

**Diana R. Garland School of Social Work
Master of Social Work Program
SACSCOC Report of Progress
Academic Year 2017-2018**

Each year, the Diana R. Garland School of Social Work (GSSW) at Baylor University conducts an assessment of our programs, initiatives, and the various activities of the School. We assess the Master of Social Work (MSW) program by evaluating our students using nine competencies listed by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). These nine Evaluation and Practice Standard (EPAS) competencies were revised and updated by CSWE in 2015. The Garland School has as a tenth competency focused on the ethical integration of faith with professional practice that reflects an area of our unique focus and is congruent with all 4 of Baylor's general education outcomes. This competency addresses the faith of the client, the faith of the social worker, and the organizational context in which a social worker finds herself.

The Garland School is in the middle of our reaccreditation cycle having last been reaffirmed in June 2013. We submit a new self-study to CSWE in 2020 for reaffirmation in 2021. The 2018-2019 academic year will be our "snapshot" year for the self-study. We will be collecting data to assess both our explicit and implicit curricula and will be looking at all the resources we have to support our mission (including all full time and adjunct faculty members). The 2016-2017 academic was used to transition from the 2008 EPAS to the 2015 in our curricula. We used that year as an opportunity update all syllabi and field learning contracts and evaluations with current EPAS competencies, and thoughtfully consider where we teach each competency and how/where we will assess the competencies of our students.

In the 2016-2017 year, evaluation focused on one measure. We assessed how competent our MSW students are in their final semester of their internships on the 10 competencies we measure. The internship or field is considered the signature pedagogy of social work education. The idea is that what is learned in the classroom will best "show up" or be demonstrated in actual practice.

2017-2018 Assessment Method

In the 2017-2018 year our measurement was more robust. In the MSW program we assessed our students at two levels and in two specializations (clinical and community). We assessed the generalist (foundation) knowledge using the 1) SWEAP FCAI and the 2) (foundation) final internship field evaluation scores. The FCAI, "Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument measures how well a program's curriculum prepares students with the knowledge necessary for competent professional social work practice. The FCAI is an exam, designed to be taken by students as they enter a social work program and again at the time of exit, with the explicit purpose of testing for knowledge gained throughout the program's curriculum"

(https://www.sweapinstruments.org/?page_id=2256). This tool also allows us to compare

our students to other students whose schools use the tool. The developers of the FCAI created a pool of items that are rigorous and robust so that competent social work students get half correct and half are missed. Therefore 50% correct is the “norm” or considered demonstration of competent knowledge.

In addition, we assessed the specialized year or advanced year. The primary measure for the 17-18 year is the final field evaluation for both specializations. For the 17-18 year we piloted the use of an online exam to assess knowledge in the clinical specialization. Because we used only 2 of the 5 sections for the pilot we will not be using the scores for program evaluation. This pilot is moving us toward the snapshot year when exams will be used in each area of specialized practice in all sections.

For the 18-19 year we are using a knowledge-based exam for both the clinical and community specializations. All of these data will be used in our continuous curriculum improvement and enhancement process, which we broadly outline after these data are displayed.

For the first time we used an online data collection system for field seminar instructor to input competency data. This aided in easier collection and analysis.

Assessment Results

First, for the generalist year we display the overall end of year FCAI results by campus location (Waco, Houston, see Tables 1 & 2). Then we display FCAI results by competency at the start and end of the generalist year for each campus (see Tables 3 & 4). Finally, the final field evaluations are displayed for the generalist year (both campuses together, see Table 5) and the two areas of specialized practice (see Tables 6 & 7).

Table 1 Waco Campus End of Generalist Year (FCAI)

	Score Average % Correct	Score Range	Standard Deviation	t-test Value	p-value	# Students Meeting & Exceeding Competency
Waco Campus N=34	71.20 %	49.06 - 92.45 %	10.44	3.54	< 0.001 **	33/34 (97 %)
National N=4589	61.23 %	0.00 - 94.34 %	14.98			

Table 2 Houston Campus End of Generalist Year (FCAI)

	Score Average % Correct	Score Range	Standard Deviation	t-test Value	p-value	# Students Meeting & Exceeding Competency
Houston Campus N=11	67.58 %	47.17 - 83.02 %	11.74	1.28	0.15	10/11 (91 %)
National N=4589	61.23 %	0.00 - 94.34 %	14.98			

Table 3 Waco Campus Generalist Year Start/Finish (FCAI)

Curricular Area	Program Start % Correct	# Students Meeting & Exceeding Competency	Generalist Year End % Correct	# Students Meeting & Exceeding Competency
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	69.84 %	33/36 (92 %)	75.63 %	33/34 (97 %)
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	69.91 %	33/36 (92 %)	72.55 %	33/34 (97 %)
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	71.76 %	33/36 (92 %)	78.43 %	33/34 (97 %)
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	49.21 %	20/36 (56 %)	61.34 %	21/34 (62 %)
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	48.02 %	18/36 (50 %)	51.26 %	20/34 (59 %)
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	54.44 %	21/36 (58 %)	70.00 %	32/34 (94 %)
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	73.33 %	33/36 (92 %)	85.29 %	33/34 (97 %)
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	72.78 %	32/36 (89 %)	84.12 %	33/34 (97 %)
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	60.00 %	22/36 (61 %)	70.59 %	27/34 (79 %)

Table 4 Houston Campus Generalist Year Start/Finish (FCAI)

Curricular Area	Program Start % Correct	# Students Meeting & Exceeding Competency	Generalist Year End % Correct	# Students Meeting & Exceeding Competency
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	67.03 %	12/13 (92 %)	70.13 %	10/11 (91 %)
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	66.67 %	13/13 (100 %)	69.70 %	11/11 (100 %)
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	66.67 %	12/13 (92 %)	75.76 %	10/11 (91 %)
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	51.65 %	7/13 (54 %)	62.34 %	9/11 (82 %)
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	45.05 %	4/13 (31 %)	62.34 %	8/11 (73 %)
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	56.92 %	10/13 (77 %)	60.00 %	8/11 (73 %)
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	64.62 %	11/13 (85 %)	81.82 %	11/11 (100 %)
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	67.69 %	11/13 (85 %)	74.55 %	9/11 (82 %)
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	58.46 %	9/13 (69 %)	52.73 %	6/11 (55 %)

Table 5 Generalist Final Field Evaluations (Waco and Houston)

Competence Area	% Proficient or Higher
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	86.67%
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	82.64%
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	75%
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	61.81%
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	82.30%
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	80.73%
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80.73%
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	74.17%
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	65.10%
10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice	85.42%

Table 6 Final Field Evaluations Clinical Specialization

Competence Area	% Proficient or Higher
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	94.12%
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	96.43%
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	93.75%
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	90.18%
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	89.29%
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	97.32%
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90.47%
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	97.02%
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	87.50%
10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice	100%

Table 7 Final Field Evaluations Community Specialization

Competence Area	% Proficient or Higher
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	90.91%
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	100%
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	95.45%
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	95.45%
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	100%
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	100%
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	93.94%
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	95.45%
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90.91%
10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice	84.09%

Standards and Results Summary

Overall students are meeting and exceeding our benchmarks. At the MSW level we expect that 60% of our MSW students score proficient or higher on field evaluations. For us the highest standard is observation in the field. Second, we expect that 85% of students will be competent on each of the 9 competencies on the FCAI. In aggregate both of the above standards have been met, but when we look at individual competencies we see areas for improvement, particularly on the FCAI. In examining the results there are several “soft spots” or areas of concern. In the Waco program competencies 4,5, and 9 are below the benchmark. In the Houston 4, 5, 6, and 9 are below the benchmark. Of note, on the SWEAP, social work students in the national sample also score lower on these same competencies.

The two areas that we will focus on most are the following: The first is in the Houston Program with Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities. The scores for that competency were lower from the start to finish of the generalist year. The second area of concern is in the Waco Program with competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice. The scores barely moved from the start of the year to the end. Interpreting these results is not always easy and learning exactly “why” these data points occurred is not always clear. Next, we describe our assessment and improvement process and how we include the results in this process.

Student Learning Competencies, Benchmarks and Measures

Data we collect on student competencies are used to inform curriculum committee decisions; they also serve as the data source for faculty-led curriculum teams, which gather each semester to generate Course Reports. These Reports can include data from field evaluations, SWEAP, course evaluations, narratives from student evaluations, faculty observation, communication with instructors from other courses that precede or follow a sequenced course or that are taken at the same time as the course. These data are used to enhance curricula and continuously refine classroom and internship experiences so that our graduates are ready to provide competent service and visionary leadership in social work practice.

All full-time faculty members are assigned to a curriculum team which oversees an area of the curricula. A course report is completed by the instructors for each course in our programs and discussed in these teams. The course reports are completed the semester after the course was taught. If there are relevant Competency data, it is included along with recommendations related to the course from prior years. The purposes of these reports are to help ensure that 1) the desired outcomes (i.e., behaviors, values, etc.) associated with this course are appropriate for the course and taught in the course; and 2) ideas and recommendations for improving how the course is taught are documented and appropriate action taken. The reports are forward to the Curriculum Committee for approval. The reports are also made available to, associate deans, program directors, and faculty. During the next academic year, the reports are reviewed by the course instructors to track the disposition of each recommendation. Each report includes recommendations from past years with space for annual updates. In addition to following up on prior recommendations, there is space for making new recommendations.

The responsibility the MSW curriculum development, delivery, assessment, and improvement rests with the faculty. In the Fall of 2015 the faculty endorsed and adopted the nine *generalist* competencies in the 2015 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) of CSWE, and one *faith and practice* competency (34 generalist behaviors) and updated all generalist course syllabi. In the Spring and Summer of 2016 faculty expanded and enhanced the generalist competencies and developed advanced competencies and behaviors for our two MSW concentrations: 1) Clinical Practice (19 behaviors) and 2) Community Practice (23 behaviors). All advanced practice syllabi were updated during the Fall of 2017

1-Inadequate	2-Novice	3-Competent	4-Proficient	5-Excellent
Does not demonstrate competency	Demonstrates emerging competency	Demonstrates basic competency	Demonstrates strong competency	Demonstrates commendable competency

Conclusion

In summary students in the MSW program are within the acceptable range. Assessment this year does not indicate a need for any significant changes, but it does signal the need to for a closer look. During the 18-19 year we will use these data to make some decisions about curricular revision.

Our competency assessment plan for the 18-19 year will be more rigorous than this year as we will be using knowledge-based exams in the 2 areas of specialized practice in addition to using field evaluation scores. The Garland School is on track for CSWE reaffirmation and on track to submit our self-study in 2020.