make ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context;
- use reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations;
- demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication;
- use technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes; and
- use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior.

Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice

Social workers understand how diversity and difference characterize and shape the human experience and are critical to the formation of identity. The dimensions of diversity are understood as the intersectionality of multiple factors including but not limited to age, class,

color, culture, disability and ability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, marital status, political ideology, race, religion/spirituality, sex, sexual orientation, and tribal sovereign status. Social workers understand that, as a consequence of difference, a person's life experiences may include oppression, poverty, marginalization, and alienation as well as privilege, power, and acclaim. Social workers also understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination and recognize the extent to which a culture's structures and values, including social, economic, political, and cultural exclusions, may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create privilege and power.

Social workers:

- apply and communicate understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels;
- present themselves as learners and engage clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences; and
- apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies.

Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice

Social workers understand that every person regardless of position in society has fundamental human rights such as freedom, safety, privacy, an adequate standard of living, health care, and education. Social workers understand the global interconnections of oppression and human rights violations, and are knowledgeable about theories of human need and social justice and strategies to promote social and economic justice and human rights. Social workers understand strategies designed to eliminate oppressive structural barriers to ensure that social goods, rights, and responsibilities are distributed equitably and that civil, political, environmental, economic, social, and cultural human rights are protected.

Social workers:

- apply their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels; and
- engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice.

Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice

Social workers understand quantitative and qualitative research methods and their respective roles in advancing a science of social work and in evaluating their practice. Social workers know the principles of logic, scientific inquiry, and culturally informed and ethical approaches to building knowledge. Social workers understand that evidence that informs practice derives from multi-disciplinary sources and multiple ways of knowing. They also understand the processes for translating research findings into effective practice.

Social workers:

- use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research;
- apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative and qualitative research methods and research findings; and
- use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery.

Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice

Social workers understand that human rights and social justice, as well as social welfare and services, are mediated by policy and its implementation at the federal, state, and local levels. Social workers understand the history and current structures of social policies and services, the role of policy in service delivery, and the role of practice in policy development. Social workers understand their role in policy development and implementation within their practice settings at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels and they actively engage in policy practice to effect change within those settings. Social workers recognize and understand the historical, social, cultural, economic, organizational, environmental, and global influences that affect social policy. They are also knowledgeable about policy formulation, analysis, implementation, and evaluation.

Social workers:

- Identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services;
- assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services;
- apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.

Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Social workers understand that engagement is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers value the importance of human relationships. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge to facilitate engagement with clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand strategies to engage diverse clients and constituencies to advance practice effectiveness.

Social workers understand how their personal experiences and affective reactions may impact their ability to effectively engage with diverse clients and constituencies. Social workers value principles of relationship-building and inter-professional collaboration to facilitate engagement with clients, constituencies, and other professionals as appropriate.

Social workers:

- apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies; and
- use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies.

Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Social workers understand that assessment is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge in the assessment of diverse clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand methods of assessment with diverse clients and

constituencies to advance practice effectiveness. Social workers recognize the implications of the larger practice context in the assessment process and value the importance of inter-professional collaboration in this process. Social workers understand how their personal experiences and affective reactions may affect their assessment and decision-making.

Social workers:

- collect and organize data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies;
- apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies;
- develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies; and
- select appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies.

Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Social workers understand that intervention is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers are knowledgeable about evidence-informed interventions to achieve the goals of clients and constituencies, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge to effectively intervene with clients and constituencies. Social workers understand methods of identifying, analyzing and implementing evidence-informed interventions to achieve client and constituency goals. Social workers value the importance of interprofessional teamwork and communication in interventions, recognizing that beneficial outcomes may require interdisciplinary, interprofessional, and inter-organizational collaboration.

Social workers:

- critically choose and implement interventions to achieve practice goals and enhance capacities of clients and constituencies;
- apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies;
- use inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to achieve beneficial practice outcomes;
- negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies; and
- facilitate effective transitions and endings that advance mutually agreed-on goals.

Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Social workers understand that evaluation is an ongoing component of the dynamic and interactive process of social work practice with, and on behalf of, diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities. Social workers recognize the importance of evaluating processes and outcomes to advance practice, policy, and service delivery effectiveness. Social

workers understand theories of human behavior and the social environment, and critically evaluate and apply this knowledge in evaluating outcomes. Social workers understand qualitative and quantitative methods for evaluating outcomes and practice effectiveness.

Social workers:

- select and use appropriate methods for evaluation of outcomes;
- apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes;
- critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate intervention and program processes and outcomes; and
- apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.

Competencies

- 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior
 - 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice
 - 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice
 - 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice
 - 5: Engage in Policy Practice Competency
 - 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
 - 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
 - 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
 - 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
- (CSWE 2015, p. 6-9)

APPENDIX B

FCAI (knowledge test) Results Report MAY 2016 N=16

FX - Foundation Curriculum @ Exit

reports no longer include suggested EPAS practice behaviors. Programs may choose to assign relevant practice behaviors at their own discretion.

LUIA - Luther College, Cohort date of :MAY16, N=16

I. Program Cumulative Scores Compared with all Student Scores

N = 16	Score Average (out of 100)	Score Range	Standard Deviation	t-test Value	p-value
Program	39.63	24.00 - 51.00	6.38	-0.60	0.50
National	40.59	9-58	7.43		

II. Program section scores compared with all FCAI section scores

Curricular Area	Primary Competency	Mean Program Section Score # Q Correct	Standard Deviation	Mean National Section Score # Q Correct	t-test value	p-value
Practice	2.1.1 2.1.10 A-D	9.00 / 13	1.58	9.5	-1.26	0.20
HBSE	2.1.7	6.44 / 10	2.45	6.63	-0.31	0.70
Policy	2.1.8	4.56 / 9	2.00	4.72	-0.32	0.70
Research	2.1.6	5.63 / 9	1.41	4.83	2.26	0.02 *
Ethics & Values	2.1.2	4.56 / 8	0.86	5.45	-4.11	< 0.001 **
Diversity	2.1.4	4.13 / 8	1.45	4.71	-1.61	0.10
Social & Econ Justice	2.1.5	5.31 / 7	1.16	4.74	1.98	0.04 *

Note: * indicates the difference is significant at the p<.05 level

III. Program: BSW Student Scores by Individual Curricular Area

Practice

Curricular Area Question	Cumulative Correct	Mean
01.A (An) _____ links clients with needed resources.	0/16	0.00
02.Macro practice targets which of the following tasks:	9/16	56.25
03.Which of the following is (are) (a) method(s) of conducting a community needs assessment?	13/16	81.25
04.A (An) _____ is a fiscal agreement between an agency with funds and another agency that can provide needed services.	7/16	43.75
05.Listening empathetically means... V9	12/16	75.00
06.Determining progress toward goal achievement is one facet of the _____ stage.	5/16	31.25
07.Which of the following is an example of informal resources? V9	15/16	93.75

08.In social work practice, partialization refers to:	11/16	68.75
09.Policies, practices, or procedures that systematically exclude people on the basis of race or ethnicity with the intentional or unintentional support of the entire culture is called:	15/16	93.75
10.In case management, monitoring:	14/16	87.50
11.Effective work skills, the ability to get along with others, and support of one`s family are examples of:	15/16	93.75
12.Which of the following techniques are common to advocacy?	15/16	93.75
13.The process by which social workers respect and effectively practice with people of different cultures, religions, classes, and ethnic background is an example of?	13/16	81.25

HBSE

Curricular Area Question	Cumulative Correct	Mean
14.Police departments and laws are instruments of:	13/16	81.25
15.Battered women often stay in their homes because of:	13/16	81.25
16.Acting on one`s prejudice toward an individual based upon a characteristic such as gender or sexual orientation is an example of :	10/16	62.50
17.Believing that social work practice is conducted at the interface between people and their environments is associated with which perspective?	7/16	43.75
18.Modification of one`s language, identity, behavior patterns, and preferences to those of the host/majority society is called:	2/16	12.50
19.The concept "person-in-environment" includes which of the following:	13/16	81.25
20.During pregnancy, which of the following is a preventable cause of mental retardation?	10/16	62.50
21.Physical punishment of a child as a means of reducing aggressive behavior has been shown to be:	15/16	93.75
22.Carol Gilligan`s disagreement with Kohlberg`s moral development theories is based on the fact that:	8/16	50.00
23.Social learning theory places an emphasis on which of the following:	12/16	75.00

Policy

Curricular Area Question	Cumulative Correct	Mean
24.The Elizabethan Poor Law is important for understanding social welfare in the US because:	7/16	43.75
25.According to the Elizabethan Poor Law, the unworthy poor were those who:	7/16	43.75
26.The enactment of the Personal Responsibilities and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (TANF) resulted in:	6/16	37.50
27.In a capitalistic economic system one of the purposes of social welfare is to:	1/16	6.25
28.In the current American political context, conservatives generally:	13/16	81.25
29.The principle of "social insurance" is best defined as:	8/16	50.00
30.The major social welfare program to emerge from the New Deal was:	14/16	87.50
31.The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) is considered by policy analysts to be:	3/16	18.75
32.In which category (ies) does the U.S. fall below other developed nations?	14/16	87.50

Research

Curricular Area Question	Cumulative Correct	Mean
33.The requirements for a "classical experimental" design include:	10/16	62.50
34.Which of the following represents a well-known single subject design?	13/16	81.25

35.Using random sampling (based upon probability theory)...	15/16	93.75
36.Which of the following is not a level of measurement?	7/16	43.75
37.Using subjects that are available, such as students in a classroom or patients in a wing of a nursing home, without random selection, illustrates which of the following approaches to sampling?	7/16	43.75
38.Which of the following can survey research not establish?	11/16	68.75
39.Which of the following is a longitudinal design?	13/16	81.25
40.Which of the following sampling strategies increases the opportunity for making sure all groups of interest in the population are represented in the sample?	6/16	37.50
41.A valid measure of a variable (is)....	8/16	50.00

Ethics/Values

Curricular Area Question	Cumulative Correct	Mean
42.Making clients aware of their choices is inherent in which social work ethical obligation?	11/16	68.75
43.The NASW Code of Ethics allows social workers to have sexual contact with post termination clients after what period of time has passed?	9/16	56.25
44.Janna`s social worker, Ed, is moving to a new agency and asks her if she would like to continue to see him after the move. According to the NASW code of Ethics, Ed`s offer could be considered:	8/16	50.00
45.The NASW Code of Ethics offers a set of values, principles and standards related to all but one of the following : V9	8/16	50.00
46.A social work student beginning her internship is told by her supervisor to not tell clients that she is a student since this might undermine their confidence in her. According to the Code of Ethics, withholding this information could:	14/16	87.50
47.When a social worker`s colleague is displaying incompetence in service to his clients, the social worker should discuss this matter first with the:	8/16	50.00
48.What is the difference between privileged communication and confidentiality?	0/16	0.00
49.A social worker offers her unemployed client a job cleaning the worker`s home. This is an example of a:	15/16	93.75

Diversity

Curricular Area Question	Cumulative Correct	Mean
50.A group of social work students have arranged to visit a local mosque to gain a greater understanding of Ramadan. In preparing for the visit one of the most important rules of etiquette should be: V9	9/16	56.25
51.Police reports in a community indicate that African Americans are the most frequently arrested group for crimes such as drug abuse, petty theft, and similar minor offenses. These reports may indicate which of the following?	13/16	81.25
52.Terms like: police officers, postal workers, spokesperson, and chairperson are examples of:	10/16	62.50
53.A social worker is meeting with a Hispanic family and notes that the father appears rather aloof and disinterested in his children`s difficulty in school. The social worker decides that this family would benefit from family counseling because of the father`s lack of concern about his family`s welfare. Another likely explanation for the father`s actions is:	7/16	43.75
54.A recent refugee from Africa displays anxiety and fear toward the social worker assigned to help him learn to cope in his new home community. The social worker wonders whether the client might be better served by another colleague and questions his own ability to work with the client. The worker`s supervisor suggests another reason the client may be reluctant to engage with the social worker. Which of the following explanations might be most relevant to the case?	7/16	43.75
55.A group of social work students are discussing a diversity assignment for human behavior and social environment. Mike states that it is racial differences due to biology that account for most of the problems that African Americans experience in society. Pat argues that there is no such thing	9/16	56.25

as race and that most differences among people are due to other factors such as socioeconomic status, cultural variables, and power struggles. Which of the two perspectives is more current?		
56.Which of the following statements is not accurate regarding women?	8/16	50.00
57.The best current knowledge about homosexual orientation is that it:	3/16	18.75

S & E Justice

Curricular Area Question	Cumulative Correct	Mean
58.A belief that those with the greatest wealth have an obligation to help provide for those with the least is part of which perspective?	9/16	56.25
59.Benefits that accrue to members of the dominant U.S. culture because of their skin color are referred to as:	15/16	93.75
60.Which of the following is false:	15/16	93.75
61.Social activism and other social change efforts are often resisted by:	14/16	87.50
62.Which of the following is true in America in the 21st century?	9/16	56.25
63.Which explanation of poverty is the most consistent with a social justice perspective?	11/16	68.75
64.Which of the following is not evidence of a social justice deficiency in the American political-economic system? V9	12/16	75.00

APPENDIX C

EXIT Survey (student ratings) Results May 2016 N=16

LUIA - Luther College EX - Exit Survey, Cohort date of :MAY16

Section A : Current Educational Experience

EX2 In what year did you enter this social work program?		
Answer	Count	%Total
1	1	6.25%
4	1	6.25%
2012	4	25%
2013	5	31.25%
2014	4	25%
2015	1	6.25%
Total:	16	

EX3: What type of program is it?		
Answer	Count	%Total
BSW	16	100%
MSW	0	0%
Total:	16	

EX2: Which of the following best describes the format of this program:		
Answer	Count	%Total
Entirely Campus-based	16	100%
Hybrid / Blended	0	0%
Entirely Online	0	0%
Total:	16	

EX2: Did you receive financial aid during while in this program?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Yes	14	87.5%
No (skip to section B)	2	12.5%
Total:	16	

EX3: Federal Funds:		
Answer	Count	%Total
Grant	7	58.33%
Loan	11	91.67%
Work	5	41.67%
Scholarship	3	25%
Total # of Forms with Responses	12	
Total # of N/A (Due to skip logic)	2	

EX3:		
Answer	Count	%Total
Grant	1	12.5%
Loan	5	62.5%
Work	1	12.5%
Scholarship	4	50%
Total # of Forms with Responses	8	
Total # of N/A (Due to skip logic)	2	

EX3: State Funds:		
Answer	Count	%Total
Grant	3	42.86%
Loan	4	57.14%
Work	1	14.29%
Scholarship	0	0%
Total # of Forms with Responses	7	
Total # of N/A (Due to skip logic)	2	

EX3: College / University Funds:		
Answer	Count	%Total
Grant	6	42.86%
Loan	3	21.43%
Work	8	57.14%
Scholarship	12	85.71%
Total # of Forms with Responses	14	
Total # of N/A (Due to skip logic)	2	

Section B : Employment During Your Current/Just Completed Program

EX2: Did you work at a paying job while enrolled in your social work program?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Yes	14	87.5%
No (skip to section C)	2	12.5%
Total:	16	

EX2: How many hours per week did you average?		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	4	28.57%
10	4	28.57%
15	2	14.29%
20	3	21.43%
25	1	7.14%
Total:	14	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	2	

EX3: Were you employed for pay in the social work field while enrolled in your program?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Yes	1	7.14%
No	13	92.86%
Total:	14	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	2	

Section C : Employment Upon Graduation

EX3: Are you planning to work for pay upon graduation from your current/just completed social work program?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Yes	10	62.5%
No (skip to section D)	5	31.25%
Unsure	1	6.25%
Total:	16	

EX2: Are you planning to work in: (Please mark one answer only)		
Answer	Count	%Total
The field of Social Work	8	72.73%
Not in the field of Social Work	2	18.18%
I do not know yet	1	9.09%
Total:	11	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	5	

EX3: Have you already secured paid employment after graduation?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Yes	3	27.27%
No (Skip to Section D)	8	72.73%
Total:	11	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	5	

EX3: Is this secured paid position:		
Answer	Count	%Total
Full-time	3	100%
Part-time	0	0%
Total:	3	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	13	

EX2: What are the educational requirements for this position?		
Answer	Count	%Total
None specified	0	0%
Associate of Arts (AA)	0	0%
Bachelors degree (other than social work)	2	66.67%
BWithBA in Social Work	0	0%
Masters degree (other than social work)	0	0%
MSW	0	0%
Other	1	33.33%
Total:	3	

* not applicable (due to skip logic)	13	
--------------------------------------	----	--

EX2: Which of the following most accurately describes the location of this position?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Urban (50,000 or more population)	2	66.67%
Rural (2,500 or less population)	1	33.33%
Suburban (Between 2,501 and 49,499 population)	0	0%
Total:	3	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	13	

EX2: What is/will be your approximate annual income from this position?		
Answer	Count	%Total
0	1	33.33%
13	1	33.33%
34000	1	33.33%
Total:	3	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	13	

EX2: What is the type of organization where you are/will be employed? (Mark only one)		
Answer	Count	%Total
Private, for profit	0	0%
Private, not for profit, religiously affiliated	0	0%
Private, not for profit, not religiously affiliated	2	66.67%
Public, federal government or military	0	0%
Public, federal government, non-military	1	33.33%
Public, state government	0	0%
Public, country, municipal or town government	0	0%
Tribal government	0	0%
Total:	3	

* not applicable (due to skip logic)	13	
--------------------------------------	----	--

EX2: Is this position in the field of social work?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Yes	2	66.67%
No (Skip to section D)	1	33.33%
Total:	3	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	13	

EX2: What is your primary function in this social work position. (Check one) :		
Answer	Count	%Total
Administration / Management	0	0%
Supervision	0	0%
Practice with Communities	0	0%
Policy Analysis / Practice	0	0%
Practice with Families	0	0%
Practice with Individuals	2	100%
Practice with Groups	0	0%
Practice with Organizations	0	0%
Research and Evaluation	0	0%
Teaching / Training	0	0%
Total # of Forms with Responses	2	
Total # of N/A (Due to skip logic)	14	

EX2: Select one (1) field of practice which most directly applies to this social work position :		
Answer	Count	%Total
Aging / Gerontological Social Work / Adult Protective Services	0	0%
Alcohol, Drug or Substance Abuse	0	0%
Child Welfare / Child Protective Services	0	0%
Community Practice	0	0%
Correctional / Criminal Justice	0	0%
Crisis Intervention / Information and Referral	0	0%

Education / Training	0	0%
Employment Services	0	0%
Family Service	0	0%
Health / Medical Care	0	0%
Homelessness	0	0%
Housing	0	0%
Income Maintenance	0	0%
Mental / Behavioral Health or Community Mental Health	0	0%
Mental Retardation / Developmental Disabilities	2	100%
Rehabilitation	0	0%
School Social Work	0	0%
Violence / Victim Services	0	0%
Youth Services	0	0%
Military	0	0%
Total:	2	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	14	

Section D: Post-Graduation Educational Plans

EX2_BSWPREPEDU: Using the scale below, assess how well your current social work program prepared you for further education?		
Answer	Count	%Total
1 Very Poor	0	0%
2 Poor / Very Poor	0	0%
3 Poor	0	0%
4 Adequate / Poor	0	0%
5 Adequate	2	14.29%
6 Adequate / Good	3	21.43%
7 Good	2	14.29%
8 Good / Very Good	6	42.86%
9 Very Good.	1	7.14%
Total:	14	
* missing	2	

EX2: Do you plan on furthering your education at some point in time after completing your current social work program?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Yes	16	100%
No (skip to Section E)	0	0%

I do not know (skip to Section E)	0	0%
Total:	16	

EX2: Which of the following degrees do you anticipate pursuing (mark all that apply)? :		
Answer	Count	%Total
Additional Bachelor's Degree	0	0%
Doctorate in Social Work	2	12.5%
MSW or MSW Advanced Standing	16	100%
None of the Above	0	0%
Other Doctorate	0	0%
Other Master's Degree	2	12.5%
Total # of Forms with Responses	16	

EX3: Have you submitted an application to a degree program to further your education?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Yes	2	12.5%
No (skip to Section E).	14	87.5%
Total:	16	

EX3: How do you plan to enroll in the degree program for which you have applied?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Part-time	0	0%
Full-time	2	100%
Total:	2	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	14	

EX3: Have you been accepted into a degree program for which you have applied ?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Yes	2	100%
No (skip to Section E).	0	0%

Total:	2	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	14	

EX3: Is the program you will attend		
Answer	Count	%Total
Entirely Campus-based	2	100%
Hybrid / Blended	0	0%
Entirely Online	0	0%
Total:	2	
* not applicable (due to skip logic)	14	

Section E: Evaluation of Social Work Preparation

EX4_EPAS15_E1:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	3	18.75%
8	6	37.5%
9	7	43.75%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E2:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	1	6.25%
8	6	37.5%
9	9	56.25%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E3:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	3	18.75%
8	6	37.5%
9	7	43.75%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E4:		
Answer	Count	%Total
4	1	6.25%
7	3	18.75%
8	5	31.25%

9	7	43.75%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E5:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	2	12.5%
8	3	18.75%
9	11	68.75%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E6:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	5	31.25%
8	4	25%
9	7	43.75%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E7:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	3	18.75%
8	6	37.5%
9	7	43.75%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E8:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	2	12.5%
8	5	31.25%
9	9	56.25%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E9:		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	2	13.33%
7	2	13.33%
8	4	26.67%
9	7	46.67%
Total:	15	
* missing	1	

EX4_EPAS15_E10:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	2	12.5%
8	8	50%
9	6	37.5%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E11:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	4	25%
8	7	43.75%
9	5	31.25%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E12:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	4	25%
8	6	37.5%
9	6	37.5%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E13:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	4	25%
8	5	31.25%
9	7	43.75%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E14:		
Answer	Count	%Total
5	2	12.5%
6	2	12.5%
7	4	25%
8	2	12.5%
9	6	37.5%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E15:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	8	50%
9	8	50%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E16:		
Answer	Count	%Total
5	1	6.25%
6	1	6.25%
7	5	31.25%
8	4	25%
9	5	31.25%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E17:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	4	25%
8	6	37.5%
9	6	37.5%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E18:		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	1	6.25%
7	3	18.75%
8	6	37.5%
9	6	37.5%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E19:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	3	18.75%
8	5	31.25%
9	8	50%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E20:		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	1	6.25%
7	3	18.75%
8	4	25%
9	8	50%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E21:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	2	12.5%
8	8	50%
9	6	37.5%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E22:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	3	18.75%
8	8	50%
9	5	31.25%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E23:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	3	18.75%
8	7	43.75%
9	6	37.5%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E24:		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	1	6.25%
7	1	6.25%
8	6	37.5%
9	8	50%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E25:		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	1	6.25%
8	5	31.25%
9	10	62.5%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E26:		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	2	12.5%
7	2	12.5%
8	4	25%
9	8	50%

Total:	16	
---------------	-----------	--

EX4_EPAS15_E27:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	4	25%
8	6	37.5%
9	6	37.5%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E28:		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	1	6.25%
7	2	12.5%
8	4	25%
9	9	56.25%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E29:		
Answer	Count	%Total
5	1	6.25%
6	1	6.25%
7	2	12.5%
8	5	31.25%
9	7	43.75%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E30:		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	2	12.5%
7	1	6.25%
8	4	25%
9	9	56.25%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E31:		
Answer	Count	%Total
5	1	6.25%
7	2	12.5%
8	5	31.25%
9	8	50%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E32:		
Answer	Count	%Total
7	3	18.75%
8	4	25%
9	9	56.25%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E33:		
Answer	Count	%Total
5	1	6.25%
6	2	12.5%
7	2	12.5%
8	3	18.75%
9	8	50%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E34:		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	1	6.25%
7	2	12.5%
8	4	25%
9	9	56.25%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E35:		
Answer	Count	%Total
5	2	12.5%
6	1	6.25%
7	2	12.5%
8	4	25%
9	7	43.75%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E36:		
Answer	Count	%Total
5	1	6.67%
7	4	26.67%
8	5	33.33%
9	5	33.33%
Total:	15	
* missing	1	

EX4_EPAS15_E37:		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	1	6.25%
7	4	25%
8	5	31.25%
9	6	37.5%
Total:	16	

EX4_EPAS15_E38:		
Answer	Count	%Total
6	2	12.5%
7	4	25%
8	4	25%
9	6	37.5%
Total:	16	

Section F : Educational Program Experience (Implicit Curriculum)

EX3: The social work program provided a learning environment that respected all persons.		
Answer	Count	%Total
1 Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2 Disagree / Strongly Disagree	0	0%
3 Disagree	0	0%
4 Neutral / Disagree	0	0%
5 Neutral	0	0%
6 Neutral / Agree	1	6.25%
7 Agree	2	12.5%
8 Agree / Strongly Agree	1	6.25%
9 Strongly Agree	12	75%
Total:	16	

EX3: The social work program models respect for difference.		
Answer	Count	%Total
1 Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2 Disagree / Strongly Disagree	0	0%
3 Disagree	0	0%
4 Neutral / Disagree	0	0%
5 Neutral	0	0%
6 Neutral / Agree	0	0%

7 Agree	3	20%
8 Agree / Strongly Agree	3	20%
9 Strongly Agree	9	60%
Total:	15	
* missing	1	

EX3: The social work program provides students with opportunities to participate in program policy decisions.		
Answer	Count	%Total
1 Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2 Disagree / Strongly Disagree	0	0%
3 Disagree	2	12.5%
4 Neutral / Disagree	1	6.25%
5 Neutral	0	0%
6 Neutral / Agree	0	0%
7 Agree	6	37.5%
8 Agree / Strongly Agree	0	0%
9 Strongly Agree	7	43.75%
Total:	16	

EX3: The faculty of the social work program models commitment to the advancement of the social work profession.		
Answer	Count	%Total
1 Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2 Disagree / Strongly Disagree	0	0%
3 Disagree	0	0%
4 Neutral / Disagree	0	0%
5 Neutral	0	0%
6 Neutral / Agree	0	0%
7 Agree	4	25%
8 Agree / Strongly Agree	4	25%
9 Strongly Agree	8	50%
Total:	16	

EX3: The social work program provides opportunities to participate in student organizations.		
Answer	Count	%Total
1 Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2 Disagree / Strongly Disagree	0	0%

3 Disagree	0	0%
4 Neutral / Disagree	1	6.25%
5 Neutral	0	0%
6 Neutral / Agree	0	0%
7 Agree	2	12.5%
8 Agree / Strongly Agree	3	18.75%
9 Strongly Agree	10	62.5%
Total:	16	

EX3: Please rate the quality of advising you received during your social work program.		
Answer	Count	%Total
1 Very Poor	0	0%
2 Very poor / Poor	0	0%
3 Poor	0	0%
4 Poor / Adequate	0	0%
5 Adequate	1	6.25%
6 Adequate / Good	0	0%
7 Good	3	18.75%
8 Good / Very Good	3	18.75%
9 Very Good.	9	56.25%
Total:	16	

EX3: What topics did you discuss with an advisor over the course of this program? (Mark all that apply) :		
Answer	Count	%Total
Course selection	16	100%
Planning for employment	8	50%
Planning for further education	11	68.75%
Total # of Forms with Responses	16	

Section G: Demographics

EX2: What is your sex/gender?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Female	12	75%
Male	3	18.75%
Other	1	6.25%
Total:	16	

EX2: Are you a citizen of the United States?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Yes	15	93.75%
No	1	6.25%
Total:	16	

EX2: Mark all conditions, impairments or disabilities that apply to you:		
Answer	Count	%Total
Chronic Medical Condition	0	0%
Deaf	0	0%
Hard of hearing	0	0%
Learning Disability (ADD, ADHD, Spatial, LD, NLD)	1	25%
Mental Health Condition	2	50%
Motor / Mobility Impairment	0	0%
Other Impairment / Disabling Condition	0	0%
Physical Impairment	0	0%
Speech Impairment	0	0%
Visual and/or Print Impairment	0	0%
Total # of Forms with Responses	4	

EX3: Did you have an educational accommodation plan to assist you during your current/just completed social work program due to a condition, impairment or disability?		
Answer	Count	%Total
Yes	0	0%
No	0	0%
Total:	0	
* missing	16	

EX2: With which of the following do you identify? (Mark all that apply) :		
Answer	Count	%Total
Black, African American, or Negro	2	12.5%
Other Asian - (i.e. Hmong,	1	6.25%

Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, etc.):		
White	12	75%
Hispanic / Latino/a Origin	0	0%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0%
Other Race	0	0%
Chinese	0	0%
Asian Indian	0	0%
Japanese	0	0%
Korean	0	0%
Filipino	0	0%
Vietnamese	1	6.25%
Guamanian or Chamorro	0	0%
Native Hawaiian	0	0%
Other Pacific Islander (Fijian, Tongan, etc.):	1	6.25%
Samoan	0	0%
Total # of Forms with Responses	16	

APPENDIX D

FPPAI (field instructors ratings of student performance) Results May 2016 N=17

LUIA - Luther College FP - Field-Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument @ Exit, Cohort date of :MAY16

Table 1: Education Demographics of Field Placement Supervisors (n=17)

BA or BS in Human Services field	6
BA or BS in Social Work	9
BS	1
MA in Liberal Arts field	1
MA in Human Services field	2
MSW or MA/MS in Social Work	1
PhD or DSW in Social Work	1
Other	1

2.1.1 - Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior

Competency	Average Score	# Meeting Competency	# Exceeding Competency
Intern makes ethical decisions by applying professional standards (i.e. the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics) as appropriate to context	4.18/ 5	17 (100%)	14 (82%)
Intern uses reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations	4.29/ 5	17 (100%)	14 (82%)
Intern demonstrates professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, oral communication, written communication, electronic communication	4.31/ 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
Intern uses technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes	4.44/ 5	17 (100%)	17 (100%)
Intern uses supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior	4.24/ 5	17 (100%)	14 (82%)
Total Section Score	4.29 / 5	n/a	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Meeting All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	17 (100%)	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Exceeding All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	n/a	13 (76%)

2.1.2 - Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice

Competency	Average Score	# Meeting Competency	# Exceeding Competency
Intern applies and communicates understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, macro level	4.06/ 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
Intern presents themselves as learners to clients and constituencies	4.47/ 5	17 (100%)	17 (100%)

Intern engages clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences	4.29/ 5	17 (100%)	16 (94%)
Intern applies self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies	4.29/ 5	17 (100%)	16 (94%)
Total Section Score	4.28 / 5	n/a	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Meeting All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	17 (100%)	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Exceeding All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	n/a	13 (76%)

2.1.3 - Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice

Competency	Average Score	# Meeting Competency	# Exceeding Competency
Intern applies their understanding of social justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels	4.24/ 5	17 (100%)	15 (88%)
Intern applies their understanding of economic justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels	4.18/ 5	17 (100%)	14 (82%)
Intern applies their understanding of environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels	4.00/ 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
Intern engages in practices that advances social, economic, environmental justice	4.07/ 5	17 (100%)	14 (82%)
Total Section Score	4.12 / 5	n/a	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Meeting All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	17 (100%)	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Exceeding All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	n/a	12 (71%)

2.1.4 - Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice

Competency	Average Score	# Meeting Competency	# Exceeding Competency
Intern uses theory to inform scientific inquiry and research	3.67/ 5	16 (94%)	12 (71%)
Intern uses practice experience to inform scientific inquiry and research	3.75/ 5	16 (94%)	13 (76%)
Intern applies critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative research methods and research findings	4.00/ 5	17 (100%)	15 (88%)
Intern applies critical thinking to engage in analysis of qualitative research methods and research findings	3.90/ 5	17 (100%)	14 (82%)
Intern uses and translates research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery.	4.10/ 5	17 (100%)	16 (94%)
Total Section Score	3.88 / 5	n/a	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Meeting All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	16 (94%)	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Exceeding All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	n/a	12 (71%)

2.1.5 - Engage in Policy Practice

Competency	Average Score	# Meeting Competency	# Exceeding Competency
Intern Identifies social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services	3.82/ 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
Intern assesses how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services	3.82/ 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
Intern applies critical thinking to analyze policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	3.88/ 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
Intern applies critical thinking to formulate policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	4.20/ 5	17 (100%)	16 (94%)
Intern applies critical thinking to advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	4.25/ 5	17 (100%)	16 (94%)
Total Section Score	3.99 / 5	n/a	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Meeting All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	17 (100%)	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Exceeding All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	n/a	12 (71%)

2.1.6 - Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Competency	Average Score	# Meeting Competency	# Exceeding Competency
Intern applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies	4.29/ 5	17 (100%)	15 (88%)
Intern uses empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies.	4.47/ 5	17 (100%)	17 (100%)
Total Section Score	4.38 / 5	n/a	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Meeting All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	17 (100%)	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students Exceeding All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	n/a	15 (88%)

2.1.7 - Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Competency	Average Score	# Meeting Competency	# Exceeding Competency
Intern collects and organizes data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies	4.19/ 5	17 (100%)	15 (88%)
Intern applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies	4.13/ 5	17 (100%)	14 (82%)
Intern develops mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the	4.13/ 5	17 (100%)	14 (82%)

critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies			
Intern selects appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies	4.06/ 5	17 (100%)	14 (82%)
Total Section Score	4.12 / 5	n/a	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students <i>Meeting</i> All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	17 (100%)	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students <i>Exceeding</i> All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	n/a	13 (76%)

2.1.8 - Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Competency	Average Score	# Meeting Competency	# Exceeding Competency
Intern critically chooses and implements interventions to achieve practice goals and enhance capacities of clients and constituencies	3.94/ 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
Intern applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies	3.94/ 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
Intern uses inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to achieve beneficial practice outcomes	4.06/ 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
Intern negotiates, mediates, and advocates with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies	4.19/ 5	17 (100%)	14 (82%)
Intern facilitate effective transitions and endings that advance mutually agreed-on goals	4.06/ 5	17 (100%)	14 (82%)
Total Section Score	4.04 / 5	n/a	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students <i>Meeting</i> All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	17 (100%)	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students <i>Exceeding</i> All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	n/a	12 (71%)

2.1.9 - Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Competency	Average Score	# Meeting Competency	# Exceeding Competency
Intern selects and uses appropriate methods for evaluation of outcomes	3.93/ 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
Intern applies knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes	3.93/ 5	17 (100%)	13 (76%)
Intern critically analyzes, monitors, and evaluates intervention and program processes and outcomes	3.80/ 5	17 (100%)	11 (65%)
Intern applies evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro,mezzo,macro level	3.83/ 5	17 (100%)	12 (71%)
Total Section Score	3.87 / 5	n/a	n/a
Total Section - Number of Students <i>Meeting</i> All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	17 (100%)	n/a

Total Section - Number of Students <i>Exceeding</i> All Competency Benchmarks (3=competent)	n/a	n/a	11 (65%)
--	-----	-----	-----------------

APPENDIX E

Findings for Assessment of Social Work Competencies 2011–2015

Competencies and Practice Behaviors	Comb. 2011-12		Comb. 2012-13		Comb. 2013-14		Comb. 2014-15	
	FI & Std	% stdt	FI & Std	% Std	FI & Std	% Std	FI & Std	% Std
	Bmk 4/5	>Bmk	Bmk 4/5	>Bmk	Bmk 4/5	> Bmk	Bmk 4/5	>Bmk
	Means		Means		Means		Means	
C1 Professional								
PB1	4.14		4.17		4.00		4.24	
PB2	4.25		4.17		4.06		4.46	
PB3	4.27		4.61		4.39		4.57	
PB4	4.42		4.52		4.51		4.47	
PB5	4.40		4.45		4.44		4.57	
PB6	4.12		4.28		4.22		4.46	
C1 Mean	4.25		4.36		4.27		4.46	
Students > Bchmk		69.0		83.3		72.2		71.4
C2 Ethical								
PB7	4.27		4.17		4.17		4.42	
PB8	4.10		4.13		4.09		4.28	
PB9	4.06		4.00		4.03		4.33	
PB10	3.98		4.34		4.08		4.25	
C2 Mean	4.10		4.16		4.09		4.32	
Students > Bchmk		63.9		66.7		55.6		64.3
C3 Critical thinking								
PB11	4.06		3.78		4.11		4.05	
PB12	3.99		3.89		3.89		4.07	
PB13	4.07		4.10		4.08		4.28	
C3 Mean	4.04		3.92		4.03		4.13	
Students > Bchmk		63.9		61.1		55.6		59.5
C4 Diversity								
PB14	4.62		4.52		4.57		4.53	
PB15	4.29		4.22		4.39		4.28	
PB16	4.33		4.45		4.33		4.61	
PB17	4.37		4.56		4.33		4.57	
C4 Mean	4.40		4.37		4.41		4.50	
Students > Bchmk		87.3		88.9		83.3		76.2

Competencies and Practice Behaviors	Comb. 2011-12		Comb. 2012-13		Comb. 2013-14		Comb. 2014-15	
	FI & Std	% stdt	FI & Std	% Std	FI & Std	% Std	FI & Std	% Std
	Bmk 4/5	>Bmk	Bmk 4/5	>Bmk	Bmk 4/5	> Bmk	Bmk 4/5	>Bmk
	Means		Means		Means		Means	
C5 Rights/Justice								
PB18	4.11		4.00		4.15		4.09	
PB19	4.17		4.17		4.00		4.09	
PB20	4.06		4.11		4.00		4.05	
C5 Mean	4.12		4.09		4.05		4.08	
Students > Bchmk		75.4		66.7		61.1		59.5
C6 Research								
PB21	3.87		3.45		3.59		4.00	
PB22	3.92		3.67		3.91		4.10	
C6 Mean	3.89		3.64		3.75		4.05	
Students > Bchmk		69.0		50.0		44.4		60.7
C7 Human Behavior								
PB23	3.94		3.89		3.82		4.19	
PB24	4.11		4.23		4.06		4.47	
C7 Mean	4.02		4.06		3.94		4.33	
Students > Bchmk		65.5		72.2		66.7		66.7
C8 Policy								
PB25	3.91		3.76		3.74		4.03	
PB26	3.89		3.86		3.60		4.06	
C8 Mean	3.88		3.81		3.72		4.04	
Students > Bchmk		55.6		61.1		38.9		50.9
C9 Contexts-Practice								
PB27	3.82		4.22		3.75		3.97	
PB28	3.93		4.00		3.86		3.85	
C9 Mean	3.88		4.11		3.81		3.91	
Students > Bchmk		72.6		72.2		50.0		51.7

Competencies and Practice Behaviors	Comb. 2011-12		Comb. 2012-13		Comb. 2013-14		Comb. 2014-15	
	FI & Std	% stdt	FI & Std	% Std	FI & Std	% Std	FI & Std	% Std
	Bmk 4/5	>Bmk	Bmk 4/5	>Bmk	Bmk 4/5	> Bmk	Bmk 4/5	>Bmk
	Means		Means		Means		Means	
C10 Practice								
PB29	4.38		4.17		4.17		4.42	
PB30	4.54		4.56		4.39		4.66	
PB31	4.28		4.22		4.00		4.40	
PB32	4.14		4.17		4.14		4.35	
PB33	4.31		4.17		4.14		4.52	
PB34	4.28		4.06		3.94		4.35	
PB35	4.03		4.00		3.89		4.17	
PB36	4.17		4.06		3.89		4.27	
PB37	3.99		3.89		3.89		4.22	
PB38	4.28		4.45		3.89		4.36	
PB39	4.13		4.15		3.93		4.35	
PB40	4.12		4.09		3.97		4.22	
PB41	4.25		3.78		3.94		4.20	
C10 Mean	4.22		4.14		3.92		4.34	
Students > Bchmk		71.8		61.1		66.7		64.3
Mean-10 Comp	4.08		4.06		4.00		4.22	

Above Benchmark

Bold

Below Benchmark