

 **Baylor University** Assessment Report: Student Learning Outcomes & Program Effectiveness (SLOPE)

Date Submitted: 6-30-2022

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

Department: Social Work

Program: Bachelor of Social Work

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.

The Garland School of Social Work celebrated three BSW students for their contribution to the school, the social work profession, their colleagues and their internships this year. Maddie Gonzales was recognized as BSW intern of the year. Maddie completed her internship with a local dropout prevention program, focused on a combined middle school after one school's campus had burned down. She helped students work toward their goals related to anxiety, anger, behavior, social service needs, and social-emotional learning. Anais Tello was recognized as the BSW Spirit of Social Work awardee for the ways she excelled and served at her internship, in the Phi Theta Kappa and Phi Alpha Honor Societies, and in the Leave Your Mark program with Baylor's Multicultural Affairs Office. Micaela Jones received the BSW Outstanding Student award. All three now-graduates are transition to graduate social work programs, one at Baylor and the other two at top-rated schools of social work.

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 and Practice **General Education Outcome? Christian Perspective**
Statement: GSSW students ethically integrate faith as it relates to the worker, client, and context of their practice.

Assessment Methods	Assessment Results	Interpretation and Improvements
<p>1A. Assessment Type: Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment Method: <i>Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i> <i>Comp#1: Ethical & Professional Behavior</i> <i>Comp#10: Integration of Faith & Practice</i></p> <p>Performance Target/Criteria for Success: At least 80% of students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency.</p>	<p>Target/Criteria Status: Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts): <i>Comp#1: Ethical & Professional Behavior (92%)</i> <i>Comp#10: Integration of Faith & Practice (86.67%)</i> See appendix for details regarding the measure and interpretation.</p>	<p>Interpretation of Results: <i>This remains a strong area of competency for students in the social work major.</i></p> <p>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement: N/A</p>
<p>1B. Assessment Type: Direct <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment Method: <i>Enrolled Student Survey: General Education Outcomes</i> <i>Developing/Clarifying Personal Value/Ethics</i> <i>Identifying Moral and Ethical Issues</i> <i>Placing Current Problems in Perspective</i></p> <p>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</p>	<p>Target/Criteria Status: Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts): <i>Developing/Clarifying Personal Value/Ethics:</i> BU: 69.1% GSSW: 84.6% <i>Identifying Moral and Ethical Issues:</i> BU: 73% GSSW: 76.9% <i>Placing Current Problems in Perspective:</i> BU: 61.5% GSSW: 69.3%</p>	<p>Interpretation of Results: <i>This remains a strong area of the student experience as a GSSW student within the larger Baylor University context.</i></p> <p>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement: N/A</p>

<p>Social Work program students will have a higher percentage of “very much” or “quite a bit” responses regarding contribution to these areas when compared to the overall university percentage.</p>		
<p>2. Outcome Name: Diversity, Human Rights, and Policy Statement: Students will be competent leaders in the field in the promotion of dignity and well-being for all people.</p>		<p>General Education Outcome? Civic Leadership</p>
<p>Assessment Methods with Performance Target</p>	<p>Achievement Status and Results</p>	<p>Interpretation and Improvements</p>
<p>2A. Assessment Type: Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment Method: <i>Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i> Competency #2, #3, #5</p> <p>Performance Target/Criteria for Success: At least 80% of students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency.</p>	<p>Target/Criteria Status: Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</p> <p>Comp#2: Engaging Diversity in Practice (88%) Comp#3: Advancing Human Rights & Justice (80%) Comp#5: Engaging in Policy Practice (80%)</p>	<p>Interpretation of Results: These results show an improvement from the past year when this target was only partially met. Competency 3 raised 6 percentage points this year and Competency 5 rose 20 points.</p> <p>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement: Continue current efforts at clarifying the application of policy practice at the BSW level and strengthening student understanding of how students can advance human rights for their clients.</p>
<p>2B. Assessment Type: Direct <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment Method: <i>Enrolled Student Survey:</i> General Education Outcomes <i>Creating Original Ideas and Solutions</i> <i>Leadership Skills</i> <i>Relating Well to People of Different Races, Nations, and Religions</i></p> <p>Performance Target/Criteria for Success: Social Work program students will have a higher percentage of “very much” or “quite a bit” responses regarding contribution to these areas when compared to the overall university percentage.</p>	<p>Target/Criteria Status: Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for extended version):</p> <p><i>Formulating Original Ideas and Solutions:</i> BU: 73.2% GSSW: 84.7%</p> <p><i>Leadership Skills:</i> BU: 68%. GSSW: 84.6%</p> <p><i>Relating Well to People of Different Races, Nations, and Religions:</i> BU: 63.3% GSSW: 69.2%</p>	<p>Interpretation of Results: These results affirm the efforts of the GSSW to increase diverse voices and engagement for social work student development.</p> <p>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement: Continue efforts at implementing the recommendations from the department’s Race Equity Work Team (REWT).</p>
<p>3. Outcome Name: Research, Assessment, and Evaluation Statement: Students will understand and apply evidence-informed practice with clients of all system sizes and contexts of practice.</p>		<p>General Education Outcome? Critical Thinking</p>
<p>Assessment Methods with Performance Target</p>	<p>Achievement Status and Results</p>	<p>Interpretation and Improvements</p>
<p>3A. Assessment Type: Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment Method: <i>Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i> Competency #4, #7, #9</p> <p>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</p>	<p>Target/Criteria Status: Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</p> <p>Comp#4: Research and Practice (76%) Comp#7: Assessment in Practice (81%) Comp#9: Evaluation of Practice (73.33%)</p>	<p>Interpretation of Results: While competency 4 is slightly higher than the previous year, competencies 4 and 9 remain under the benchmark. Though all students were rated 3-competent or higher on competency 9, and all but two on</p>

<p>At least 80% of students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency.</p>		<p>competency 4, this shows an area needing continued attention.</p> <p>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement: The Field Education office is working with the Research faculty to develop guides and examples for how this competency can be met at a BSW level within the internship context. The Evaluation of Practice results will be shared with practice and research faculty in a curriculum discussion about how evaluation curricular content can be strengthened in order to support student application in the field setting.</p>
<p>3B. Assessment Type: Direct <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment Method: Enrolled Student Survey: General Education Outcomes <i>Evaluating/Choosing bet. Alternative Courses of Action</i> <i>Synthesizing & Integrating Ideas & Information</i> <i>Thinking Critically</i></p> <p>Performance Target/Criteria for Success: <i>Social Work program students will have a higher percentage of “very much” or “quite a bit” responses regarding contribution to these areas when compared to the overall university percentage.</i></p>	<p>Target/Criteria Status: Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</p> <p><i>Evaluating/Choosing bet. Alternative Courses of Action:</i> <i>BU: 70.2% GSSW: 69.2%</i></p> <p><i>Synthesizing & Integrating Ideas & Information:</i> <i>BU: 77.3% GSSW: 84.6%</i></p> <p><i>Thinking Critically:</i> <i>BU:83.1% GSSW: 92.3%</i></p>	<p>Interpretation of Results: <i>The results for “Evaluating/Choosing between Alternative Courses of Action” fell just below the benchmark, while the other two categories solidly met the benchmark. This shows that critical thinking overall is not a challenge for GSSW students, though specific focus on considering alternative courses of action deserves attention.</i></p> <p>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement: <i>I will present these results along with other assessment results to the GSSW faculty including the curriculum committee. We will discuss which aspects of our implicit and explicit curriculum give the greatest opportunity to address these areas that GSSW students fell below university average and determine appropriate next steps.</i></p>
<p>4. Outcome Name: Human Interaction and Intervention General Education Outcome? Communication Statement: Students will demonstrate skillful and empathic communication in their work with clients and constituents.</p>		
<p>Assessment Methods with Performance Target</p> <p>4A. Assessment Type: Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment Method: <i>Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i> <i>Competency #6, #8</i></p> <p>Performance Target/Criteria for Success: <i>At least 80% of students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency.</i></p>	<p>Achievement Status and Results</p> <p>Target/Criteria Status: Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts):</p> <p><i>Comp#6: Engagement with Individuals & Groups (92%)</i> <i>Comp#8: Intervention with Individuals & Groups (67.2%)</i></p>	<p>Interpretation and Improvements</p> <p>Interpretation of Results: <i>While competency 8 did not meet the benchmark, all students did score 3-competent or higher. However, with a benchmark that pushes beyond competence toward proficiency, it is important to examine why competency 8 would have scored lower this year than in the past.</i></p> <p>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement: <i>The Associate Dean, BSW Program Director, and Director of Field Education will meet to review the competencies that fell below the benchmark. The review will consider potential circumstances unique to the last academic year</i></p>

		as well as opportunities for improvement within the curriculum or in how students are supported in applying the competency and its behaviors in the field setting.
4B. Assessment Type: Direct <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment Method: Enrolled Student Survey: General Education Outcomes <i>Communicating Well Orally</i> <i>Reading or Speaking a Foreign Language</i> <i>Writing Clearly and Effectively</i> Performance Target/Criteria for Success: <i>Social Work program students will have a higher percentage of “very much” or “quite a bit” responses regarding contribution to these areas when compared to the overall university percentage.</i>	Target/Criteria Status: Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts): <i>Communicating Well Orally:</i> <i>BU: 72.8% GSSW: 69.3%</i> <i>Reading or Speaking a Foreign Language:</i> <i>BU: 40.3% GSSW: 38.5%</i> <i>Writing Clearly and Effectively:</i> <i>BU: 71% GSSW: 92.38%</i>	Interpretation of Results: <i>These results indicate success in the GSSW with preparation for clear written communication, while they show students falling just under the university average in how they perceive their preparation for oral communication in general and in regard to foreign languages.</i> Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement: <i>I will present these results along with other assessment results to the GSSW faculty including the curriculum committee. We will discuss which aspects of our implicit and explicit curriculum give the greatest opportunity to address these areas that GSSW students fell below university average and determine appropriate next steps.</i>

Part 3: Follow-Ups on Prior Year Student Learning Outcomes Improvement Plans (IMPORTANT) <i>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?</i>
<i>Last year’s report showed a need for attention for GSSW competencies 3, 4, 5, and 9 in either the field rubric or the knowledge assessment conducted that year. These competencies were regarding advancing human rights, research-informed practice, policy practice, and evaluation of practice. Faculty discussions took place via leadership teams (Associate Dean, Program Director, Field Director), curriculum committee, curriculum and course teaching teams. Program leadership and curriculum committee leaders created a curriculum matrix as a resource for faculty to see more detail regarding where various knowledge points were addressed and any potential for gaps or overlaps. Competencies 3 and 5 met the field benchmark this year, while competences 4 and 9 still fall 4-7 points below the benchmark.</i>

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: The GSSW will foster growth and belonging for all students in a supportive and caring community. Alignment with which Institutional Goals: University Value and Commitment of a “Caring Community”		
Performance Measure and Achievement Target	Achievement Status and Results	Interpretation and Improvements
Performance Measure: GSSW Implicit Curriculum Student Survey (Diversity & Difference) <i>(1) I am flourishing at the GSSW</i> <i>(2) I feel safe at the GSSW</i> <i>(4) People of color flourish at the GSSW</i> <i>(5) Sexual minorities flourish at the GSSW</i> <i>(8) I am able to be myself without fear or anxiety</i> <i>(9) Garland School faculty value me</i>	Target/Criteria Status: Met <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts): <i>The benchmark was fully met for 9 of the 11 items: Items 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 16.</i>	Interpretation of Results: <i>These results indicate a large positive experience of belonging for GSSW BSW students, though less so for students who identify with a non-majority racial, ethnic, or sexual identity. This emphasizes the importance of continued efforts at inclusion that have already begun through the recommendations of the Race Equity Work Team (REWT).</i>

<p>(10) Garland School staff value me (11) GSSW students/peers value me (12) I feel excluded at the Garland School (15) I belong at the Garland School (16) I withhold parts of myself to fit in at the GSSW</p> <p>Performance Target/Criteria for Success: Mean score of 2.25 or lower on items 12 and 16, mean score of 3.75 or higher on all others listed</p>	<p>The benchmark was partially met for item 4, as BSW score met the benchmark even though the overall GSSW score fell just below at 3.68.</p> <p>The benchmark was not met for item 5, falling just below for both the BSW score (3.56) and overall score (3.68).</p> <p>(See details in Appendix B below).</p>	<p>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement: The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will host a meeting with the DEI Consultant and Program Directors to review the findings from the survey and determine what efforts may be contributing to these positive scores as well as what may be contributing to the lower scores. Based on that conversation, next steps with the DEI Consultant, DEI committee, and larger faculty and staff body will be identified. Additionally, survey results will be shared with GSSW faculty and staff in order to celebrate areas of strength and identify strategies for improvement, specifically for items 4 and 5.</p>
<p>2. Outcome Name/Statement: The GSSW will provide a learning environment that is fair and encourages academic and professional learning and growth. Alignment with which Institutional Goals: University Value and Commitment of “Top Tier Academics”</p>		
<p>Performance Measure and Achievement Target</p>	<p>Achievement Status and Results</p>	<p>Interpretation and Improvements</p>
<p>Performance Measure: GSSW Implicit Curriculum Student Survey (Diversity & Difference) (6) Faculty discriminate against me (7) My perspectives are welcomed and valued in the GSSW (13) My assignments are graded fairly (14) The GSSW supports my academic success</p> <p>Performance Target/Criteria for Success: Mean score of 1.5 or lower on item 6, mean score of 3.75 or higher on all others listed</p>	<p>Target/Criteria Status: Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Brief Summary of Results (use Appendix for details/charts): All four areas met the benchmark for both the Overall GSSW Score and the BSW Student Core. (See details in Appendix B below).</p>	<p>Interpretation of Results: GSSW leadership is pleased to these items as areas of strength for the BSW student experience.</p> <p>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement: The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will host a meeting with the DEI Consultant and Program Directors to review the findings from the survey and determine what efforts may be contributing to these positive scores, so that such efforts can continue with intentionality. Additionally, survey results will be shared with GSSW faculty and staff in order to celebrate areas of strength and identify strategies for improvement where needed.</p>

<p>Part 5: Assessment Team and Review Process Description Please provide a description of how this report was compiled.</p>
<p>Team: The assessment team for these direct measures consists of Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Program Manager for Academic Affairs, Academic Consultant & Instructional Designer, and the Field Education office, with input from the BSW Program Director. The Enrolled Student Survey was facilitated by the university and information was distributed to academic units. The team overseeing the implicit curriculum survey on diversity and difference included the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Program Manager for Academic Affairs, Academic Consultant & Instructional Designer, with help and/or input from the dean, DEI consultant, BSW program Director, BSW Program Manager, and previous Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.</p> <p>Process: The Field Rubric is completed by the Field Liaisons who directly observe and assess student competence in applying their knowledge, skills, and cognitive and affective processes in the internship setting. An overall rating of 3-competent or higher is required for students to complete the internship program, but the GSSW has set a benchmark for at least 80% of our students to reach 4-proficient or 5-excellent. The Liaisons rate the competency of the students in their sections, and the data is compiled and analyzed by the Field Education Program manager. The Field Program manager provides the summary data to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs as well as to the Directors of Field Education for review. The Enrolled Student Survey data is made available to department leadership by the university. The implicit survey regarding diversity and difference at the GSSW was created and conducted a few years ago as part of our self-study processes under the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). The team noted above reviewed the questions for any needed updates and sent the survey to all students within the social work major. The survey was voluntary, and received a 34%</p>

response rate. While this cannot be definitively generalized to the experience of all our students, it does give the GSSW leadership an idea of where strengths and areas of growth exist in making all students feel safe, welcomed, and supported during their social work studies.

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

Appendix A: Field Rubric Summary Table:

Competence Area	% Proficient or Excellent (4+ on a 5-pt scale)
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	92%
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	88%
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	80%
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	76%
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	80%
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	92%
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	81%
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	67.2%
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	73.33%
10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice	86.67%

Appendix B: Implicit Curriculum Survey Results Summary Table:(green = benchmark met, yellow = slightly under benchmark)

Question	Measure (mean score on 1-5 scale)	Overall GSSW	BSW
1. I am flourishing at the GSSW	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	3.86	3.75
2. I feel safe at the GSSW	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	4.49	4.44
3. I perpetuate microaggressions at the GSSW	(1=never, 2=sometimes)	1.26	1.38
4. People of color flourish in the GSSW	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	3.64	3.75
5. Sexual minorities flourish in the GSSW	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	3.68	3.56
6. Faculty discriminate against me	(1=never, 2=sometimes)	1.16	1.13
7. My perspectives are welcomed or valued in the GSSW	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	4.16	4.13
8. I am able to be myself without fear or anxiety in the GSSW	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	3.98	3.75
9. Garland School faculty value me	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	4.34	4.37
10. Garland School staff value me	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	4.15	4.19
11. GSSW students/peers value me	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	4.26	4.0
12. I feel excluded at the Garland School	(1=never, 2=sometimes)	1.58	1.56
13. My assignments are graded fairly	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	4.31	4.19
14. The GSSW supports my academic success	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	4.34	4.38
15. I belong in the Garland School	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	4.26	4.06
16. I withhold parts of myself to fit in at the Garland School	(1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=half time)	2.02	2.19

