

 **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: **Master 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 four MSW students for their contribution to the school, the social work profession, their colleagues, and their internships this year. Carley Weixelman, a student from our Online MSW campus, was recognized as the MSW Clinical Intern of the Year. She provided counseling to uninsured individuals for two academic terms as part of her final MSW internship and was recognized for her excellence in that role. Geneece Goertzen received the award of MSW Community Intern of the Year, providing support to church leaders as they support the needs of people in their congregations. She also conducted a research project on domestic violence and the church's response. Briana Fowler received the MSW Spirit of Social Work award and provided mental health and crisis response services with a local school district's high school campus. The MSW Outstanding Student award was given to Trinity Martinez, who also provided mental health support services to college students.*

*The Garland School is also pleased to see that our Waco and Houston campus first-year students met all field rubric benchmarks across the ten competencies this spring. Our advanced Community Practice specialization students met the benchmark in all ten competencies for the entire year, and Waco and Online campus students met all clinical field benchmarks. This is impressive, as our performance target was set for ratings of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, even though the 3-competent rating is what is needed to complete the program.*

**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:** Students will demonstrate an ethical integration of faith and practice in social work settings at the generalist and advanced levels.

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 (98.3% Waco, 97.7% Houston, 99% Online)</i>	<b>Interpretation of Results:</b> <i>This remains a strong area of competency for students in the MSW Program.</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>Generalist Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i> <i>Comp#1: Ethical &amp; Professional Behavior                      Comp#10: Integration of Faith &amp; Practice</i> <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b>	<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> <i>Comp#1: Ethical &amp; Professional Behavior (96% Waco, 100% Houston, 92.9% Online)</i>	<b>Interpretation of Results:</b> <i>This continues to be a strong area for first-year MSW students, as the online program fell just .01 below the benchmark.</i>  <b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b>

<p>At least 80% of first-year students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency</p>	<p>Comp#10: Integration of Faith &amp; Practice (96% Waco, 100% Houston, 79.9% Online)</p>	<p>The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will consult with the Online MSW Program Manager and Field Director to determine additional supports for students understanding the application of the competency in the field setting.</p>
<p><b>1C. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/>  <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Advanced Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i>  Comp#1: Ethical &amp; Professional Behavior  Comp#10: Integration of Faith &amp; Practice  <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b>  At least 80% of advanced students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency</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>   <b>Clinical Specialization:</b>  Comp#1: Ethical &amp; Professional Behavior (95.6% Waco, 84.8% Houston, 83.8% Online)  Comp#10: Integration of Faith &amp; Practice (100% Waco, 78.3% Houston, 99% Online)   <b>Community Specialization:</b>  Comp#1: Ethical &amp; Professional Behavior (94.5% Waco, N/A Houston, 100% Online)  Comp#10: Integration of Faith &amp; Practice (100% Waco, N/A Houston, 100% Online)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b>  This continues to be a strong area for advanced MSW students, with only one campus falling 1.7 points below benchmark in just one of the competencies.   <b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b>  Houston-area students will now be served by our Online MSW program, so the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will consult with the Online MSW Program Manager and Field Director to determine additional supports for students understanding the application of the competency in the field setting.</p>
<p><b>2. Outcome Name: Diversity, Human Rights, and Policy</b>  <b>Statement:</b> Students will be competent leaders in the field in the promotion of dignity and well-being for all people.</p>		<p><b>General Education Outcome? Civic Leadership</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>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</i> (questions 12, 23, 28, 30)   <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> At least 80% of clinical students should correctly answer the 5379 exam questions associated with Competencies 2, 3, and 5</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#2: Engaging Diversity in Practice (51.7% Waco, 59% Houston, 63.8% Online)  Comp#3: Advancing Human Rights &amp; Justice (91% Waco, 75.8% Houston, 58.67% Online)  Comp#5: Engaging in Policy Practice (71.7% Waco, 79.5% Houston, 45.2% Online)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b>  Competencies 2 &amp; 5 fell below the benchmark for all three campuses, and the Houston and Online campuses fell below benchmark for all three competencies in this category. Additionally, competency 3 was below in 2 of the 3 campuses though the overall MSW score met benchmark at 80.9. This merits attention regarding curriculum consistency across campuses and review of the exam questions tied to these competencies.   <b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b>  The Associate Dean will share the results with the Clinical Practice Curriculum Team and ask them to review competencies that fell below at all three campuses. The intent of this review will be to determine if questions accurately assess the competencies, and if so, how the course content can better prepare students to correctly answer the question.</p>
<p><b>2B. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/>  <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Generalist Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i></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 extended version):</b></p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b>  All campuses met benchmark for these three competencies except for one campus on one benchmark.</p>

<p>Competency #2, #3, #5  <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b>  At least 80% of first-year students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency</p>	<p>Comp#2: Engaging Diversity in Practice (92% Waco, 100% Houston, 87.5% Online)  Comp#3: Advancing Human Rights &amp; Justice (90% Waco, 100% Houston, 83.5% Online)  Comp#5: Engaging in Policy Practice (81.3% Waco, 89.7% Houston, 73.8% Online)</p>	<p>While this does not raise alarm, it does merit attention for where there may be inconsistencies in curriculum delivery.</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b>  The lead faculty member for the Online MSW's policy course is conducting a major iteration of the course over the coming academic year. This will include alignment of campus course content and updated policy content.</p>
<p><b>2C. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/>  <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Advanced Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i>  Competency #2, #3, #5  <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b>  At least 80% of advanced 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 extended version):</b></p> <p><b>Clinical Specialization:</b>  Comp#2: Engaging Diversity in Practice (100% Waco, 86.9% Houston, 96.6% Online)  Comp#3: Advancing Human Rights &amp; Justice (95.9% Waco, 97.8% Houston, 99% Online)  Comp#5: Engaging in Policy Practice (100% Waco, 86.9% Houston, 92.2% Online)</p> <p><b>Community Specialization:</b>  Comp#2: Engaging Diversity in Practice (100% Waco, N/A Houston, 100% Online)  Comp#3: Advancing Human Rights &amp; Justice (100% Waco, N/A Houston, 100% Online)  Comp#5: Engaging in Policy Practice (100% Waco, N/A Houston, 100% Online)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b>  GSSW Leadership is pleased to see such strong scores across specializations and campuses for this important aspect of social work study and practice.</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b>  Continue efforts at implementing the recommendations from the department's Race Equity Work Team (REWT).</p>
<p><b>3. Outcome Name: Research, Assessment, and Evaluation</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>General Education Outcome? Critical Thinking</b></span>  <b>Statement:</b> Students will understand and apply evidence-informed practice with clients of all system sizes and contexts of practice.</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>  (questions 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></p> <p>Comp#4: Research and Practice (67.5% Waco, 61.9% Houston, 66% Online)  Comp#7: Assessment in Practice (85.1% Waco, 79.3% Houston, 81.5% Online)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b>  Competency 4 fell under the benchmark in all three campuses. Thus, specific attention is needed regarding the measure's accuracy and/or the content's preparation for students to meet the benchmark.  While competency 7 met benchmark overall with a score of 83.1, the Houston campus fell just 0.7 below the benchmark. This does not raise alarm but is worth paying attention to as we review the clinical exam.</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b>  The Associate Dean will share the results with the Clinical Practice Curriculum Team and ask them to review competencies that fell below at all three</p>

		campuses. The intent of this review will be to determine if questions accurately assess the competencies, and if so, how the course content can better prepare students to correctly answer the question.
<b>3B. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Generalist Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i> <i>Competency #4, #7, #9</i> <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> <i>At least 80% of first-year students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency.</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 details/charts):</b>  <i>Comp#4: Research and Practice (88% Waco, 89.75% Houston, 71.7% Online)</i> <i>Comp#7: Assessment in Practice (91% Waco, 98.1% Houston, 85.2% Online)</i> <i>Comp#9: Evaluation of Practice (90% Waco, 98.1% Houston, 75.3% Online)</i>	<b>Interpretation of Results:</b> <i>The Waco and Houston campuses met the benchmark for all three competencies in this category, which is worth celebrating. The online campus fell below the benchmark in two of the three competencies, though not significantly.</i>  <b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> <i>The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will consult with the Online MSW Program Manager and Field Director to determine additional supports for students understanding the application of the competency in the field setting.</i>
<b>3C. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Advanced Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i> <i>Competency #4, #7, #9</i> <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> <i>At least 80% of first-year students should reach the rating of 4-proficient or 5-excellent on each competency.</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 details/charts):</b>  <b>Clinical Specialization</b> <i>Comp#4: Research and Practice (100% Waco, 69.6% Houston, 92.2% Online)</i> <i>Comp#7: Assessment in Practice (100% Waco, 92.3% Houston, 95.1% Online)</i> <i>Comp#9: Evaluation of Practice 100% Waco, 95.7% Houston, 96.7% Online)</i>  <b>Community Specialization</b> <i>Comp#4: Research and Practice (100% Waco, N/A Houston, 100% Online)</i> <i>Comp#7: Assessment in Practice (97.2% Waco, N/A Houston, 100% Online)</i> <i>Comp#9: Evaluation of Practice (100% Waco, N/A Houston, 100% Online)</i>	<b>Interpretation of Results:</b> <i>All competencies met the benchmark across the three campuses when review the MSW percentages as a whole. However, separate campus data shows the Houston campus falling below benchmark in the competency 4. This also fell below in the knowledge benchmark (see 3A).</i>  <b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> <i>Houston-area students will now be served by our Online MSW program, so the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will consult with the Online MSW Program Manager and Field Director to determine additional supports for students understanding the application of the competency in the field setting.</i>
<b>4. Outcome Name: Human Interaction and Intervention</b> <b>Statement:</b> Students will demonstrate skillful and empathic communication in their work with clients and constituents.		<b>General Education Outcome? Communication</b>
<b>Assessment Methods with Performance Target</b>	<b>Achievement Status and Results</b>	<b>Interpretation and Improvements</b>
<b>4A. 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 (question 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18, 20-22, 26)</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 details/charts):</b>	<b>Interpretation of Results:</b> <i>While competency 6 did not meet the benchmark at each individual campus, it did meet for the MSW program overall with a score of 82.1. Thus, attention to</i>

<p><b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> At least 80% of clinical students should correctly answer the 5379 exam questions associated with Competencies 6, 8</p>	<p>Comp#6: Engagement with Individuals &amp; Groups (86.7% Waco, 77.3% Houston, 74.6% Online) Comp#8: Intervention with Individuals &amp; Groups (85.2% Waco, 81.3% Houston, 81.7% Online)</p>	<p>what might have been different in the Houston and Online courses is worth attention. Competency 8 met benchmark at all three.</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> The Associate Dean, MSW 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 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.</p>
<p><b>4C. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Generalist Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i> Competency #6, #8 <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> At least 80% of first-year 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#6: Engagement with Individuals &amp; Groups (98% Waco, 100% Houston, 85.2% Online) Comp#8: Intervention with Individuals &amp; Groups (92.8% Waco, 100% Houston, 84.5% Online)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b> GSSW leadership is pleased to see such strong scores for our first-year MSW students.</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> N/A</p>
<p><b>4C. Assessment Type:</b> Direct <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indirect <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assessment Method:</b> <i>Advanced Field Rubric Skill Ratings</i> Competency #6, #8 <b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b> At least 80% of advanced 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>  <b>Clinical Specialization:</b> Comp#6: Engagement with Individuals &amp; Groups (97.3% Waco, 95.7% Houston, 96.2% Online) Comp#8: Intervention with Individuals &amp; Groups (99.1% Waco, 94.2% Houston, 97.7% Online)  <b>Community Specialization:</b> Comp#6: Engagement with Individuals &amp; Groups (100% Waco, N/A Houston, 100% Online) Comp#8: Intervention with Individuals &amp; Groups (95.8% Waco, N/A Houston, 100% Online)</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b> GSSW leadership is pleased to see such strong scores for our advanced MSW students. This has all levels and campuses meeting or exceeding the benchmark for competencies 6 and 8.</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b> 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?

Last year's report showed a need for attention for GSSW competencies 2, 4, and 6 in the knowledge assessment. These competencies were regarding diversity, research-informed practice, and engagement. Faculty discussions about curriculum improvement 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. These competencies are still below the benchmark especially in relation to one specific measure, which warrants more specific attention about whether this measure needs attention or if there are ways to strengthen student preparation. Curriculum updates and major course iterations are happening at the generalist and advanced level over the next year.

**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 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
<p><b>Performance Measure:</b>  <b>GSSW Diversity &amp; Difference Student Survey</b>                      (1) I am flourishing at the GSSW                      (2) I feel safe at the GSSW                      (4) People of color flourish at the GSSW                      (5) Sexual minorities flourish at the GSSW                      (8) I am able to be myself without fear or anxiety                      (9) Garland School faculty value me                      (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><b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b>                      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><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></p> <p>The benchmark was fully met for 4 of the 11 items: Items 2, 9, 10, and 15.</p> <p>For 4 items, the benchmark was met overall and in 2 of the 3 campuses. This includes items 8, 11, 12, and 16. The Houston campus feel under the benchmark in those 4 areas.</p> <p>For item 1, overall GSSW scores and Online MSW scores met the benchmark while the Waco and Houston scores did not.</p> <p>For items 4 &amp; 5 regarding particular populations, the overall scores fell just under at 3.64 and 3.68. For item 4, the Waco and Houston campus scores fell under the benchmark while for item 5, only the Waco scores fell under the benchmark.</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b>                      These results indicate a large positive experience of belonging for GSSW MSW students, though less so for students who identify with a non-majority racial, ethnic, or sexual identity. Additionally, there is some variation when the data is separated by campus. This emphasizes the importance of continued efforts at inclusion that have already begun through the recommendations of the Race Equity Work Team (REWT).</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b>                      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 to celebrate areas of strength and identify strategies for improvement, specifically for items 4 and 5.</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”**

Performance Measure and Achievement Target	Achievement Status and Results	Interpretation and Improvements
<p><b>Performance Measure:</b>  <b>GSSW Diversity &amp; Difference Student Survey</b>                      (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><b>Performance Target/Criteria for Success:</b>                      Mean score of 1.5 or lower on item 6, mean score of 3.75 or higher on all others listed</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></p> <p>The benchmark was fully met for all but one item (item 7).</p> <p>The benchmark was partially met for item 7, as the Overall GSSW score met the benchmark along with the Waco and Online campuses, but the Houston campus score fell slightly below at 3.58.</p>	<p><b>Interpretation of Results:</b>                      GSSW leadership is pleased to these items as areas of strength for the MSW student experience, though the Houston campus fell below the benchmark for item 7.</p> <p><b>Recommended Decisions/Actions for Improvement:</b>                      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 one lower</p>

		<p>score for the Houston campus. 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 to celebrate areas of strength and identify strategies for improvement.</p>
--	--	---

**Part 5: Assessment Team and Review Process Description**  
*Please provide a description of how this report was compiled.*

**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 MSW Program Director. 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, MSW program Director, MSW Program Manager, and previous Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

**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 5379 Clinical Final Exam is assessed by faculty and results are compiled by the Academic Consultant & Instructional Designer and reviewed by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. 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 response rate of approximately 60% of our Waco students, 33% of our Houston students, and approximately 20% of our online students. 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: Generalist Field Rubric Summary Table:**

Competence Area	% 4+ on 5pt scale WACO CAMPUS	HOUSTON	ONLINE
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	96%	100%	92.9%
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	92%	100%	87.5%
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	90%	100%	83.5%
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	88%	89.75%	71.7%
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	81.3%	89.74%	73.8%
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	98%	100%	85.5%
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	91%	98.08%	85.2%
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	92.8%	100%	84.5%
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	98.09%	75.3%
10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice	96%	100%	79.9%

**Appendix B: Specialized Clinical Field Rubric Summary Table:**

Competence Area	% 4+ on 5pt scale WACO CAMPUS	HOUSTON	ONLINE
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	96%	84.8%%	83.8%
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	100%	87%	96.6%
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	96%	97.8%	99%
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	100%	69.6%%	92.2%
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	100%	87%	92.2%
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	97.3%	95.7%	96.2%
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	100%	92.8%	95.1%
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	99.1%	94.2%	97.7%
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	100%	95.7%	96.7%
10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice	100%	78.3%	99%

**Appendix C: Specialized Community Field Rubric Summary Table:**

Competence Area	% 4+ on 5pt scale WACO CAMPUS	ONLINE
1 : Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	94.5%	100%
2 : Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	100%	100%
3 : Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	100%	100%
4 : Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	100%	100%
5 : Engage in Policy Practice	100%	100%
6 : Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations and Communities	100%	100%
7 : Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	97.2%	100%
8 : Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	95.6%	100%
9 : Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	100%	100%
10: Ethical Integration of Faith and Practice	100%	100%

**Appendix D: Implicit Curriculum Survey Results Summary Table:**

Question	Measure (mean score 1-5 scale)	Overall GSSW	MSW Waco	MSW Houston	MSW Online
1. I am flourishing at the GSSW	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	3.86	3.57	3.67	4.15
2. I feel safe at the GSSW	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	4.49	4.34	4.11	4.70
3. I perpetuate microaggressions at the GSSW	(1=never, 2=sometimes)	1.26	1.39	1.0	1.17
4. People of color flourish in the GSSW	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	3.64	3.12	3.56	4.00
5. Sexual minorities flourish in the GSSW	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	3.68	3.18	4.56	3.93
6. Faculty discriminate against me	(1=never, 2=sometimes)	1.16	1.23	1.33	1.09



<b>7. My perspectives are welcomed or valued in the GSSW</b>	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	<b>4.16</b>	4.03	3.56	4.40
<b>8. I am able to be myself without fear or anxiety in the GSSW</b>	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	<b>3.98</b>	3.94	3.67	4.15
<b>9. Garland School faculty value me</b>	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	<b>4.34</b>	4.20	3.89	4.52
<b>10. Garland School staff value me</b>	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	<b>4.15</b>	4.03	3.78	4.30
<b>11. GSSW students/peers value me</b>	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	<b>4.26</b>	4.41	3.67	4.35
<b>12. I feel excluded at the Garland School</b>	(1=never, 2=sometimes)	<b>1.58</b>	1.74	2.33	1.30
<b>13. My assignments are graded fairly</b>	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	<b>4.31</b>	4.32	4.22	4.37
<b>14. The GSSW supports my academic success</b>	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	<b>4.34</b>	4.12	4.11	4.54
<b>15. I belong in the Garland School</b>	(3=half time, 4=most time, 5=always)	<b>4.26</b>	3.97	3.89	4.63
<b>16. I withhold parts of myself to fit in at the Garland School</b>	(1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=half time)	<b>2.02</b>	2.20	2.67	1.70