


COLLABORATING FOR IMPROVED IMPLICIT CURRICULUM THROUGH STANDARDIZED STUDENT INFORMED MEASURES

Traci A. DeLong-Hamilton, Tamela H. Harris-Jackson, Kathryn S. Krae, Brian Christenson, Dorothy Farrell, Dan Freedman, Ruth Gerritsen-McKane, Patrick Panoz, Dana Sullivan, & Phillip Ng



IMPORTANCE OF THE IMPLICIT CURRICULUM

- Regular program assessment is vital to program improvement & meets accreditation standards (SWEP, 2015)
- SWEP programs are required to assess the explicit and implicit curricula
- Training, articles, etc. typically focus on content assessment (explicit); less time dedicated to understanding/ assessing the environment in which that content is delivered (implicit)




IMPORTANCE OF THE IMPLICIT CURRICULUM

- The implicit curriculum
 - supports a well-rounded program,
 - demonstrates alignment with the NASW core values & ethics, and
 - is just as important as the explicit curriculum in shaping students' professional character & competence (CBWE, 2015; Patwacki & Zastrow, 2010)
- Under the 2008 and 2015 CSWE EPAS, the implicit curriculum includes:
 - Program commitment to diversity,
 - Student development,
 - Faculty qualifications and ratios,
 - Administrative structure, and
 - Program resources


ROLE OF STUDENTS IN IMPLICIT CURRICULUM

- Self-efficacy is not a direct measure of student skill. However, students' reports still have value.
- It is important to note that some student characteristics have been found to correlate with their reports of program satisfaction:
 - Ex: Correlation found between social support and prog. satisfaction for women;
 - Correlation found between White and Asian students, availability of faculty outside of class, & prog. satisfaction (Bass & Brown, 2015)




ROLE OF STUDENTS IN IMPLICIT CURRICULUM

- Regardless of race/ethnicity, all students reported quality of instruction, the social environment, self-reported intellectual development and self-reported grades with program satisfaction (Bassman & Brown, 2015)




ROLE OF PROGRAMS IN IMPLICIT CURRICULUM

- In addition to student characteristics, program characteristics have also been correlated with student reports of student satisfaction.
- Program characteristics include:
 - College size,
 - Program size and
 - Faculty approach to teaching




ROLE OF PROGRAMS IN IMPLICIT CURRICULUM

- Smaller universities and programs are thought to provide more individualized attention and leading to greater student satisfaction.
- Faculty instructors who provide clear feedback and greater variety in learning activities (greater student engagement) have students who report more satisfaction with their learning experience (Friedman & Hershman, 2015; Clark, 2009; A. Clark, 2009)



STUDY PURPOSE

- The purpose of this study was to examine how student and program characteristics relate to student informed implicit curriculum objective outcomes.
- This study examined BSW student evaluation of implicit curriculum outcomes of their social work programs using the **SWEP Essential Assessment Package (SWEP) Exit Survey**.



ABOUT SWEP

- SWEP, originally known as BEAP, is a non-profit organization made up of a **UNIVERSITY** team of social work faculty from various programs
- The team developed and maintains a collection of six copyrighted instruments designed to help social work programs assess their outcomes.
- The instruments are used by baccalaureate and graduate social work programs.
- PROGRAMS COMPARE THEIR RESULTS TO NATIONAL NORMS**



SWEAP INSTRUMENTS

- Entrance instrument collects general demographic information from students entering the BSW or MSW program.
- Foundational Curriculum Assessment Instrument (FCAI), also referred to as the Curriculum Instrument, evaluates the value-added from the delivery of a program's curriculum (knowledge assessment).
- Field Practicum Placement Assessment Instrument (FPPI), or Field Instrument, is designed to assess student performance in field in accordance to CSWE 2008 or 2015 Core Competencies.
- Alumni Instrument is designed to be completed by students two years post graduation and provides data on a long-term view of student outcomes and perceptions of program.
- The Employer/Supervisor Survey is completed by the employer of alumni and asks employers to assess the alumni preparedness for the social work practice.
- Exit Instrument is designed to be used by programs to evaluate how well they support student's competencies for the profession. The instrument captures explicit and implicit curricula items and is used in both BSW and MSW programs. Students complete the Exit Instrument just prior to graduation.

SWEAP EXIT INSTRUMENT

<https://www.sweapinstruments.org>

SWEAP INSTRUMENT USERS

Instrument	2009-2015
Entrance	20,824
FCAI (2009-2011) (ENTRANCE)	10,227
(EXIT)	7,075
EXIT	12,338
FPPI	4,401
Alumni	1,668
Employer	648

SWEAP EXIT SURVEY

Section F: Educational Program Experience (Implicit Curriculum)

100 items are presented below. Please indicate with appropriate checkmarks the extent to which you agree or disagree with each item.

Very Strongly Agree Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Very Strongly Disagree

The social work program provided a learning environment that respected all persons.

The social work program provides opportunities to participate in program policy decisions.

The social work program provides opportunities to participate in student organizations.

The quality of the social work program reflects commitment to the advancement of the social work profession.

The social work program provides opportunities to participate in student organizations.

Please see the quality of advising you received during your social work program.

STUDY METHOD

- Design: Quantitative, non-experimental, secondary data analysis (permission obtained from SWEAP)
- Sample: All undergraduate programs that used the Exit Instrument between 2013-2015. Programs: N = 40+; Student Responses: N= 1,484.
- Variables:
 - Student characteristics: gender, race/ethnicity, age, financial aid utilization, conditions/impairments/disability, work experience, education plans for the future
 - Program characteristics: BSW/MSW Format; Campus based, hybrid/blended, online
 - Program satisfaction: SWEAP Exit Instrument Implicit Items, EPAS practice behavior assessment.

STUDY METHOD

- Items for the Program Satisfaction variable asked students to identify their level of agreement with statements on a nine-point scale from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.
- The items were:
 - The social work program provided a learning environment that respected all persons.
 - The social work program models respect for difference.
 - The social work program provides students with opportunities to participate in program policy decisions.
 - The faculty of the social work program models commitment to the advancement of the social work profession.
 - The social work program provides opportunities to participate in student organizations.
 - Please see the quality of advising you received during your social work program.

RESULT

Instrument	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis	Alpha
Entrance	1484	1.00	0.90	0.00	5.00	1.0422	0.500	0.91
FCAI (2009-2011) (ENTRANCE)	10227	1.00	0.90	0.00	5.00	1.0422	0.500	0.91
(EXIT)	7075	1.00	0.90	0.00	5.00	1.0422	0.500	0.91
EXIT	12338	1.00	0.90	0.00	5.00	1.0422	0.500	0.91
FPPI	4401	1.00	0.90	0.00	5.00	1.0422	0.500	0.91
Alumni	1668	1.00	0.90	0.00	5.00	1.0422	0.500	0.91
Employer	648	1.00	0.90	0.00	5.00	1.0422	0.500	0.91

GENDER/SEX

- Three categories:
 - Female (1314)
 - Male (142)
 - Other (12)
- Participants who did not specify Female/Male gender rated all Implicit Curriculum Items LOWER than Female and Male
- Same within BSW and MSW cohorts

GENDER/SEX

- When "other" is removed from analysis, no statistically significant differences between respondents who selected female or male
- Updated SWEAP instruments use new item to capture gender (How would you identify your gender? (Select all that apply))
 - "Cit" indicates a person who identifies with the gender assigned at birth.
 - "Trans" indicates a person who identifies with a gender other than that assigned at birth.
 - CIS Gender / CIS Male / Trans Female / Trans Male
 - Genderqueer / Genderfluid / Agender / Gender non-conforming
 - Another identity: _____ I prefer not to disclose

RACE/ETHNICITY

	Percent
White	68.3
Black/African-American	14.3
Asian	7.3
Hispanic	8.9
Multi-Racial	2.1

- Difference by race
- The social work program provides students with opportunities to participate in program policy decisions.
 - Black/African-American students rated higher than other students
 - There was an MSW/MSW level.
 - White students rated lower than other
 - MSW less than MSW
- The social work program provides opportunities to participate in student organizations.
 - Only significant when looking at entire sample.
 - Black/African-American students rated higher than other students.
- The social work program models respect for difference.
 - Multi-racial students rated lower than other students.
 - MSW less than MSW
- The faculty of the social work program models commitment to the advancement of the social work profession.
 - White students rated higher than other students.

AGE

	Mean Age
Total Sample	20.4
MSW	20.3
BSW	21.2

- As Age of BSW & MSW students +
 - Higher ratings of opportunities to participate in program policy decisions.
 - Higher ratings of advisement quality
 - Millennial expectations?

CONDITIONS/IMPAIRMENTS/DISABILITY

	Percent
Chronic Medical Condition	4.4
Deaf	0.1
Hard of Hearing	1.4
Learning Disability, or other condition related to Learning	7.8
Mental Health Condition	7.0
Motor and/or physical impairment	0.6
Optical Impairment	1.5
Other	1.8

- 19.3% of sample identified a condition/impairment/disabilities
 - 5% identified 2 or more
- 9.7% reported receiving an educational accommodation
 - NO NEW STUDENTS

CONDITIONS/IMPAIRMENTS/DISABILITY

Differences found when comparing students who identified a condition/impairment/disability and those who didn't

- Students who identified as having a learning disability (or other condition related to learning) and MSW students who identified having a speech impairment, rated family modeling commitment to the advancement of the social work profession HIGHER
 - Students who identified as having a motor impairment rated HIGHER
- BSW students who identified as having a mental health condition rated the opportunity to participate in program policy decisions HIGHER
- MSW students who identified as having a visual impairment, and BSW students who identified having a mental health condition, rated the opportunity to participate in student organizations HIGHER
 - MSW students who reported receiving an educational accommodation rated HIGHER
 - BSW students who reported receiving an educational accommodation rated the opportunity to participate in policy decisions HIGHER

WORK EXPERIENCE

- 79% of all students worked while in school
 - 81% of BSW
 - 19% of students, full time
 - 23 hours on average
 - 70% of MSW
 - 26% of students, full time
 - 28 hours on average
- BSW students working full-time while in their SW program rated opportunities to participate in program policy decisions and student organizations, as well as advisement quality, HIGHER
 - Inconsistent with age?

FINANCIAL AID UTILIZATION

- 85.5% of students received financial aid
- Students receiving grants rated ALL items HIGHER
- Students receiving scholarships rated advisement, and respect items HIGHER
- MSW students receiving loans rated advisement HIGHER

EDUCATIONAL PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

- 86.5% of BSW students have plans for future studies
 - 28% of MSW students
- Students with intentions for future studies rated ALL items HIGHER
- Students who had already submitted application for future education rated advisement HIGHER

BSW/MSW

- BSW students rated all items HIGHER than did MSW students

PROGRAM FORMAT

- 66% Campus Based
- 28% Hybrid/Blended
- 1% Entirely Online
 - Only BSW
- Students from Hybrid/Blended and Online programs rated ALL items HIGHER

PROGRAM SATISFACTION

- Students were asked to assess how well their social work program prepared them for each of the 2008 EPAS Practice Behaviors.
- Student assessments of the explicit curriculum were positively correlated with student assessment of the implicit curriculum.

DISCUSSION/IMPLICATIONS

- Plans for multivariate analyses
- As programs move to closer examination of Implicit Curriculum through EPAS 2015 Assessment, should pay attention to interaction between implicit curriculum assessment measures, and student and program characteristics.
- SWEAP programs who use the Exit Survey can use raw data towards similar analyses
 - Can compare to national norms
- In response to clarifications by CSWE at APM meetings, SWEAP team to consider developing additional questions within each category of the implicit curriculum, to allow for more detailed analysis.

REFERENCES

- Council on Social Work Education. (2015). 2015 Education policy and accreditation standards. Retrieved from <http://www.cswe.org/Files.aspx?id=1660>
- Emerson, M. K. & Matier, M. W. (2005). Exploring differences in correlates of student satisfaction with undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education, 46*, 641-676.
- Fortune, A. E. & Abramson, J. S. (1993). Predictors of satisfaction with field practicum among social work students. *The Clinical Supervisor, 11*, 95-110.
- Ford, G., Spenshaw, M. & Curry-Jackson, A. (1995). BSW programs in black colleges: Building on the strengths of tradition. *Journal of Social Work Education, 32*, 327-335.
- Petracchi, H.E. & Zastrow, C. (2010). Suggestions for utilizing the 2008 EPAS in CSWE-accredited baccalaureate and masters curricula - reflections from the field, part 1: The explicit curriculum. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 35*, 135-146. doi: 10.1080/08812113.1003707911