

**ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(University of Mississippi) MASTERS OF SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM
MSW (Foundation Exit) Summer 2015 FPPAI
LAST COMPLETED ON (August 2015)**

Form AS4 (M) -Duplicate and expand as needed. Provide table(s) to support self -study narrative addressing *Accreditation Standards* below.

This form is used to assist the COA in the evaluation of the program's compliance with *Accreditation Standards* stated below.

4.0.2: *The program provides summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of its competencies, identifying the percentage of students achieving each benchmark.*

4.0.4: *The program uses Form AS 4 (B) and/or Form AS4 (M) to report its most recent assessment outcomes to constituents and the public on its website and routinely up-dates (minimally every 2 years) these postings.*

All Council on Social Work Education programs measure and report student learning outcomes. Students are assessed on their mastery of the competencies which comprise the accreditation standards of the Council on Social Work Education. These competencies are dimensions of social work practice which all social workers are expected to master during their professional training. A measurement benchmark is set by the social work programs for each competency. An assessment score at or above that benchmark is considered by the program to represent mastery of that particular competency.

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENT OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK		
		Foundation CONCENTRATION	XXX CONCENTRATION	XXX CONCENTRATION
	Scale 0 (Unable to perform)-9 (Mastered competency); benchmark 5 (Competent performance)			
Identify as a Professional Social Worker	5	100%		
Apply Ethical Principles	5	100%		
Apply Critical Thinking	5	100%		
Engage Diversity in Practice	5	100%		
Advance Human Rights/ Social and Economic Justice	5	100%		
Engage Research Informed Practice/ Practice Informed Research	5	100%		
Human Behavior Knowledge	5	100%		
Engage Policy Practice to Advance Well-Being and Deliver Services	5	100%		
Respond to Practice Contexts	5	100%		

Practice Engagement	5	100%		
Practice Assessment	5	100%		
Practice Intervention	5	100%		
Practice Evaluation	5	100%		

Field instructors assessed the students completing foundation year field placement in summer 2015, using the Social Work Education Assessment Project Field Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPAI). Consistent with the typical performance of students in the MSW program, 100% of the students were rated as meeting or exceeding competency. All practice behaviors for all 10 competencies were assessed. Mean scores ranged from 8.6-8.8 on all competencies/practice behaviors, with no student being rated at less than 7 Superior performance on any practice behavior.

The results of this assessment affirm that the foundation curriculum (Human Behavior and the Social Environment, Practice with Individuals, Research methods, policy, practice with groups, and practice with communities and organizations) prepared the students for competency in the practice behaviors at the foundation level.

The students completing foundation field placement also completed 2 elective courses during the foundation year, SW 600 Diversity in Social Work Practice and SW 651 Social Work Practice in Integrated Healthcare. These foundation level electives were designed and implemented into the curriculum to strengthen students' competence in the areas of 2.1.4 Engage diversity and difference in practice, 2.1.5 Advance human rights and social and economic justice, 2.1.8 Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic wellbeing and to deliver effective social work services, and 2.1.9 Respond to contexts that shape practice. Field placement agencies included intimate partner domestic violence shelter, child and adolescent psychiatric residential facility, hospice, and family and children's services in child protection. In each of these settings, student interns were able to utilize knowledge and skills learned from the elective classes to enhance performance on the foundation objectives of 2.1.4, 2.1.5, 2.1.8, and 2.1.9.

Foundation year students also completed a self assessment of their performance on the practice behaviors in April 2015, prior to going to internship. Student assessment of performance indicated the majority of students evaluated themselves as competent, with rankings from "satisfactory" to "excellent". Student assessment of practice behaviors were generally rated more conservatively in the areas of 2.1.3 critical thinking (practice behavior 11 distinguish, appraise, and integrated multiple sources of knowledge, including research based knowledge and practice wisdom, practice behavior 12 analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation, for example), 2.1.6 research (practice behavior 21 use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry and practice behavior 22 use research evidence to inform practice, for example). This is consistent with areas where foundation students experience self-doubt, although all rated themselves as at least satisfactory. The field instructor ratings affirm that the curriculum is sufficient for students to experience mastery of these practice behaviors, as they exceeded benchmarks by the end of the foundation field placement. Self assessment is important for students to be aware of areas of weakness in practice, and their performance ratings indicated they are aware of need to enhance their own performance.

**ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(University of Mississippi) MASTERS OF SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM
MSW (FOUNDATION EXIT) SPRING (2015) FCAI FOUNDATION CURRICULUM
LAST COMPLETED ON (APRIL 2015)**

Form AS4 (M) -Duplicate and expand as needed. Provide table(s) to support self -study narrative addressing *Accreditation Standards* below.

This form is used to assist the COA in the evaluation of the program's compliance with *Accreditation Standards* stated below.

4.0.2: *The program provides summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of its competencies, identifying the percentage of students achieving each benchmark.*

4.0.4: *The program uses Form AS 4 (B) and/or Form AS4 (M) to report its most recent assessment outcomes to constituents and the public on its website and routinely up-dates (minimally every 2 years) these postings.*

All Council on Social Work Education programs measure and report student learning outcomes. Students are assessed on their mastery of the competencies which comprise the accreditation standards of the Council on Social Work Education. These competencies are dimensions of social work practice which all social workers are expected to master during their professional training. A measurement benchmark is set by the social work programs for each competency. An assessment score at or above that benchmark is considered by the program to represent mastery of that particular competency.

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENT OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK		
		Foundation CONCENTRATION	XXX CONCENTRATION	XXX CONCENTRATION
Identify as a Professional Social Worker	70%	100%		
Apply Ethical Principles	70%	87%		
Apply Critical Thinking	70%	79%		
Engage Diversity in Practice	70%	75%		
Advance Human Rights/ Social and Economic Justice	70%	88%		
Engage Research Informed Practice/ Practice Informed Research	70%	73%		
Human Behavior Knowledge	70%	80%		
Engage Policy Practice to Advance Well-Being and Deliver Services	70%	87%		
Respond to Practice Contexts	70%	79%		
Practice Engagement	70%	82%		
Practice Assessment	70%	94%		
Practice Intervention	70%	87%		

Practice Evaluation	70%	76%		
---------------------	-----	-----	--	--

The target for the foundation performance on the Social Work Education Assessment Project Foundation Curriculum program evaluation results are equal to or greater than the national results on the exit score. This instrument is administered at the beginning and end of the foundation year. Students' score average at entrance was 39.06 compared to the national score of 31.29, for a significant difference ($p < 0.001$). Also at beginning assessment on foundation curriculum, University of Mississippi students scored significantly higher than the national mean in the areas of practice ($p = 0.001$), HBSE ($p < 0.001$), Policy ($p = 0.001$), Research ($p = 0.02$), and Social & Economic Justice ($p = 0.03$). By exit of foundation year, University of Mississippi scores were 45.45 ($p = 0.001$) compared with national scores of 40.59. Exit program scores remained significantly higher than the national scores for areas of Practice ($p = 0.001$), Policy ($p = 0.001$), and reached higher scores for Ethics & Values ($p < 0.001$). Although not statistically significant, student scores in all areas improved from their entrance to the foundation year, with the exception of HBSE, which remained the same.

The benchmark for the FCAI is 70% in each competency area. Because the SWEAP no longer assigns practice behaviors or competency areas to the examination, programs can assign questions on the exam to specific practice behaviors. This revision is preferable, as it enables programs to more effectively address areas of needed curriculum development, enables the program to consider in which classes content should be embedded, and eliminate questions that have been found by the program to be problematic. One limitation of SWEAP has been that it assigned a practice behavior competency by measuring only one question, and that those practice behaviors as measured by other tools (for example, the FPPAI SWEAP field placement assessment, or the program's clinical examination) generally assessed the students as meeting those practice behaviors when multiple assessment instruments or measures were utilized. The program selected questions (1 or more) that measured practice behaviors in each competency area and calculated a percentage of students' overall scores for that competency. Those scores indicated that students met benchmark (70% or higher) in each competency.

Overall, this affirms the efficacy of the foundation curriculum in preparing students for foundation practice of advanced social work. Students in this foundation cohort (spring 2015) met competency benchmarks in all areas, which was an improvement from the foundation cohort spring 2013—the last time the instrument was administered. Engaging diversity in practice has improved since 2013 also, as indicated by students exceeding benchmark at 75% contrasted with the 2013 score of 62%. The introduction of SW 600 Diversity in Social Work Practice was implemented with this cohort in fall 2014, and these revisions appear to have strengthened the competency of the students in the area of diversity—historically a weak area of the program in spite of the focus on it. HBSE scores also improved to 80% of students in spring 2015 foundation cohort meeting or exceeding benchmark, an improvement from 68% with spring 2013 cohort. One impact of the improvement in HBSE may have been related to the restructuring of the HBSE course content and delivery, and a change in textbooks, plus an overall move from developmental stages to a more macro-infused approach that utilized a developmental-ecological systems approach consistent and compatible with the program's clinical conceptual framework.

**ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(University of Mississippi) MASTERS OF SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM
MSW (CLINICAL EXIT) SPRING (2015) CLINICAL FPPAI
LAST COMPLETED ON (04/25/2015)**

Form AS4 (M) Duplicate and expand as needed. Provide table(s) to support self -study narrative addressing *Accreditation Standards* below.

This form is used to assist the COA in the evaluation of the program's compliance with *Accreditation Standards* stated below.

4.0.2: *The program provides summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of its competencies, identifying the percentage of students achieving each benchmark.*

4.0.4: *The program uses Form AS 4 (B) and/or Form AS4 (M) to report its most recent assessment outcomes to constituents and the public on its website and routinely up-dates (minimally every 2 years) these postings.*

All Council on Social Work Education programs measure and report student learning outcomes. Students are assessed on their mastery of the competencies which comprise the accreditation standards of the Council on Social Work Education. These competencies are dimensions of social work practice which all social workers are expected to master during their professional training. A measurement benchmark is set by the social work programs for each competency. An assessment score at or above that benchmark is considered by the program to represent mastery of that particular competency.

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENT OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK		
		Clinical CONCENTRATION	XXX CONCENTRATION	XXX CONCENTRATION
	Scale 0 (Failure totally incompetent)-10 (Mastered performance) Benchmark 5 (Competent performance)			
Identify as a Professional Social Worker	5	100		
Apply Ethical Principles	5	100		
Apply Critical Thinking	5	100		
Engage Diversity in Practice	5	100		
Advance Human Rights/ Social and Economic Justice	5	100		
Engage Research Informed Practice/ Practice Informed Research	5	100		
Human Behavior Knowledge	5	100		
Engage Policy Practice to Advance Well-Being and Deliver Services	5	100		
Respond to Practice Contexts	5	100		

Practice Engagement	5	100		
Practice Assessment	5	100		
Practice Intervention	5	100		
Practice Evaluation	5	100		

Students in the MSW clinical internship have consistently met all competencies and practice behaviors, affirming the explicit and implicit curriculum. Scores for the 2015 cohort ranged from 6 (higher than competent but less than superior performance) to 10 (mastered performance), with 100% of students achieving benchmark. Mean scores were 9.3 for 2.1.1, 8.8 for 2.1.2, 8.9 for 2.1.3, 8.9 for 2.1.4, 8.6 for 2.1.5, 8.6 for 2.1.6, 8.8 for 2.1.7, 8.3 for 2.1.8, 8.8 for 2.1.9, 9.9 for 2.1.10a, 8.9 for 2.1.10b, 9 for 2.1.10c, and 8.5 for 2.1.10d. Students performed at the higher range of competency in most areas. Lower scores were noted in 2.1.4 Engage diversity and difference in practice and 2.1.5 Advance human rights and social and economic justice, but these scores were still above the minimum competency benchmark.

These results reinforce that the changes made to curriculum content in the area of diversity and social justice within the past two years has been beneficial. SW 600 Diversity in Social Work Practice was added to the curriculum in fall 2014. This same group of students completed an implicit learning environment survey in spring 2015, and 84% of students indicated their coursework routinely included diverse perspectives on race, class, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, ability/disability, immigration status, ethnicity, and age, and that they believed social work faculty respected and encouraged diversity and that this enabled them to consider different information or perspectives, and change their points of view.

The program administered a clinical self-efficacy examination in spring 2015 at the completion of the semester. Self-efficacy beliefs, based on Bandura's scholarship (1986), refers to individuals' assessment of their capacity to perform a specific task at a specific level, and has been shown to be useful in predicting the tasks undertaken, performance efforts and time invested in the task. The usefulness of self-efficacy has been shown, first, in that students with low self-efficacy may experience greater anxiety in performance, whereas students with higher self-efficacy are more willing to engage in challenging tasks and perform with less anxiety, both of which may enhance their performance outcomes. Second, because self-efficacy assessment is domain specific, meaning, it is only useful in assessing specific tasks for specific accomplishments, such as those practice behaviors related to clinical social work performance, it is important to note that generalized self-efficacy assessments are not of value in predicting student behavior, nor in assessing for specific achievement (Bandura, 1997; Choi, 2005). Several recent studies (for example, Ahn, Boykin, Hebert, & Kulkin, 2012; Fortune, Cavazos, & Lee, 2005; Rishel & Majewski, 2009) have noted varying relationships between social work self-efficacy and social work performance in the classroom and the internship with both BSW and MSW students. Its potential usefulness in social work assessment is in pairing skill performance with students' self assessment in order to help them develop realistic self-assessment skills (Rawlings, 2012) and facilitate the learning process (Drisko, 2014).

The self-efficacy assessment for the clinical practice behaviors in spring 2015 were consistent with the FPPAI assessment, completed by the clinical field instructors. Students rated themselves on a similar scale of 0-10, with 5 being competent performance and benchmark for competency. In 7 competencies, students assessed themselves as meeting or exceeding benchmark. On competency 2.1.10, data was available for a and b which indicated competency, but not for c and d. On competency 2.1.8, two students assessed their performance at

less than competent, and thus, fell below the field instructor rating of 100% competency for this measure, which supports that student assessment can actually be useful in helping students develop professional skills, as those low performance scores were also noted in policy 2.1.8 on the clinical examination outcomes.

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
 (Clinical Comprehensive Examination) **MASTERS OF SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM**
LAST COMPLETED ON (06/12/15)

Form AS4 (M) -Duplicate and expand as needed. Provide table(s) to support self -study narrative addressing *Accreditation Standards* below.

This form is used to assist the COA in the evaluation of the program's compliance with *Accreditation Standards* stated below.

4.0.2: *The program provides summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of its competencies, identifying the percentage of students achieving each benchmark.*

4.0.4: *The program uses Form AS 4 (B) and/or Form AS4 (M) to report its most recent assessment outcomes to constituents and the public on its website and routinely up-dates (minimally every 2 years) these postings.*

All Council on Social Work Education programs measure and report student learning outcomes. Students are assessed on their mastery of the competencies which comprise the accreditation standards of the Council on Social Work Education. These competencies are dimensions of social work practice which all social workers are expected to master during their professional training. A measurement benchmark is set by the social work programs for each competency. An assessment score at or above that benchmark is considered by the program to represent mastery of that particular competency.

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENT OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK		
		Clinical 1 st Admin. CONCENTRATION	Clinical 2 nd Admin. CONCENTRATION	XXX CONCENTRATION
Identify as a Professional Social Worker	70%	56%*	100%	
Apply Ethical Principles	70%	56%*	100%	
Apply Critical Thinking	70%	82%	100%	
Engage Diversity in Practice	70%	78%	100%	
Advance Human Rights/ Social and Economic Justice	70%	78%	100%	
Engage Research Informed Practice/ Practice Informed Research	70%	33%*	100%	
Human Behavior Knowledge	70%	89%	100%	
Engage Policy Practice to Advance Well-Being and Deliver Services	70%	67%*	100%	
Respond to Practice Contexts	70%	89%	100%	
Practice Engagement	N/A	NA	NA	
Practice Assessment	70%	89%	100%	
Practice Intervention	70%	78%	100%	
Practice Evaluation	70%	33%*	100%	

The Comprehensive Clinical Examination is a 2-day written examination that measures competencies 2.1.1-2.1.10 (b, c, & d). Because it is a written examination, the exam does not cover the practice competency of engagement. The examination requires students to organize a collection of facts and information into a cohesive bio-psycho-social-spiritual assessment, assign a diagnosis, develop a clinical intervention plan through a recognized practice theory or model, develop a policy to improve clinical service delivery and procedure for evaluation, demonstrate how the clinical practice theory or model utilized in intervention might be conceptualized as challenging dominant norms and world-views that have marginalized persons such as those in the case study, evaluate effectiveness of client outcomes from the intervention plan, and discuss how the process of working with the client in the case might be utilized for further development of self-awareness and professional use of self in engaging and practicing with diverse populations.

After the evaluation of the first administration of the examination, students have two opportunities to make revisions to the sections of the exam that do not meet competency benchmarks. Competency benchmarks are set at 70% for assessment of practice behaviors and competencies, although students must achieve 100% with two additional attempts at revision after the first administration in order to meet the program's examination requirement. The majority of students achieve 100% on the second administration with only an occasional student requiring a subsequent revision. All students must pass all six sections of the examination in order to complete the program. Section 1 of the exam includes practice behaviors that measure competencies 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.7, 2.1.9, and 2.1.10b. Section 2 of the exam includes practice behaviors that measure competencies 2.1.3, 2.1.5, and 2.1.10c. Section 3 of the exam includes practice behaviors that measure 2.1.8. Section 4 of the exam includes practice behaviors that measure 2.1.3 and 2.1.4. Section 5 of the exam includes practice behaviors that measure 2.1.6, and 2.1.10d. Section 6 of the exam includes practice behaviors that measure 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.3.

The comprehensive examination was administered in March and April 2015 for 9 students in the final semester of the second year of the MSW program. Demographics for the examinees included 1 white male, 1 African American female, and 7 white females. On the first administration, all students met competency in seven areas, including 2.1.3 Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgment, 2.1.4 Engage diversity and difference in practice, 2.1.5 Advance human rights and social and economic justice, 2.1.7 Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, 2.1.9 Respond to contexts that shape practice, 2.1.10b Assessment, and 2.1.10c Intervention. This data affirms the curriculum in HBSE (SW 601), practice classes (including SW 602 Practice with individuals, SW 615 Practice with families and groups, SW 620 Practice with organizations and communities, SW 630 Methods of Family Intervention, SW 640 Advanced clinical practice with groups, SW 650 Clinical assessment and diagnosis, SW 683 Theories of psychotherapy, and SW 686 Trauma and crisis intervention). The competencies in which students met benchmark also suggest that the program is enabling students to develop and apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgment, engage diversity and difference in practice, and respond to contexts that shape practice.

In the first administration for 2015, students did not meet competency in several areas, including 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.6, 2.1.8, and 2.1.10d. When the clinical comprehensive examination was administered for the 2011 cohort, the first class to be graduated from the MSW program and the first year the examination was administered, all students passed all sections of the exam, including research and policy. That cohort of students took research and policy classes face-to-face in the classroom, and performed at benchmark on the comprehensive clinical examination. The third and fourth cohorts in the program (completing in 2014 and 2015) took research and policy classes online, and were the first cohorts to perform at less than benchmark on the clinical examination in the areas of policy and research. Following the less-than-benchmark performance in 2014, both research and policy classes were returned to face-to-face classes, and the content of the courses were enhanced and more rigorous. The results of that revision in the curriculum and curriculum delivery will not be evident until the completion of the comprehensive clinical examination in spring of 2016 for the cohort currently engaged in the second (clinical) year of the program.

In addition to returning the classes to face-to-face delivery for the current cohort of students (scheduled to sit for the examination in spring 2016), we are revising the method of exam instructions for question 3, the development of policy, policy evaluation, and program evaluation (2.1.8; 2.1.10d), question

5, evaluation of the clinical intervention/research (2.1.6; 2.1.10d), and question 6, discussion of development of self-awareness and professional use of self (2.1.1; 2.1.2).

Although the first administration benchmark measures would seem to indicate that students are not performing well in 2.1.1 identifying as a professional social worker, and 2.1.2 applying ethical principles, these areas are affected by the way the examination is designed to assess the clinical conceptual framework and goals of the program. Competency 2.1.1 is measured by only two practice behaviors in this examination, professional use of self and understanding professional strengths, limitations and challenges. To enhance student performance in this area, we have increased assignments in student self-assessments throughout the curriculum. We implemented pre and post assessments that include these practice behaviors in several courses in the curriculum, including SW 601 HBSE, SW 602 Practice with Individuals, SW 640 Advanced Clinical Practice with Groups, SW 660 Clinical Supervision, and SW 687 Substance Abuse and Addictions. Students in the current cohort (who will sit for the clinical comprehensive examination in spring 2016) have thus had extensive practice in assessing professional use of self and identifying strengths, limitations, and challenges, and also in being required to identify learning needs and set goals to achieve those address those professional development needs, and have demonstrated consistent improvement in this area of professional practice, particularly evident thus far in their clinical concentration.

Competency 2.1.2 is measured by only one practice behavior in the clinical comprehensive examination, that of recognizing and managing personal biases as they affect the therapeutic relationship in the service of the clients' well-being. This practice behavior may not adequately reflect student ability in this area, as the clinical examination result for this competency is inconsistent with field instructors' rating of students on this competency, as well as their performance in the classroom. The clinical conceptual framework of the program is grounded in understanding the socio-political-cultural environment in Mississippi related to the history of enslavement and the subsequent oppression and discrimination of the Jim Crow system, so this has been an area of extreme importance and focus in the curriculum. In reviewing student performance (assessment of the raw data of the examination), it would appear that students do not always grasp that this question is asking them to address **their** potential bias and identify how they might respond to that **in relationship to the actual case presented**, and instead, tend to answer the question in a broad, general "what a social worker should ethically do" approach. This is an area of planned revision in the examination itself, as it is not an accurate reflection of the curriculum content, or student learning, but rather, appears to be a flaw in the way the measurement is presented. The program added a new elective, SW 600 Diversity in social work practice, in fall of 2014 in order to better prepare students for social work practice with a diverse population. All students in the cohort that will sit for the clinical exam in spring 2016 took this elective class, so the results of these revisions will be known following spring 2016 assessment.

Students have historically performed well on the clinical aspects of the examination, which is the focus of the clinical program: completing comprehensive bio-psycho-social-spiritual assessments, making accurate diagnoses, developing clinical intervention plans that use recognized and evidence-based models of practice, and understanding professional use of self. They have performed less effectively in the area of competence in developing policy or conducting program evaluation or practice evaluation, and these areas have been enhanced, strengthened, and are more rigorous.

However, it is important to note that in the **second administration** of the 2015 examination, **all students met benchmark in all competencies.**

Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) Licensure Exam Pass Rates

Licensed Social Worker (LSW)

Bachelors Licensure Exam First-Time Pass Rates

Year	University of Mississippi	North American
2009	51% (21:41)	79%
2010	67% (29:43)	78%
2011	48% (26:54)	78%
2012	69% (24:35)	77%
2013	60% (28:47)	78%
2014	61% (28:46)	71%

* license held by an individual licensed to practice social work in the state of Mississippi at the baccalaureate level

Licensed Master Social Worker (LMSW)

Masters Licensure Exam First-Time Pass Rates

Year	University of Mississippi	North American
2011	100% (10:10)	83%
2012	78% (7:9)	84%
2013	67% (6:9)	82%
2014	75% (18:24)	71%

* license held by an individual with a masters or doctoral degree who is licensed to practice social work in the state of Mississippi at the masters level

Licensed Certified Social Worker (LCSW)

Clinical Licensure Exam First-Time Pass Rates

Year	University of Mississippi	North American
2013	100% (2:2)	78%
2014	0% (0:1)	67%

* license held by an individual who has fulfilled the requirements for LMSW and completed the requirements of the BOE SW/MFT for post-masters professional supervision. This individual is licensed at the certified level. Only licensed certified social workers who have completed clinical supervision and taken the ASWB clinical exam may hold himself/herself out to the public as a "clinical social worker".