

Date Submitted: **June 30, 2021**

College/School: **Diana R. Garland School of Social Work**

Department: **Social Work**

Program: **Master of Social Work (MSW)**

Contact Person: **Melody York Zuniga**

**Part 1: Introductory Content**

**Notable Achievement: Briefly describe one of the most notable student achievements of your program this year.**

*In the summer of 2020 the Garland School graduated our first cohort from the fully online MSW program. In the spring of 2021, we graduated four Global Mission Leadership scholars who completed internships in their home regions of Lebanon, Kenya, Nigeria, and Zambia. We also celebrated a May 2021 commencement with graduates from all three campuses walking the stage at graduation. While not provided in detail in this document, the community practice specialization met overall competency benchmarks for the knowledge assessment across all ten competencies.*

**Part 2: Student Learning Outcome Summary Table: Methods, Results, Interpretation, Alignment, and Improvements Planned or Implemented in Response to Results**  
 Please include at least one direct measure of learning for each outcome and at least two methods for assessing each learning outcome

**1. Outcome Name:** Ethical Integration of Faith & Practice **General Education Outcome? Christian Perspective**  
**Statement:** *Students will demonstrate an ethical integration of faith and practice in professional/clinical contexts.*

Assessment Methods	Assessment Results	Interpretation and Improvements
<b>1A. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Final exam: 5379 Advanced Clinical Practice with Individuals &amp; Families (questions 6, 9)</i> <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> <i>At least 80% of clinical students should correctly answer the 5379 exam questions associated with Competency 10</i>	<b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</b> <i>All three campuses exceeded the target for this assessment method.                      Comp#10: Ethically Integrate Faith &amp; Practice (99% Waco, 97.4% Houston, 96.7% Online)</i>	<b>Interpretation of Results:</b> <i>This is a strong area of learning in the clinical practice specialization.</i>  <b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> <i>n/a</i>
<b>1B. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>SWEAP FCAI Instrument and Book Review</i> <i>Comp#1: Ethical &amp; Professional Behavior</i> <i>Comp#10: Integration of Faith &amp; Practice</i> <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> <i>At least 80% of students should reach the benchmark of 50% correct responses</i>	<b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</b> <i>Comp#1: Ethical &amp; Professional Behavior (88% Waco, 100% Houston, 91% Online)                      Comp#10: Integration of Faith &amp; Practice (96% Waco, 100% Houston, 88% Online)</i>	<b>Interpretation of Results:</b> <i>This remains an area of strength in the MSW program.</i>  <b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> <i>n/a</i>
<b>1C. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i> <i>Comp#1: Ethical &amp; Professional Behavior</i> <i>Comp#10: Integration of Faith &amp; Practice</i> <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b>	<b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</b> <i>Comp#1: Ethical &amp; Professional Behavior (94.61% Generalist, 94% Clinical, 87% Community)</i>	<b>Interpretation of Results:</b> <i>This remains a stable area of learning in the MSW program.</i>  <b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b>

At least 80% of students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency	Comp#10: Integration of Faith & Practice (93.16% Generalist, 100% Clinical,95% Community)	n/a
<b>2. Outcome Name:</b> <i>Diversity, Human Rights &amp; Policy</i> <b>Statement:</b> <i>Students will be competent leaders in the field in the promotion of dignity and well-being for all people.</i>		<b>General Education Outcome? Civic Leadership</b>
<b>Assessment Methods with Performance Target</b>	<b>Achievement Status and Results</b>	<b>Interpretation and Improvements</b>
<b>2A. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Final exam: 5379 Advanced Clinical Practice with Individuals &amp; Families (questions 12, 23, 28, 30)</i>  <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> <i>At least 80% of clinical students should correctly answer the 5379 exam questions associated with Competencies 2, 3, and 5</i>	<b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Comp#2: Engaging Diversity in Practice (62.2% Waco, 63.2% Houston, 61.7% Online)</i> <i>Comp#3: Advancing Human Rights &amp; Justice (85% Waco, 87.7% Houston, 76.7% Online)</i> <i>Comp#5: Engaging in Policy Practice (81.6% Waco, 69.4% Houston, 68.3% Online)</i>	<b>Interpretation of Results:</b> <i>Competency 3 met the target score at the Waco &amp; Houston campuses, while competency 5 was met in Waco but not in Houston or online. For competency 2, the goal was not met at any of the three campuses, though scores were up compared to last year's results in Houston and online. For competency 5, the goal was met in Waco and online but fell short in Houston and online. This shows some continued need for attention in the policy course, but a greater need for examining the assessment method and various factors that could have impacted competency 2's results.</i>  <b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> <i>The curriculum team for clinical practice will be informed of lower results as they prepare to teach the course again in order to consider possible changes to address the unmet goals, appropriate assessment methods, and how needs may vary across campuses.</i>
<b>2B. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>SWEAP FCAI Instrument Competency #2, #3, #5</i> <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> <i>At least 80% of students should reach the benchmark of 50% correct responses</i>	<b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for extended version):</b>  <i>Comp#2: Engaging Diversity in Practice (92% Waco, 88% Houston, 100% Online)</i> <i>Comp#3: Advancing Human Rights &amp; Justice (96% Waco, 88% Houston, 88% Online)</i> <i>Comp#5: Engaging in Policy Practice (76% Waco, 88% Houston, 59% Online)</i>	<b>Interpretation of Results:</b> <i>While competencies 2 and 3 met the intended benchmark and all three campuses, the policy competency remains lower than others and worth continued attention. However, it is worth noting that the mean score for competency five, when compared to the national average, is higher on the Waco and Houston campuses, and comparable in the online campus. This implied needed attention to the policy competency at schools of social work more broadly.</i>  <b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> <i>The field directors and curriculum teams for policy will be informed of the continued lower results in policy at the generalist level, in time for the course reporting process.</i>
<b>2C. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Field Rubric Skill Ratings Competency #2, #3, #5</i>	<b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for extended version):</b>	<b>Interpretation of Results:</b>

<p><b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> At least 80% of students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency</p>	<p>Comp#2: Engaging Diversity in Practice (91.88% Generalist, 95% Clinical, 84% Community) Comp#3: Advancing Human Rights &amp; Justice (92.95% Generalist, 92% Clinical, 96% Community) Comp#5: Engaging in Policy Practice (82.91% Generalist, 93% Clinical, 82% Community)</p>	<p>This was a solid area for MSW students in applying these competencies in the field education component of the program.</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> N/A</p>
<p><b>3. Outcome Name:</b> <u>Research, Assessment &amp; Evaluation</u> <b>Statement:</b></p>		<p><b>General Education Outcome? Critical Thinking</b></p>
<p><b>Assessment Methods with Performance Target</b></p>	<p><b>Achievement Status and Results</b></p>	<p><b>Interpretation and Improvements</b></p>
<p><b>3A. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Final exam: 5379 Advanced Clinical Practice with Individuals &amp; Families</i> (question 1-5, 7, 8, 13-16, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 35, 36) <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> At least 80% of clinical students should correctly answer the 5379 exam questions associated with Competencies 4, 7</p>	<p><b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</b>  Comp#4: Research and Practice (64.5% Waco, 66.4% Houston, 66.7% Online) Comp#7: Assessment in Practice (84.3% Waco, 85% Houston, 81% Online)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b> While all campuses met the benchmark for competency 7, none of the three campuses met the benchmark for competency 4. This merits attention to the questions used to assess this competency as well as the content in the clinical curriculum that prepares students for applying this area of knowledge.</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> The curriculum team for clinical practice will be informed of lower results as they prepare to teach the course again in order to consider possible changes to address the unmet goals, appropriate assessment methods, and how needs may vary across campuses.</p>
<p><b>3B. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>SWEAP FCAI Instrument Competency #4, #7, #9</i> <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> At least 80% of students should reach the benchmark of 50% correct responses</p>	<p><b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</b>  Comp#4: Research and Practice (88% Waco, 88% Houston, 68% Online) Comp#7: Assessment in Practice (92% Waco, 100% Houston, 94% Online) Comp#9: Evaluation of Practice (80% Waco, 63% Houston, 82% Online)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b> All three competencies met benchmark at least two of three campuses. The research and practice competency was not met online, and evaluation of practice was not met in Houston. This merits attention on the content delivery and connection to the assessment measure.</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> The curriculum teams for policy will be informed of the continued lower results at the generalist level, in time for the course reporting process.</p>
<p><b>3C. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Field Rubric Skill Ratings Competency #4, #7, #9</i> <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> At least 80% of students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency.</p>	<p><b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</b>  Comp#4: Research and Practice (83.33% Generalist, 94% Clinical, 96% Community) Comp#7: Assessment in Practice (83.62% Generalist, 97% Clinical, 94.67% Community)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b> This was a solid area for MSW students in applying these competencies in the field education component of the program.</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> N/A</p>

	Comp#9: Evaluation of Practice (87.18% Generalist, 94% Clinical, 92% Community)	
<b>4. Outcome Name:</b> <i>Human Interaction &amp; Intervention</i>		<b>General Education Outcome? Communication</b>
<b>Statement:</b>		
<b>Assessment Methods with Performance Target</b>	<b>Achievement Status and Results</b>	<b>Interpretation and Improvements</b>
<p><b>4A. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Final exam: 5379 Advanced Clinical Practice with Individuals &amp; Families</i> (question 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18, 20-22, 26)</p> <p><b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> <i>At least 80% of clinical students should correctly answer the 5379 exam questions associated with Competencies 6, 8</i></p>	<p><b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</b></p> <p>Comp#6: <i>Engagement with Individuals &amp; Groups</i> (83% Waco, 73.7% Houston, 70% Online)</p> <p>Comp#8: <i>Intervention with Individuals &amp; Groups</i> (83.2% Waco, 85.3% Houston, 80% Online)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b></p> <p><i>Competency 6 falling below the benchmark at both the Houston and Online campuses is worth attention. All three campuses met the benchmark for competency 8.</i></p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b></p> <p><i>The curriculum team for clinical practice will be informed of lower results as they prepare to teach the course again in order to consider possible changes to address the unmet goals, appropriate assessment methods, and how needs may vary across campuses.</i></p>
<p><b>4B. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>SWEAP FCAI Instrument</i> Competency #6, #8</p> <p><b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> <i>At least 80% of students should reach the benchmark of 50% correct responses</i></p>	<p><b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</b></p> <p>Comp#6: <i>Engagement with Individuals &amp; Groups</i> (80% Waco, 63% Houston, 74% Online)</p> <p>Comp#8: <i>Intervention with Individuals &amp; Groups</i> (96% Waco, 88% Houston, 91% Online)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b></p> <p><i>Competency 6 falling below the benchmark at both the Houston and Online campuses is worth attention. While it met the benchmark, it was still a lower score than others for the Waco campus as well.</i></p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b></p> <p><i>The field directors and curriculum teams for the practice courses at the generalist level will be informed of these lower results in time for the course reporting process.</i></p>
<p><b>4C. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i> Competency #6, #8</p> <p><b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> <i>At least 80% of students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency.</i></p>	<p><b>Target/Criteria Status:</b> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</b></p> <p>Comp#6: <i>Engagement with Individuals &amp; Groups</i> (94.87% Generalist, 97% Clinical, 9%% Community)</p> <p>Comp#8: <i>Intervention with Individuals &amp; Groups</i> (92.56% Generalist, 95% Clinical, 84% Community)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b></p> <p><i>This was a solid area for MSW students in applying these competencies in the field education component of the program.</i></p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b></p> <p>N/A</p>

**Part 3: Follow-Ups on Prior Year Student Learning Outcomes Improvement Plans (IMPORTANT)**  
*Describe the status of any decisions or actions for improvement reported in prior years. Were changes/improvements initiated or completed? Do you have any evidence to date that they have been effective?*

*The Garland School of Social Work initiated improvements based on data from prior years. Competency teams met to review how competencies 5(Policy), 9(Evaluation), and 10(Faith & Practice Integration) could be strengthened. These team meetings generated ideas for content delivery, application, and measure that we hope will show improvement as they are implemented in future semesters. The clinical curriculum team continues to review the exam content in consideration of the most appropriate and effective assessment method for the specialized area of practice.*

--

**Part 4: Program Effectiveness Summary Table: Methods, Findings, Strategic Alignment and Actions/Budget Planned or Implemented in Response to Results (Optional)**

**1. Outcome Name/Statement:** *NA- No program effectiveness outcomes at this time*

<b>Alignment with which Institutional Goals:</b>		
Performance Measure and Achievement Target	Achievement Status and Results	Interpretation and Improvements
<u>Performance Measure:</u>	Target/Criteria Status: Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</u>	<u>Interpretation of Results:</u>
<u>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</u>		<u>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</u>

**2. Outcome Name/Statement:**

**Alignment with which Institutional Goals:**

Performance Measure and Achievement Target	Achievement Status and Results	Interpretation and Improvements
<u>Performance Measure:</u>	Target/Criteria Status: Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</u>	<u>Interpretation of Results:</u>
<u>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</u>		<u>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</u>

**3. Outcome Name/Statement:**

**Alignment with which Institutional Goals:**

Performance Measure and Achievement Target	Achievement Status and Results	Interpretation and Improvements
<u>Performance Measure:</u>	Target/Criteria Status: Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</u>	<u>Interpretation of Results:</u>
<u>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</u>		<u>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</u>

**Part 5: Assessment Team and Review Process Description**

*Please provide a description of how this report was compiled.*

Team: Assessment team consists of Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Program Manager for Academic Affairs, MSW program Director, Academic Consultant & Instructional Designer, Curriculum Committee & Chairs, and all full-time faculty members through curriculum teams, with specific input from field and clinical practice faculty members.

Process: 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, 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.

**Part 6: APPENDICES-program context, curriculum matrix, data analysis details, assessment rubrics or other supporting documents (OPTIONAL)**

**Master of Social Work Program  
SACSCOC Report of Progress  
Academic Year 2020-2021**

**2020-2021 Assessment Method**

The final field rubrics were used as a key direct measure of student learning outcomes across all levels of the MSW curriculum. The field education seminar course includes a required internship/practicum component at both the generalist and specialized levels. Field Instructors that supervise the students' activities in agencies rate the student's competence across all nine of CSWE's competencies as well as the added tenth competency (ethical integration of faith and practice) as part of a final field evaluation, which informs the rubric completed by the instructor of the final field seminar/course. Then seminar instructors use those ratings, plus their own observations, to rate students. To successfully complete the field experience, a rating of 3-competent is expected. However, we have set a goal for this year that even with all adjustments made for Covid-19 continued safety precautions and distance-learning opportunities, at least 80% of our students would still rate as 4-Proficient or 5-excellent across the ten competencies.

The field rubrics measure skill, but measures for knowledge were also attained. For the generalist level of the MSW curriculum, knowledge of competencies 1-9 is assessed through the FCAI, an instrument, which is part of Social Work Education Assessment Project (SWEAP). This MSW generalist curricular assessment tool evaluates the knowledge of our MSW students completing the generalist course content. FCAI stands for Foundation Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI), and is used by programs across the country, which 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. For the Garland School benchmarks, the faculty expects that at the end of the MSW generalist curriculum, 80% of students will correctly answer at least 50% of the questions in each competency area correctly on the FCAI. Knowledge of competency 10 is measured through two components on a book review in a course that falls at the end of the practice curriculum and requires students to demonstrate knowledge of how an ethical integration of faith and practice is applied. Students are expected to achieve 32 of the 40 available points to demonstrate competency, and the benchmark for the MSW program is that 80% or more of our students would demonstrate competency.

We also utilized a knowledge-based assessments for the clinical and community specializations in the advanced year. The community specialization (offered at the Waco and Online campuses) was analyzed via an integrated practice rubric that pulled data from multiple courses. The clinical specialization (offered at all three campuses) was analyzed via a final exam in the clinical practice course. 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**

**Table 1: Generalist Assessment Results: Generalist (Waco, Houston, and Online combined)**

Competence Area	Knowledge Results	Skill Results	Combined
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	<b>79%</b>	<b>94.61%</b>	<b>86.8%</b>
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	<b>85%</b>	<b>91.88%</b>	<b>88.4%</b>
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	<b>81%</b>	<b>92.95%</b>	<b>87%</b>
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	<b>67%</b>	<b>83.33%</b>	<b>75.2%</b>
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	<b>58%</b>	<b>82.91%</b>	<b>70.5%</b>
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	<b>67%</b>	<b>94.87%</b>	<b>80.9%</b>
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	<b>82%</b>	<b>89.42%</b>	<b>85.7%</b>
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	<b>82%</b>	<b>92.56%</b>	<b>87.3%</b>
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	<b>72%</b>	<b>87.18%</b>	<b>79.6%</b>
10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice	<b>93%</b>	<b>93.16%</b>	<b>93.1%</b>

**Table 2: Specialized Assessment Results: Clinical (Waco, Houston, and Online combined)**

Competence Area	Knowledge Results	Skill Results	Combined
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	<b>60%</b>	<b>94.19%</b>	<b>77.1%</b>
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	<b>62%</b>	<b>95.35%</b>	<b>78.6%</b>
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	<b>83%</b>	<b>91.86%</b>	<b>87.43%</b>
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	<b>66%</b>	<b>93.6%</b>	<b>79.8%</b>
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	<b>75%</b>	<b>93.02%</b>	<b>84%</b>
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	<b>77%</b>	<b>97.09%</b>	<b>87%</b>
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	<b>83%</b>	<b>96.9%</b>	<b>90%</b>
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	<b>83%</b>	<b>94.96%</b>	<b>89%</b>
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	<b>72%</b>	<b>94.19%</b>	<b>83.1%</b>
10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice	<b>98%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>99%</b>

**Table 3: Specialized Assessment Results: Community (Waco and Online combined)**

Competence Area	Knowledge Results	Skill Results	Combined
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	<b>100%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>93.5%</b>
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	<b>100%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>92%</b>
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	<b>100%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>98%</b>
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	<b>96%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>96%</b>
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	<b>100%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>91%</b>
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	<b>100%</b>	<b>94.67%</b>	<b>97.33%</b>
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	<b>100%</b>	<b>94.67%</b>	<b>97.33%</b>
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	<b>100%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>92%</b>
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	<b>100%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>96%</b>
10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice	<b>96%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>95.5%</b>

### **Conclusion**

In summary, students in the MSW program at across all three campuses performing satisfactorily and competently in field, with a majority performing at a proficient or excellent level. 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 21-22 year we will use these data to inform future conversations about curricular improvement revision. We will also continue conversation about the tools used to assess the knowledge competency across the levels and campuses of the MSW program, to ensure the data we gather is as accurate and helpful as possible.

The Garland School is set to receive word about CSWE accreditation reaffirmation by the start of the 2021-2022 academic year.