

**Diana R. Garland School of Social Work**  
**Master of Social Work Program**  
**SACSCOC Report of Progress**  
**Academic Year 2019-2020**

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's accreditation with CSWE was reaffirmed in June 2013. As part of the 8-year cycle, we submit a new self-study to CSWE in 2020 for reaffirmation in 2021. The 2018-2019 academic year is considered our "snapshot" year for the self-study. As part of this process, we have collected data to assess both our explicit and implicit curricula and are reviewing all the resources we have to support our mission (including all full time and adjunct faculty members). During the 2016-2017 academic year, The Garland School transitioned from the 2008 EPAS to the 2015 in our curricula. We used that year as an opportunity to 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.

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.

### **Student Learning Competencies, Benchmarks and Measures**

In the 2017-2018 year, we assessed our students at two levels, generalist and advanced. We assessed the generalist (foundation) knowledge using the 1) SWEAP FCAI and the 2) (foundation) final internship field rubric scores. This tool is called the Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI) and "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](https://www.sweapinstruments.org/?page_id=2256)). The FCAI 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 social work students get half correct and half are missed. Therefore 50% correct is the "norm" or considered demonstration of competent knowledge.

We assessed the specialized year or advanced year primarily through the final field rubric. This electronic rubric is completed by faculty who teach the final field course based largely on the final evaluation document that asks internship supervisors to assess the competency of the student in the internship setting. For the 17-18 year we also 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 did not include the scores for program evaluation. This pilot prepared us for this "snapshot year" when exams were used in each area of specialized practice in all sections.

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.

The rubric used on the field rubric is copied below:

| 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 |

Through our 17-18 assessment we found that based on aggregate data we met our benchmarks, but individual competency areas still deserved further attention. We focused on two main areas: 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. Data was shared with the faculty so that curriculum teams focused on courses that address content connected to those competencies could consider the data in the course review process.

### **2018-2019 Assessment Method**

For the 18-19 year we continued to use the assessment process described above for the purposes of this report. Since the SWEAP FCAI does not assess our 10<sup>th</sup> competency, we added the Religion and Spirituality Integrated Practice Assessment Scale (RSIPAS) for the 18-19 academic year to measure our student’s knowledge around the 10<sup>th</sup> competency, while the field rubric assesses the skill for our 10<sup>th</sup> competency. Our field assessment/evaluations are now captured online and this is our second year using the web-based rubric to capture these data. The RSIPAS data will be analyzed later this year as part of our self-assessment for CSWE that is currently underway. We also added a knowledge-based assessment for both the clinical and community specializations in the advanced year in order to prepare for our self-study for reaffirmation of CSWE accreditation. That data is not included in this report as we are still determining the most helpful ways to analyze the data we have gathered in order for us to see our strengths and growth areas as they related to the ten competencies. All of these data will be used in our continuous curriculum improvement and enhancement process, which we broadly outline after these data are displayed.

### **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 scores from the final field rubrics are displayed for the generalist year (both campuses together in Table 5) and the two areas of specialized practice (Tables 6 & 7).

**Table 1 Waco Campus End of Generalist Year (FCAI)**

|                    | <b>Score<br/>Average%<br/>Correct</b> | <b>Score Range</b> | <b># Students Meeting &amp;<br/>Exceeding Competency</b> |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Program<br>N=29    | 73.85 %                               | 56.60 - 92.45 %    | 29/29 (100 %)  |
| National<br>N=1901 | 64.87 %                               | 0.00 - 92.45 %     |  |

Meeting & Exceeding Competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct.


**Table 2 Houston Campus End of Generalist Year (FCAI)**

|                    | <b>Score<br/>Average%<br/>Correct</b> | <b>Score Range</b> | <b># Students Meeting &amp;<br/>Exceeding Competency</b> |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Program<br>N=6     | 74.53 %                               | 49.06 - 92.45 %    | 5/6 (83 %)   |
| National<br>N=1872 | 64.73 %                               | 0.00 - 92.45 %     |  |

**Table 3 Waco Campus Generalist Curriculum**

| <b>Curricular Area</b>   | <b>Mean<br/>Section<br/>Score% Q<br/>Correct</b> | <b>Mean National<br/>Section Score% Q<br/>Correct</b> | <b># Students Meeting &amp;<br/>Exceeding Competency</b> |
|--|--|---|--|
| 1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior                            | 74.38 %  | 66.81 %   | 27/29 (93 %)   |
| 2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice                              | 79.89 %  | 69.13 %   | 27/29 (93 %)   |
| 3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice     | 83.33 %  | 69.90 %   | 29/29 (100 %)  |
| 4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice      | 70.94 %  | 57.77 %   | 24/29 (83 %)   |
| 5 : Engage in Policy Practice  | 62.07 %  | 51.47 %   | 20/29 (69 %)   |
| 6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities | 66.90 %  | 59.14 %   | 23/29 (79 %)   |
| 7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities     | 77.93 %  | 75.15 %   | 28/29 (97 %)   |
| 8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families,                                    | 85.52 %  | 78.25 %   | 29/29 (100 %)  |

|  |         |         |              |
|--|---------|---------|--------------|
| Groups, Organizations, and Communities   |         |         |              |
| 9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | 66.21 % | 61.78 % | 20/29 (69 %) |

 Meeting & Exceeding Competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct.

**Table 4 Houston Campus Generalist Curriculum**

| <b>Curricular Area</b>   | <b>Mean Section Score% Q Correct</b> | <b>Mean National Section Score% Q Correct</b> | <b># Students Meeting &amp; Exceeding Competency</b> |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior  | 71.43 %                              | 66.69 %                                       | 6/6 (100 %)  |
| 2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice  | 77.78 %                              | 68.96 %                                       | 6/6 (100 %)  |
| 3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice                 | 80.56 %                              | 69.69 %                                       | 6/6 (100 %)  |
| 4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice                  | 76.19 %                              | 57.57 %                                       | 5/6 (83 %)   |
| 5 : Engage in Policy Practice  | 61.90 %                              | 51.30 %                                       | 3/6 (50 %)   |
| 6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities             | 63.33 %                              | 59.02 %                                       | 4/6 (67 %)   |
| 7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities                 | 80.00 %                              | 75.11 %                                       | 6/6 (100 %)  |
| 8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities         | 83.33 %                              | 78.14 %                                       | 5/6 (83 %)   |
| 9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | 80.00 %                              | 61.71 %                                       | 5/6 (83 %)   |

 Meeting number of questions correct. & Exceeding Competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total

**Table 5 Final Field Rubrics: Generalist (Waco and Houston)**

| Competence Area  | % Proficient or Higher |
|--|------------------------|
| 1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior  | <b>91.58%</b>          |
| 2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice  | <b>92.99%</b>          |
| 3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice                 | <b>92.11%</b>          |
| 4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice                  | <b>73.69%</b>          |
| 5 : Engage in Policy Practice  | <b>71.05%</b>          |
| 6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities             | <b>93.43%</b>          |
| 7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities                 | <b>90.79%</b>          |
| 8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities         | <b>91.06%</b>          |
| 9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | <b>77.63%</b>          |
| 10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice  | <b>75.44%</b>          |

**Table 6 Final Field Rubrics: Clinical Specialization**

| Competence Area  | % Proficient or Higher |
|--|------------------------|
| 1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior  | <b>92.76%</b>          |
| 2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice  | <b>89.86%</b>          |
| 3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice                 | <b>74.64%</b>          |
| 4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice                  | <b>85.51%</b>          |
| 5 : Engage in Policy Practice  | <b>56.52%</b>          |
| 6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities             | <b>89.86%</b>          |
| 7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities                 | <b>83.59%</b>          |
| 8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities         | <b>83.09%</b>          |
| 9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | <b>69.57%</b>          |
| 10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice  | <b>92.75%</b>          |

**(Competency Scale for the Final Field Evaluation and Final Field Rubric)**

| 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 |

**Table 7 Final Field Rubrics: Community Specialization**

| Competence Area  | % Proficient or Higher |
|--|------------------------|
| 1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior  | <b>88.89%</b>          |
| 2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice  | <b>93.33%</b>          |
| 3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice                 | <b>100%</b>            |
| 4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice                  | <b>83.34%</b>          |
| 5 : Engage in Policy Practice  | <b>86.67%</b>          |
| 6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities             | <b>84.45%</b>          |
| 7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities                 | <b>95.56%</b>          |
| 8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities         | <b>86.67%</b>          |
| 9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | <b>86.67%</b>          |
| 10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice  | <b>86.67%</b>          |

### Use of Results

Upon examination of the results, there are several areas that merit further attention. Overall, our students in both campuses are meeting the expected benchmarks for knowledge and skills. Individual competencies show the weaker areas for attention. In the Waco program competencies 4, 5, 6, and 9 are below the 85% benchmark for knowledge. In the Houston 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 are below the 85% benchmark. While these scores did not reflect our benchmark of 85% of our students meeting or exceeding competency, we are pleased to see our students still score higher than the national average. This reflects a potential challenge in social work education overall, and reflects the need for exploring solutions in our individual program.

Competencies 4 (Practice-informed research and research-informed practice), 5 (Policy practice), 6 (Engaging in practice), and 9 (Evaluating practice) are on the lower end at one or both campuses for the second year in a row, with competency 5 also falling just under the 60% benchmark in the clinical field/skill assessment. We will bring this information to the faculty and encourage consideration of the results among the various curriculum teams outlined earlier in this document. A helpful factor with the SWEAP instrument is that it provides information on specific questions that were missed, which can help the curriculum teams gain a more accurate picture of content that was not as strong for this cohort as they consider preparations for future iterations of their courses.

### Conclusion

In summary, students in the MSW program at both the Waco and Houston campuses are meeting or exceeding knowledge competency above the national average. While our assessment data does not indicate a need for significant change, it does raise particular curricular items that deserve more attention in order to reach our stated competency benchmark. During the 19-20 year we will use these data to inform future conversations about curricular improvement revision. We will also complete the analysis of data from the RSIPAS and the clinical and community specialized content assessments that will

continue to inform our forward movement as a program.

Our competency assessment plan for the 19-20 year will be a continuation of the process used this year as well as the addition of the RSIPAS and specialized knowledge results, as we will continue to monitor data and improvement across consistent data points. The Garland School is on track for CSWE reaffirmation and on track to submit our self-study in 2020.