Indiana University
School of Social Work

PRAC Annual Report
2005-2006 Academic Year

Introduction

The Indiana University School of Social Work was founded in 1911. It currently offers social work education at the Baccalaureate, Master, and Doctoral levels. The Master of Social Work (MSW) program received its accreditation from the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) in 1923, and the Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) program received accreditation in 1975. Since then, both programs have enjoyed accredited status. The last review for reaffirmation of accredited status was in 2005. The School started the Ph.D. in Social Work program in 1994 and a Pre-Doc program in 1997.

The Bachelor of Social Work program prepares students for generalist social work practice. The Master of Social Work program prepares graduate students for advanced social work practice in an area of specialization. The Doctoral program prepares students for leading roles in areas such as social work education, social welfare, policy analysis and development, administration, social work practice, and advocacy.

In prior years, we have reported on the six dimensions of the Planning for Learning and Assessment grid as provided by the PRAC committee. In our 2004-2005 report we focused on the assessment plans, approaches, and results prepared for our accrediting body. In the current report we will respond to the question *"What improvements have been made on assessment findings?"*

Before we address the specific changes based on assessment findings, we will provide an update on *Goal 6, Principle 4 of the "Indiana's Framework for Policy and Planning Development in Higher Education*, the Indiana Commission on Higher Education

Part I.- Indiana's Framework for Policy and Planning Development in Higher Education - Goal Six – Principle Four

The Indiana Commission on Higher Education requested Indiana University to report on Goal 6 Principle 4. The principle reads:

> *The campus statement of learning goals has set forth how evidence on the attainment of each learning goal will be collected for individual students at the course, major and degree levels and that can be reported for all baccalaureate graduates collectively as a measure of continuing institutional improvement.*

As a way of introduction, we would like to state that the implementation of the BSW program is guided by its vision, mission, goals, 19 learning objectives, and IUPUI Principles of Undergradyate Learning (PUL). The BSW program uses a number of approaches to assess the attainment of the learning goals at the course and program levels. Two key approaches are used for the purpose of assessing *Goal 6, Principle 4*. These are:

The Course Learning Objectives Classification System
The Course/Instructor and Student Learning Assessment (CISLA) System.

The Course Learning Objectives Classification System. This approach facilitates curriculum analysis on the basis of multiple dimensions and based on the 'assessment question(s)' posed by the faculty. Currently, our dimensions are the School goals, academic program goals, curriculum content areas mandated by our accrediting body, the program learning objectives; Bloom's Taxonomy; and IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning.

Table one reflects the latest assessment of the distribution of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning in the BSW course objectives.

	#1 Core Communication and Quantitative Skills	#2 Critical Thinking	#3 Integration and Application of Knowledge	#4 Intellectual Depth, Breadth and Adaptiveness	#5 Understanding Society and Culture	#6 Values and Ethics
Social Work Course Numbers						
S100	6	2	6	6	9	4
S141	4	3	7	4	3	3
S221	4	2	4	6	6	2
S231	3	1	6	3	1	1
S251	4	2	3	7	8	3
S322	2	4	8	3	4	2
S323	5	6	9	4	4	2
S332	2	4	10	4	2	4
S352	2	10	9	5	10	3
S371	7	3	6	3	1	2
S381	5	3	15	5	7	11
S400	2	4	5	6	2	3
S433	4	5	5	7	6	4
S442	4	11	9	7	7	4
S472	3	7	10	9	2	1
S482	7	6	16	6	9	11
Total	64	73	128	85	81	60

Table 1
Number of BSW Classified Course Objectives
By IUPUI Learning Principles Per Course

Table 1 indicates that the Principles of Undergraduate Learning are well distributed in all course objectives of the undergraduate curriculum. While the most observable objectives have been identified by the *Course Learning Objectives Classification System*, PULs are implicit in all course objectives. They indeed represent the essence of what we teach and how we teach in social work education.

The *Course Learning Objectives Classification System* approach is further operationalized by the systematic collection of information from faculty teaching in the BSW program regarding the activities and products expected in their courses to meet the course objectives. We call this approach '*Implementation of Course Objectives.*' This approach assures that all BSW courses provide content and opportunities to address all the course learning objectives.   Table 2 provides examples from our current database.

Table two: Implementation of Course Objectives

Course Number and Title	Selected Course Objectives	Activity	Product/Assignment (Outcome)
S221/Human Behavior & the Social Environment: Individual Functioning	1. Demonstrate knowledge of the essential wholeness of the human being with recognition of the physical, intellectual, emotional, spiritual, and social aspects of human functioning. PUL #1, 4	- Text reading throughout semester - Outside reading as specified on syllabus throughout the semester - Lecture - Large Group Activities throughout the semester.	- Class discussions throughout the semester - Application Paper #2 - Dyad presentations - Final exam
S352/Social Services Delivery System	4. Analyze the influence of politics, economics, and cultural and social values in the development and implementation of social policy decisions. PUL #2, 4, 5, 6	- Lecture/discussion - Text reading "policy in the news" mini presentations and discussions on Indiana and federal legislative session topics 2 guest speakers who do policy practice in the following issues: GLBT issues; predatory lending and other economic issues	- Class discussions - Exam 1 - Exam 2 - Advocacy letter - Letter to the editor - Policy emails: critique and reflection
S433 Community Behavior and Practice within a Generalist Perspective	3. Analyze the effects of discrimination, economic deprivation, political marginalization, and oppression upon various populations-at-risk PUL #1,2, 3,4,5,6.	- Lectures - Forums - Internet search - Quizzes - Essay questions - One portion of the community project is devoted to issues related to this objective	- Lecture notes/ppp - Forum statements - Website addresses - Results in quizzes. - Responses on the essay questions - Section in the final paper - Group presentation & poster presentation

Table 2 depicts several examples as to how the BSW program monitors the implementation of the course objectives. This type of data collection assures that all BSW courses provide content and opportunities to address the course learning objectives and the Principles of Undergraduate Learning.

Course/Instructor and Course Learning Objective Assessment System. This approach captures students' perceptions of their learning experience in individual courses. The instrument for implementing this approach consists of twenty-two standard or common items to seek students' perceptions of their efforts in the course as well as the assessment of the instructor. The second component of the instrument consists of the discrete course learning objectives (CLO) of each course. Given the linkages of the course learning objectives to the Principles of Undergraduate Learning, the BSW program is in a good position to monitor students' perceptions of meeting the PULs throughout the curriculum.

Part II.- Improvements Made Based on Assessment Findings

Under this heading we will respond to the question *What Improvements Have Been Made Based on Assessment Findings?* by academic programs.

Baccalaureate Social Work Program

During Fall 2005 and Spring of 2006, the BSW program has not engaged in curriculum changes. We have continued with our monitoring function as in previous years. As a result, we have few updates from last year.

Online Teaching and Learning: Update

Year: The BSW program has continued with the development of online courses in 2005-2006. The total number of online courses (required and electives) as of the Spring semester was eleven courses.

Method Used: As mentioned in previous reports, the BSW program has designed a 'road map' that calls for the development of all the BSW courses online except for our internships. The Dean's office has provided incentives for faculty (full-time and part-time) to develop online courses.

Changes Made: One more online course was developed and implemented during academic year 2005-2006. Another course is under development.

Impact of Changes: We have created more flexibility in the curriculum for all students but particularly for those students who have to work full-time and/or have other personal commitments to fulfill while attending school. During 2005-2006 we reached a large number of non-social work students with our online courses, particularly in S141 Introduction to Social Work, S200 Introduction to Case Management, S221 Human Behavior and the Social Environment: Individual Functioning, S251 Emergence of Social Services, S300 Crisis Intervention, and S371 Social Work Research.

As we develop and implement online courses, we assess students' perception of online learning. During 2005 we conducted focus groups with senior students. Some of the common themes mentioned from students are:

Reason for taking online course…
- Complex family situations
- Convenience e.g. flexible time to "attend class" and no travel requirements
- Self-paced

Contact with instructor and rating of communication
- Accessibility of instructors and classmates via email
- Availability of instructor throughout the course
  - Could email assignments for feedback before they were due and get 'instant feedback before grading'
  -

Recommendation to other students to prepare for an online course
- Ask for help - Don't be afraid

- Don't be afraid to seek clarification with your professors
  - Be willing to negotiate and call on other professors to assist you
  - If data coming across email is questionable, clarify
  - Be aware that some courses have more expectations than face to face courses.

- Students should be committed

- Program should dispel myth that online courses are easier than traditional ones.

- Students should prepare the study environment when working on their online courses as much as possible e.g. work behind closed doors, don't answer phones, get someone to watch the kids etc.

- Take a computer course before taking online courses

Recommendations to instructors to help students prepare for an online course

- Accessibility (for questions, feedback and concerns)
- Feedback (considerate, continuous, & timely)
- Encouragement (invite participation, touch base with student often)

- Teach about group rules and responsibilities

- Recommend that students check emails regularly, everyday if possible

We will be sharing students' perspectives about online courses during faculty orientations.

Internationalization of the Professional Undergraduate Curriculum

The IUPUI Office of International Affairs was awarded a two-year, federally funded project to internationalize the undergraduate curriculum in the schools of Engineering, Education, and Social Work. Through collaborative international exchange and faculty development, this project aims at developing courses and course modules that explore professional concerns in cross-cultural contexts and build a comprehensive and cumulative knowledge of the language, history, culture, and present circumstances of one particular nation: Indonesia [excerpt modified from press release].

Year: 2005 – 2007

Method Used: This project is dependent on a reciprocal international partnership with Gadjah Mada University (UGM) in Yogyakarta, Indonesia and the three schools mentioned above. Faculty at IUPUI and UGM are directly involved in the process of curriculum development, through fellowships, workshops, curricular exchange, and study trips. Faculty members from both universities are receiving training in order to collaboratively develop professionally relevant materials to internationalize the curriculum. Physical distance between the members of this project is bridged by advanced communication technology, especially videoconferencing and web-based course management.

Changes Made: We have begun to explore how to internationalize the BSW curriculum by using one of our senior courses as a "testing ground".

Impact of Change: It is early to say what the exact impact of this grant will be but we aim at transforming parts of our curriculum to reflect the global nature of the 21st century and helping the students to become better practitioners in an international environment. This project is in line with the newly implemented Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (CSWE, 2001).

Master in Social Work Program

Program evaluation for the Masters of Social Work Program at the IU School of Social Work as a whole is part of the accrediting process. The MSW program from the various campuses has one committee responsible for evaluation of the respective programs for all campuses. In addition, each campus program conducts its own ongoing evaluations as needed. The assessment process attempts to measure how well the program meets program goals, whether the MSW Program is meeting the needs of the field, and if the students think they are obtaining the knowledge base and skills to be skilled MSWs in their jobs.

Assessment Plans and Activities in the MSW Program

As stated in previous reports, the MSW program assessment plan has several components, including:

>   Student performance in classroom and field;
>   End of semester course evaluations that are uniform across campuses;
>   Program completion rates;
>   Performance on certification examinations;
>   Focus groups with students, field instructors, and employers;
>   Exit surveys completed upon graduation;
>   Alumni survey;

Faculty and administrative satisfaction with program;
Advisory Board input from IUSSW Advisory Board and the respective advisory boards from the respective campuses; and
The ability of the IUSSW to attract and retain well-qualified faculty
Course-Learning Objectives Classification System - Curriculum Analyzer Project
Pass/fail summary for Indiana state LSW and LCSW licenses
Ongoing dialogue with community and agency groups
Dean's Advisory Council

Program Assessment

Course-Learning Objectives Classification System -

The MSW Committee uses the *Course-Learning Objectives Classification System* to assess the course objectives as they relate to MSW Program Goals, MSW Program Objectives, NASW Cultural Competence Standards, EPAS Foundation Objectives, EPAS Content Areas, and Bloom's Taxonomy. The information below indicates how well our course objectives support our MSW Program Objectives

MSW Educational Program Objectives

1. Apply social work values and ethics, including an understanding of and respect for human diversity, in the context of social work practice with diverse populations, an understanding of distributive justice, and with systems of various sizes and types.
   - Thirty-one percent of the course objectives were related to this objective. This finding is positive for the program, as commitment to these areas is strong.

2. Understand and interpret the history of the social work profession and its current structures and issues.
   - Only five (5) percent of course objectives related to history and structures. This finding demonstrates one potential problem with many of the current MSW program objectives, the combining of more than one aspect into the same objective. Thus, the raters may have looked for both historic content and current policy or for either separately. One outcome of this study will be a discussion by the MSW Committee as to whether objectives should be refined to reflect only one main concept.

3. Understand and interpret the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination in the context of the professional practice of social work and understand and apply strategies and skills of change that advance social and economic justice.
   - Ten percent of course objectives related specifically to this objective. Given the two part nature of this objective, this percentage seems appropriate.

4. Understand, analyze, and apply knowledge of biological, sociological, cultural, psychological, and spiritual variables that affect human development and behavior across the life span, and apply theoretical frameworks to understand the interactions among individuals and between individuals and social systems (i.e., families, groups, organizations, and communities), and the ways these systems promote or deter people in maintaining or achieving health and well-being.
   - Twenty-three percent of course objectives relate to this objective. This indicates that almost one quarter of course objectives connect to theoretical content.

7

5. Analyze the impact of social policies on client systems, workers, and agencies and demonstrate skills for influencing policy formulation and promoting social and political change consistent with social work values.
- Eleven percent relate to this objective. Social policy analysis and practice seems to be appropriately included in course objectives.

6. Practice within the structure of organizations and service delivery systems and advocate for necessary organizational change.
- Twenty percent connect to this objective, indicating that courses are including advocacy and agency-based practice in objectives.

7. Use communication and cultural competence skills differentially with a variety of client populations, colleagues, and members of the community.
- Six percent of course objectives relate to this objective. This is an area for the MSW Committee to examine so as to determine possible expansion of course content in this area.

8. Understand and evaluate relevant research studies and apply findings to practice, and demonstrate skills in ethical approaches to quantitative and qualitative research design, data analysis, and knowledge distribution.
- Seven percent of course objectives include research components, indicating another area for possible further consideration by the MSW Committee.

9. Conduct ethical, culturally competent empirical evaluations of their own practice interventions and those of other relevant systems.
- Eight percent of course objectives relate to this objective, indicating an intended focus on practice evaluation.

10. Apply the knowledge and skills of a generalist social work perspective to practice with systems of all sizes.
- Fifteen percent of course objectives apparently deal with various system sizes.

11. Apply the knowledge and skills of advanced social work practice in an area of concentration (i.e., Child Welfare, Families, Health, Leadership, or Mental Health and Addictions).
- Sixty-seven percent of course objectives include advanced practice, indicating that the intended focus of this curriculum on advanced practice in context seems on track.

12. Apply critical thinking skills within professional contexts; including synthesizing and applying appropriate theories and knowledge to practice interventions.
- Twenty-four percent of course objectives relate to this objective, which seems appropriate.

13. Demonstrate the professional use of self.
- Seven percent of course objectives address this program educational objective.
-
14. Use supervision and consultation appropriate to advanced practice in a concentration area.
- Two percent of course objectives relate to supervision and consultation, indicating another area for further examination.

The curriculum analysis provides a base for the MSW Committee to review and assess the curriculum in a systematic manner. Both program and course objectives may be revised to reflect a clearer intent for the curriculum.

Doctor of Philosophy in Social Work

Addition of Teaching Mentoring Course

Year: In Spring 2004 we first offered an elective course on academic teaching as part of the doctoral curriculum (*S724: Theory, Practice and Assessment of Social Work Teaching).* The course is now offered every other spring. In summer 2006 we instituted a companion teaching mentoring course for doctoral students who took *S724* and who are now taking on responsibility for teaching a course or courses in our undergraduate or master's social work programs.

Method Used: The mentoring course was developed by Dr. Valerie Chang, the same professor who earlier developed *S724*.   Dr. Chang developed the mentoring course based in part on models she had examined as part of her sabbatical project focused on best practices in teaching social work at the college level.

Changes Made: For the initial offering of *Mentoring in Social Work Teaching,* students registered using our special topics course number, *S790.*   Course content includes developing syllabi, designing case-based learning experiences, developing grading rubrics, and constructing written course plans that include objectives, lecture content, and active learning strategies for each course session to be taught. The course plan is detailed below:

Date	Time	Topic	Assignments
May 16	12 - 3	Develop a syllabus	1)Review syllabi used in S231 & S504
May 30	10 - 1	Teaching & evaluating practice skills	1)Complete draft of syllabus 2)Read chapters 4 – 7 in Chang, Scott, Decker 3)Review syllabi of social work courses that precede the course you will be teaching 4)Place book & instructor manuals order
June 13	10 - 1	Using case-based learning	1)Read all the cases 2)Review material on case-based learning
June 30	1 - 4	Create rubrics for all assignments Create outline or overview of course plans (dates & assignments)	1)Write assignments & directions related to case-based learning 2)Review material on rubrics
August 1	10 - 1	Review key elements of	1) Develop rubrics for all

		course content Develop plans for class 1	assignments 2)Syllabus completed and turned in 3)Read assigned textbooks and assigned readings
August 15	10 - 2	Develop plans for classes 2 – 4	1)Written plans related to objectives, content, & active learning for first class 2)Turn in any contributions to textbook
August 29	10 - 1	Teaching generalist theories & ethics	1)Written plans (objectives, content, active learning, CATs) for classes 2 – 4
September 12	1 - 3	Teaching theory & practice	1)Written plans (objectives, content, active learning, CATs) for classes 5 - 8
September 26	1 - 3	Using peer evaluation of teaching	1)Written plans (objectives, content, active learning, CATs) for classes 9 – 12 2) Establish plans for peer evaluation completed by the instructor and by a class colleague
October 10	1- 3	Evaluating teaching and learning	1)Written plans (objectives, content, active learning, CATs) for classes 13 – 15
October 24	1 -3	Review course identifying strengths & solving problems	1) Written plans for midterm evaluation of teaching and learning
November 14	1 - 3	Preparing to evaluate practice skills	1)Complete peer evaluation of one class colleague
December 12	1 - 3	Review and evaluate	1)Written plans for the next time you teach this course 2)Identify strengths and areas for growth as a teacher

Impact of Changes: Four students enrolled in the inaugural offering of *Mentoring in Social Work Teaching*. These students will meet with Dr. Chang roughly twice a month throughout the summer and fall semesters. Each meeting involves practical course preparation tasks that will facilitate the students' readiness to start teaching in the fall. These doctoral students have the opportunity for focused mentoring from a FACET faculty member who has received numerous teaching awards. They will be well-equipped to take on their teaching responsibilities.

Integration and Extension of Advanced Research Methods Courses

Year: Fall 2005/Spring 2006

Method Used: Two of the core social work doctoral courses are advanced research methods courses: one covering qualitative research *(S726)* and one covering quantitative research *(S727)*. These courses have typically been taught as separate courses in a traditional 15 week semester and were offered in alternating years.

Changes Made: In fall 2004/spring 2005, the qualitative research methods course was offered for the first time on a yearlong basis in order to allow students to learn about qualitative research by conducting an actual pilot study including all the phases from conceptualization of the study to getting IRB approval, collecting and analyzing data, and presenting the results. In previous 15 week semesters, students often did not have time to accomplish all the phases of even a pilot project. For the first time, in the 2004 academic year, students met with the instructor every other week over two semesters and were able to design and implement a pilot research project.

Given the success of this yearlong model, in the following academic year (fall 2005/spring 2006), we decided to offer the quantitative course on a yearlong basis as well. Students registered for 1.5 credits of the qualitative course in the fall and 1.5 credits in the spring. Students also registered for 1.5 credits of the quantitative course in both the fall and spring. The goal was for the students to plan and conduct mixed-methods pilot studies. Students met one week with the qualitative instructor and the next with the quantitative instructor throughout the fall and spring semesters. Thus, over the academic year, students conducted two pilot studies--one quantitative and one qualitative.

Impact of Changes: Offering the two advanced research courses simultaneously was an attempt to offer a learning experience where the two methods of conducting research—qualitative and quantitative—could be integrated in a unique fashion. It turned out to be perhaps too ambitious of a goal. Students reported that the workload was very heavy; many felt like they were taking four 3-credit courses instead of four 1.5 credit courses. Several students ended up pursuing different research topics in the qualitative and quantitative courses, which in effect doubled their workload, instead of streamlining it through integration. Through this process, we learned that while it may be worthwhile in terms of learning outcomes to offer each course on a yearlong basis, offering them simultaneously did not seem like the best plan. Thus, we have decided to stick to the yearlong format, but to offer the two courses in alternating years.

Curriculum Planning Retreat

Year: During spring 2004 the PhD Program Committee met for a set of three progressive strategic planning retreats to examine the content and structure of the curriculum. As a follow-up to the work accomplished in the earlier retreats, the Committee had another day-long meeting in May 2006 to analyze strengths and areas for improvement in the curriculum as well as the overall program. All four retreat sessions were facilitated by Dr. Bill Barton, Director of the IUSSW Office of Research Services.

Method Used: The first session, held in January 2004, focused on identifying desirable outcomes for the graduates of our PhD program. Sixty-five desirable outcomes were identified and arranged into eight categories (Background and Context of Knowledge Development, Theory/Content, Methods, Specific Research Methods, Scholarly Writing and Communication, Teaching Methods, Professional Context of Social Work, and Personal and Role Characteristics).

The second session, held in February 2004, focused on extending and validating the 65 outcomes and eight categories. At the third session, held in May 2004, the committee brainstormed about which components of the existing PhD program—including components beyond the curriculum—contributed to the attainment of the identified outcomes.

The follow-up retreat held in May 2006 reconsidered the strengths and areas of improvement in our curriculum in light of the outcomes for graduates identified in the earlier retreat sessions. Faculty participants individually rated the "current adequacy" of the program in attaining the 65 desirable student outcomes and also rank-ordered each outcome as low, medium, or high priority. A consolidation of responses led to 12 of the 65 items being ranked as "high priority." These 12 areas were further streamlined into three topic areas that were addressed in small group discussions: 1) basic issues of knowledge and theory building, critical thinking, and a global perspective, 2) foundational research knowledge, and 3) career planning, academic mentoring, and a culture of completion. Each small group produced brief recommendations for curriculum and/or program changes relating to their topic areas. Recommendations included partnering with the MSW Program Director to offer an enhanced graduate research course for both masters and PhD students to help our incoming PhD students meet their needs for foundational research knowledge, incorporating more global perspectives and critical thinking exercises into our theory courses, and offering a two-part integrative seminar—one part geared toward new students and a second geared toward students completing their coursework.

Changes Made: While discussions with the MSW Program Director have begun to plan for the enhanced foundation research course, given the newness of the recommendations (May 2006), other changes are still underway.

Impact of Changes: Suggestions that have arisen in the course of the retreats will be considered by the PhD Committee when it reconvenes in fall 2006 and are expected to lead to refinements in program structures and processes that will ultimately enhance student learning outcomes.

Summary

From this year's report, it is evident that the three educational programs have been involved in monitoring, assessment, and program revisions as needed. New educational initiatives are being developed and implemented that call for diverse ways of assessment. For sure, during academic year 2005-2006 we continued the implementation of our assessment road map guided by the concepts of scholarship of assessment.

<div align="center">

References

</div>

Council on Social Work Education (2001). Educational policy and accreditation standards. Alexandria, VA: Author.