

## **Indiana University School of Social Work**

### **PRAC Annual Report**

#### **2010-2011 Academic Year**

##### **Introduction**

The Indiana University School of Social Work (IUSSW) was founded in 1911, and is currently celebrating its centennial anniversary. The School currently offers social work education and the Baccalaureate, Masters, and Doctoral level and is one of the few remaining system schools at Indiana University. The Bachelor (BSW) and the Master of Social Work (MSW) programs are both accredited by the Council of Social Work Education (CSWE). In the spring semester of 2012, the BSW and MSW programs will be reviewed for reaffirmation by CSWE under a new curriculum policy statement that focuses on competency-based education. The national accreditation covers all the programs of the system school: The BSW program is offered in Indianapolis, Bloomington and Richmond (IU East) and has recently been approved for Gary (IU Northwest). At IUPUI, the BSW program also grants two certificates: Case Management and Family Life Education. The MSW program is offered in Indianapolis, Richmond, Fort Wayne, South Bend and Gary: a one-time cohort is being planned for southern Indiana at IU Southeast to begin in 2011 or early 2012 pending state-level approval. It is important to note that both BSW and MSW programs at IUPUI have new Program Directors who began their positions in July of 2010.

Since July 2007, the Division of Labor Studies merged with the School of Social Work and is now an undergraduate program within IUSSW. Labor Studies is also a system-wide program with offices in Bloomington, Fort Wayne, IUPUI, Kokomo, IU Northwest and IU South Bend. The program offers a Bachelor of Science, an Associate of Science, a Certificate, and a minor in Labor Studies.

In order to make the transition to competency-based education as articulated in the CSWE 2008 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS), the faculty in the social work programs has been working to operationalize the 10 identified core competencies for the various program levels and advanced graduate concentrations of the IUSSW social work program. Competencies are being linked to the objectives of each course in the curriculum and will be assessed in the field practica by agency-based associate faculty as well as by the classroom faculty. This report will highlight pilot data collected under the new professional program standards in Fall and Spring 2010 as well as report on progress in preparation for the reaffirmation assessment as well as other ongoing efforts to assess the achievement of identified program outcomes that have been traditionally identified by IUSSW to facilitate high levels of student achievement of competencies. This report will summarize these efforts by program level.

##### **Bachelor of Social Work**

The BSW program operates in multiple contexts that both guide the development and implementation of curriculum as well as provide a framework for assessment of student achievement. Given that the program has an upcoming reaffirmation of national accreditation, the first context to be considered is the shift to competency-based education required by CSWE. During the previous academic year (2009-

2010), the BSW committee reviewed the core competencies mandated by CSWE and identified where in the curriculum that content is delivered to facilitate student achievement of those competencies. In addition to the core competencies, CSWE has identified 41 foundational practice behaviors for generalist social work practice (See Appendix A). The BSW committee adopted these 41 practice behaviors as the operationalization of these competencies. CSWE has also mandated that these practice behaviors be assessed by two measures, one of which must be in the field practicum; field education has been identified as the *signature pedagogy* for social work education.

The second context for the assessment of social work education is at the level of the university, which is also facing an accreditation process in Spring of 2012. The BSW program has been actively involved in the identified of the Principles of Undergraduate Education (PUL) as major and moderate emphasis in each of the social work courses offered. Selected faculty provided scores for students on classroom assignments related to the identified PUL and additional classes were assessed in the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. It is interesting to note that there is significant overlap between the identified competencies of CSWE for social work education and the PULs: examples include critical thinking, values and ethics and understanding culture and society. To the extent of this overlap, efforts to assess the competencies triangulate the assessment of the PULS and the existing assessment data on the competencies have implications for the assessment of the PULS.

The report below will be focused around the two efforts identified above: A. Assessment of Competency-based education in field practicum and through coursework collected in an ePortfolio); and B. PUL assessment.

#### A1. Assessment of Competency-based Education – Field Education

##### 1. What general outcome are you seeking?

The BSW program seeks to have our 85% of our graduating seniors achieve competency as demonstrated in their field practicum and ePortfolio on 100% of the 41 identified practice behaviors adopted as outcomes for the BSW program.

##### 2. How would you know the practice behaviors if you saw them?

The practice behaviors were articulated by the Council on Social Work Education and were designed to be focused on observable behavior that would be assessed in the field practica as well as in one other means as identified by the program. In the Fall of 2010, the BSW program implemented the assessment tools utilized in the two practica, one at the Junior level and one at the Senior level, which had been revised to reflect the newly adopted learning outcomes. The field assessment tool, the Learning Evaluation Tool (LET), has been linked to the 41 practice behaviors with the expectation that students and agency-based field instructors will identify tasks that students may perform in the agency which will allow the demonstration of each practice behavior. Students will be expected to provide documentation of each of the practice behaviors and both the student and the agency-based field instructor will assess the level of competency.

For the second measure of competency used to triangulate the data collected by the Field Instructors, the BSW program committee voted to adopt the ePortfolio. Products that demonstrate each of the 41 practice behaviors were uploaded into the ePortfolio and evaluated by the graduating Senior students' assigned faculty liaison during the Fall 2010 as the pilot of this assessment project. The BSW committee decided that students and faculty evaluators needed additional time to upload a range of products, so in the Spring of 2011, a new ePortfolio was introduced which would allow students to begin uploading products in their Junior practicum and then continue through their Senior practicum.

3. What opportunities do students have to learn it?

The BSW program has 13 required courses, not including practica, which deliver content and opportunities for application of content to prepare students for practice. Each course has articulated objectives which have been systematically linked to the CSWE core competencies to create an educational matrix. The BSW committee has reviewed the current linkages and is initially confident that the content delivered should facilitate the development of the core competencies, however, this matrix will be revisited at our annual BSW program retreat in August.

4. How are you measuring each of the desired behaviors identified in #2 above?

Each of the 41 practice behaviors will be assessed by both the student themselves and their field instructors during their Senior practicum, S482. The Learning Evaluation Tool (LET) has been developed to provide a tool to gather this data. Each practice behavior will be assessed using a 7-point scale with 7 being a "Distinguished", 5 being "Proficient", 3 being "Apprentice" and 1 being "Not Demonstrated". This tool is also used to assign a grade for the S482 course, which is either "Satisfactory" or "Fail".

In addition, faculty members evaluate the same practice behaviors using the student products uploaded into the ePortfolio, using the same scale as above. It is the goal of the BSW committee to create specific rubrics for each of the practice behaviors but that did not happen during this period.

5. What are the assessment findings?

For each of the practice behaviors, we have 3 data points on the level of competency: 1 – ePortfolio as evaluated by the faculty member; 2- Student self-report from the field practicum and 3- Field instructor (agency-based associate faculty) from the field practicum. We identified scores of 5 and above as being "competent" and calculated the percentage of students who were competent, using the benchmark for success at 85%. Therefore, the scores relate to what percentage of students were rated 5 or above, for each of the 41 practice behaviors, with our goal being at least 85%.

To facilitate data collection, students and field instructors were encouraged to upload their final LET scores into Survey Monkey for data analysis. 35 of 56 IUPUI students (62%) and 22 field instructors (40%) submitted scores which are included in the data. For the ePortfolio, the percent participation of students uploading materials ranged among the 41 items, from 14 to 22 (25% to 40%). We believe that these levels of participation are appropriate given the pilot for the project, however, we hope in the future that a majority of students, field instructors and faculty will participate in the assessment efforts.

A document summarizing the data with is presented in Appendix B. The program achieved our benchmark of 85% on all three measures for 34 of 41 practice behaviors (83%). For the 7 practice behaviors which did not meet benchmark, only one of three scores did not reach the benchmark and many just missed the benchmark. Generally speaking, these results indicate that the program is doing a good job of achieving the identified outcomes of the BSW program.

These results are limited by many factors. The first is that this was a pilot and so therefore, new to everyone involved. The field evaluation forms were significantly different than previous field evaluations and both students and agency-based field instructors struggled with some of the changes and higher expectations for evaluation. We did not give either students or field instructors much time to plan for the uploading of the LET scores into an online survey format which limited the response rate, which does not represent a majority of the respondents. And the ePortfolio was not introduced until early November which did not give students and faculty adequate time to upload and evaluate the products. We were actually delighted that as many students used it; but we know that the ones who did are likely to be the stronger students which skewed the results in a positive manner. We also realized that without specific rubrics to calibrate measurement of student products in the ePortfolio, there is likely to be a wide range of what is considered “competent” among evaluators.

6. What improvements have been made based on the assessment findings?

As mentioned in the earlier section, these were pilot findings and therefore it would not be appropriate to make significant changes to curriculum based upon them. And the general picture of the program was quite positive so there were few clear areas where change seemed to be needed. Findings using different methods the previous years had identified the potential for change necessary in our research sequence, however, that was not supported by this data. Most of the improvements we are currently considering include how to make this data stronger to a) more clearly identify potential areas for improvement, and b) increase trust in the data that changes are warranted. We will receive additional data when this year’s Seniors complete their field placements and ePortfolios and the data may be compared to the pilot data to identify trends.

After working to change the field assessment tools and develop the ePortfolio, we made some changes in our plans for collecting and evaluating data. In the future, the program will provide data entry to ALL the LET field tools so that we will have 100% of scores from the field, including both student self-report and field instructor assessment. We will also continue to provide training to students and field instructors on how to effectively utilize the tools to comprehensively assess student progress. For the ePortfolio, we decided that one semester was too much for collecting and evaluating student products for all 41 practice behaviors. We decided which practice behaviors were more elementary and assigned them to the Junior practicum where students could begin uploading their materials. This would provide a two-semester time period to complete the ePortfolio. We also discussed that because students do not receive a grade for participating in the ePortfolio, we needed to give credit for class participation in the Junior practicum for uploading products. In addition, we are exploring adding the PresentationMaker function to the ePort site, which would allow students a specific benefit to them in using the ePortfolio in their job search or graduate application process.

During the coming year, we are reviewing whether all of the 41 behaviors are necessary and appropriate as feedback from students, faculty and field instructors is that they may be repetitive and too difficult to manage for learning as well as assessment. At the same time, it has been identified that the practice behaviors may need to be reworded to be more observable and individual rubrics need to be developed to determine what competence looks like. All of these issues will be discussed during the BSW curriculum committee this year.

#### B. PUL Assessment

##### 1. What general outcome are you seeking?

As one of many undergraduate majors at the IUPUI campus, the BSW program has identified how our current curriculum provides opportunities for students to demonstrate their achievement of the PULs. As a result of the educational opportunities provided in BSW coursework, 80% of Freshman and Sophomore students will achieve competency on the major and moderate emphasis PULs in each of their courses, and 90% of Junior and Senior students will achieve competency on the major and moderate emphasis PULs in each of their courses. \*\*Please note that scores for the small number of Labor Studies students are included in the IUPUI PUL analysis.

##### 2. How would you know it if you saw it?

The stated PULs are to be assessed across the BSW curriculum. Faculty members, including associate faculty, were offered a workshop for faculty development in assessing the PULs as part of their academic responsibilities in teaching BSW courses. This occurred in Fall semesters 2009 and 2010 and will be again offered in Fall 2011. In

addition, there are opportunities for faculty to consult with the program director to enable them to make good assessments of the PULs based on classroom assignments.

3. What opportunities do students have to learn it?

Administrative faculty and staff have developed a matrix that identifies major and moderate emphasis of each PUL in the required BSW program courses. It has been determined that these courses provide educational content and experiences that allow students to build competency on those identified PULs. The matrix has been reviewed to ensure that all PULs are covered at some point in the BSW professional curriculum and we know that in areas that have less emphasis in the BSW curriculum (e.g PUL #1a and b), this is additionally covered in their general and supportive educational requirements for the BSW degree.

4. How are you measuring each of the desired behaviors listed in #2?

An evaluation plan has been developed which gathered data on student achievement of identified PULs from faculty in identified courses. A summary report was produced by the IUPUI Office of Information Management and Institutional Research. Data collection took place in Spring, 2010, Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. Faculty members identified one (or more) student products from the course which provided the opportunity to assess the identified PUL, for both major and moderate emphasis. These products will be evaluated according to a 4-point scale, with 3 being considered "competent".

5. What are the assessment findings?

The School of Social Work received a report from the Office of Information Management and Institutional Research dated July 2011 which provided faculty ratings from both Social Work and Labor studies from data collected in Spring 2010, Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. The data was provided for courses at the 100, 200, 300 and 400 level courses as well as aggregate scores, for both major and moderate emphasis on the PULs. The tables below summarize the results.

Scores were grouped by 100/200 and 300/400 level courses for analysis. In general, scores averaged at or above the 3.0 level which is the standard of "competent". The scores tended to trend higher for 300/400 level courses than in 100/200 courses although it is not possible to tell whether the trends are statistically significant. 80% levels for 100/200 students were achieved for 5 of 12 measures (2 additional measures were 79%) and 90% levels for 300/400 students were achieved for 3 of 10 measures (2 additional measures were 89%).

Some of the findings that seem out of synch with the others seem to be based on smaller sample which limit interpretation of the data as well as potential problems in the measurement of the PULs. However, we continue to be concerned that our

students are weak in PUL #1a (Written, Oral and Visual Communication) and believe that this is an important finding. The tables and results identified above will be disseminated to all faculty, including associates, teaching in the BSW program.

Table 1. PUL analysis for 100 & 200 level courses

PUL	Emphasis	Mean %Effective	Total Number of responses
1a. Written, oral & visual communication	Major	3.05	77
	Moderate	3.27	33
2. Critical thinking	Major	2.10	10
	Moderate	3.13	211
3. Integration & App. of knowledge	Major	3.22	256
	Moderate	2.97	87
4. Intellect. breadth, depth & adapt.	Major	1.71	7
	Moderate	NA	NA
5. Society and culture	Major	3.02	914
	Moderate	3.18	32
6. Values and Ethics	Major	NA	NA
	Moderate	3.15	267

Table 2. PUL analysis for 300 & 400 level courses

PUL	Emphasis	Mean Score	Total Number of responses
1. Written, oral & visual communication	Major	NA	NA
	Moderate	3.2	5
1b. Quantitative skill	Major	3.39	56
	Moderate	NA	NA
2. Critical thinking	Major	NA	NA
	Moderate	3.20	203
3. Integration & App. of knowledge	Major	3.22	256
	Moderate	2.97	87
4. Intellect. breadth, depth & adapt.	Major	3.20	296
	Moderate	3.56	56
5. Society and culture	Major	NA	NA
	Moderate	3.61	88
6. Values and Ethics	Major	3.29	49
	Moderate	3.26	140



Table 3. PUL analysis for 100/200 level courses (major OR moderate if no major course)

PUL	% Effective (3 or 4)	Course Level	Total Number (n)
1a. Written, oral & visual communication	82%	100	77
	89.6%	200	33
	60%	300	5
1b. Quantitative skills	96.4%	400	56
2. Critical thinking	79.2%	100	142
	82.7%	200	69
	83.6%	300	104
3. Integration & App. of knowledge	73.6%	100	56
	79.2%	200	87
	83.4%	300	236
	94.5%%	400	56
4. Intellect. breadth, depth & adapt.	29.3%	100	7
	NA	200	NA
	83.7%	300	135
	89.8%	400	88
5. Society and culture	74.9%	100	246
	86.8%	200	68
	NA	300	NA
	89.7	400	88
6. Values and Ethics	66.7%	100	126
	92.9%	200	141
	85%	300	140
	93.9%	400	49

6. What improvements have been made based on assessment findings?

Program faculty and staff from the IUPUI campus will consider the findings and work to improve participation of faculty in assessing PULs as well as defining criteria of what is competent. We will do this by holding another workshop in Fall 2011 for both new Associate faculty and those who have been teaching at IUPUI over time. We have discussed the issues relating to PUL #1a (Written, oral and visual communication skills) in our BSW curriculum committee and have identified steps to strengthen the general writing and critical thinking skills for our students. Two activities have already been implemented: 1) stressing scholarly writing in our BSW admissions info sessions and during New Student Orientation; and 2) the addition of an elective course, S490 Scholarly Writing for Social Work.

## APPENDIX A

### Foundation Competencies and Practice Behaviors for BSW Graduates

#### ***Identify as a Professional Social Worker and Conduct Oneself Accordingly***

1. *Advocate for client access to the services of social work*
2. *Practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development*
3. *Attend to professional roles and boundaries*
4. *Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication*
5. *Engage in career-long learning*
6. *Use supervision and consultation*

#### ***Apply Social Work Ethical Principles to Guide Professional Practice***

7. *Recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice*
8. *Make ethical decisions by applying standards of the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics and, as applicable, of the International Federation of Social Workers / International Association of Schools of Social Work Ethics in Social Work, Statement Principles*
9. *Tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts*
10. *Apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions*

#### ***Apply Critical Thinking to Inform and Communicate Professional Judgments***

11. *Distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom*
12. *Analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation*
13. *Demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues*

#### ***Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice***

14. *Recognize the extent to which a culture's structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create or enhance privilege and power*

15. *Gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups*
16. *Recognize and communicate their understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences*
17. *View themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants*

***Advance Human Rights and Social and Economic Justice***

18. *Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination*
19. *Advocate for human rights and social and economic justice*
20. *Engage in practices that advance social and economic justice*

***Engage in Research-Informed Practice and Practice-Informed Research***

21. *Use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry*
22. *Use research evidence to inform practice*

***Apply Knowledge of Human Behavior and the Social Environment***

23. *Utilize conceptual framework to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation*
24. *Critique and apply knowledge to understand personal environment*

***Engage in Policy Practice to Advance Social and Economic Well-Being and to Deliver Effective Social Work Services***

25. *Analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being*
26. *Collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action*

***Respond to Contexts that Shape Practice***

27. *Continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services*
28. *Provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services*

***Engage, Assess, Intervene, and Evaluate with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities***

- 29. Substantively and affectively prepare for action with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities*
- 30. Use empathy and other interpersonal skills*
- 31. Develop mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes*

***Assessment***

- 32. Collect, organize, and interpret client data*
- 33. Assess client strengths and limitations*
- 34. Develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives*
- 35. Select appropriate intervention strategies*

***Intervention***

- 36. Initiate actions to achieve organizational goals*
- 37. Implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities*
- 38. Help clients resolve problems*
- 39. Negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients*
- 40. Facilitate transitions and endings*

***Evaluation***

- 41. Social workers critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions*

**Competent by ePortfolio, Field Instructor and Student Fall 2010 (Appendix B)**

Measure	Practice Behavior 1 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 2 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 3 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 4 % Competent Benchmark?
<b>ePortfolio</b>	91% ✓	90% ✓	91% ✓	82% ✓
Field Instructor	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓
Student Self Report	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓
	<b>Practice Behavior 5</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 6</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 7</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 8</b>

Measure	Practice Behavior 1 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 2 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 3 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 4 % Competent Benchmark?
<b>ePortfolio</b>	91% ✓	90% ✓	91% ✓	82% ✓
Field Instructor	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓
Student Self Report	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓
	<b>Practice Behavior 5</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 6</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 7</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 8</b>

Measure	Practice Behavior 1 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 2 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 3 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 4 % Competent Benchmark?
<b>ePortfolio</b>	91% ✓	90% ✓	91% ✓	82% ✓
Field Instructor	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓
Student Self Report	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓
	<b>Practice Behavior 5</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 6</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 7</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 8</b>

Measure	Practice Behavior 1 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 2 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 3 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 4 % Competent Benchmark?
<b>ePortfolio</b>	91% ✓	90% ✓	91% ✓	82% ✓
Field Instructor	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓
Student Self Report	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓
	<b>Practice Behavior 5</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 6</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 7</b>	<b>Practice Behavior 8</b>

### Competent by ePortfolio, Field Instructor and Student Fall 2010

Measure	Practice Behavior 1 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 2 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 3 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 4 % Competent Benchmark?
ePortfolio	91% ✓	90% ✓	91% ✓	82% ✓
Field Instructor	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓
Student Self Report	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓
	Practice Behavior 5	Practice Behavior 6	Practice Behavior 7	Practice Behavior 8

Measure	Practice Behavior 1 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 2 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 3 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 4 % Competent Benchmark?
ePortfolio	91% ✓	90% ✓	91% ✓	82% ✓
Field Instructor	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓
Student Self Report	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓
	Practice Behavior 5	Practice Behavior 6	Practice Behavior 7	Practice Behavior 8

Measure	Practice Behavior 1 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 2 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 3 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 4 % Competent Benchmark?
ePortfolio	91% ✓	90% ✓	91% ✓	82% ✓
Field Instructor	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓
Student Self Report	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓
	Practice Behavior 5	Practice Behavior 6	Practice Behavior 7	Practice Behavior 8

Measure	Practice Behavior 1 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 2 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 3 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 4 % Competent Benchmark?
ePortfolio	91% ✓	90% ✓	91% ✓	82% ✓
Field Instructor	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓
Student Self Report	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓
Measure	Practice Behavior 5	Practice Behavior 6	Practice Behavior 7	Practice Behavior 8

### Competent by ePortfolio, Field Instructor and Student Fall 2010

Measure	Practice Behavior 1 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 2 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 3 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 4 % Competent Benchmark?
ePortfolio	91% ✓	90% ✓	91% ✓	82% ✓
Field Instructor	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓
Student Self Report	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓
Measure	Practice Behavior 5	Practice Behavior 6	Practice Behavior 7	Practice Behavior 8

Measure	Practice Behavior 1 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 2 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 3 % Competent Benchmark?	Practice Behavior 4 % Competent Benchmark?
ePortfolio	91% ✓	90% ✓	91% ✓	82% ✓
Field Instructor	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓	91% ✓
Student Self Report	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓	100% ✓
Measure	Practice Behavior 5	Practice Behavior 6	Practice Behavior 7	Practice Behavior 8

Measure	Practice Behavior 1 % Competent Benchmark?	F
ePortfolio	91% ✓	9
Field Instructor	91% ✓	9
Student Self Report	100% ✓	1
Measure	Practice Behavior 5	F



## **Doctor of Philosophy in Social Work, 2010-2011 PRAC Report**

### **1. *Celebrating the PhD Program's History***

**Year:** Fall 2010/Spring 2011

**Aim:** To acknowledge and celebrate the PhD Program's history in the context of the School's centennial, 1911-2011

**Methods Used:**

- A. A daylong conference featuring the founding Program Director as a keynote speaker.
- B. Renaming the Esprit Award to honor Dr. Power's contributions to the program
- C. Compiling a booklet profiling the program's PhD alumni

**Changes Made:**

**A. Special Celebration of the Program's Founding**

The focus of the IU School of Social Work's *15th Annual PhD Spring Symposium* held on April 29, 2011 was the history of the establishment of the PhD Program in Social Work at Indiana University. This year's symposium was held at the Governor's Mansion in conjunction with our year-long celebration of the School of Social Work's centennial. The founding PhD program director, Dr. Gerald Powers, now an emeritus faculty member, was our keynote speaker. In his talk, titled, "*The Role of the Ph.D. Program in a Century of Social Work Education at Indiana University*," Dr. Powers shared about the 20 year effort to establish a PhD program in Social Work at IUPUI. The inaugural class entered the PhD Program in Fall 1994 and has grown to 60 students currently. The PhD Program at IU remains the only doctoral program in Social Work in the state of Indiana. This year we made a special effort to involve our PhD Program alumni in the symposium.

A brief description of Dr. Powers' presentation follows:

*In the words of Aristotle, "If you would understand anything, observe its beginning and its development." On this, the 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Indiana University School of Social Work we are presented with a unique opportunity to reflect upon one of the more recent developments in the School's remarkable history – the creation and evolution of the only social work PhD program in the State of Indiana. The history of an educational program is inevitably more than merely a series of chronological events; it is first and foremost the story of people (in this case professional social workers, faculty, students, administrators and politicians) who, through their imagination, courage, and unflinching commitment, helped shape the identity of the School as we celebrate this our Centennial year. It is also a story of the challenges and opportunities encountered along the way as the school struggled to understand and adapt to the complex set of accountability demands inherent within the context of the social, political and economic realities of a state-related higher educational system. We will take this opportunity to recognize and pay tribute to those who have helped make the dream of doctoral education within the State of Indiana a reality, and by their so doing; contribute significantly to the School's emergence as one of the finest Schools of Social Work in the country.*

Our specific objective in inviting Dr. Powers as our keynote presenter was to capture the oral history of the program and to honor Dr. Powers for his many and continuing efforts to support the PhD Program.

The day-long symposium began with a display of student research posters. A record number (17) of students presented posters highlighting their ongoing research projects. Our keynote presentation was next, followed by a question-and-answer session. Dr. Sheldon Siegel, former Dean of the IUSSW, then shared some reflections about Dr. Powers's efforts over the years to see the program through to final approval. Former Vice Chancellor Bill Plater was also on hand to pay tribute to Dr. Powers. After a brief break, we held our annual awards luncheon. Students, faculty, and Dr. Powers received a variety of awards. In addition to the Esprit Award, and the "Most Valuable Professor Award," we acknowledged our newest graduate, Ankita Deka, who was selected to receive the *2011 Chancellor's Scholar Award*. The day wrapped up with an open dialogue among our keynote speaker, our current students, and our PhD alumni. Our goal for this year was primarily to celebrate the founding of the program and to honor Dr. Powers as the primary force in establishing the PhD Program in Social Work

at Indiana University. About 50 students, faculty members, and affiliates attended various aspects of our day-long seminar. The event was supported with funding from the Murray-Powers Symposium Foundation Account and a grant from the IUPUI Conference Fund.

## **B. Renaming the Esprit Award**

Dr. Powers' many efforts over the years in developing the program and securing its approval was honored by renaming the Esprit Award, an annual award that is given to a PhD student by the faculty, as *The Jerry Powers Esprit Award*. A plaque commemorating this honor and that lists all of the past recipients was presented to Dr. Powers and is now on display in the Dean's suite of the IU School of Social Work. The new name for the annual award was also displayed on the individual plaque given to this year's recipient, *Jennifer Wright-Berryman*.

## **C. Alumni Profile**

As an additional program tribute, we compiled and updated a booklet with narrative profiles of each of the program's 16 graduates. Compiling this information also gave us the opportunity to connect with each of the graduates and ask for their perspective on the program. The booklet of alumni profiles was distributed to all of the current students and other attendees at the PhD symposium.

## **Impact of Changes:**

### **A. Special Celebration of the Program's Founding**

Dr. Powers' presentation was videotaped and is posted on the PhD website. It is available as an oral history of the establishment of the PhD Program in Social Work at Indiana University. The presentation may be viewed at:

[mms://wms.indiana.edu/ip/isfk400/jerry\\_powers\\_phd\\_history.wmv](mms://wms.indiana.edu/ip/isfk400/jerry_powers_phd_history.wmv)

Students who attended the presentation commented that they were not aware of the long struggle it took to establish the PhD Program and that they gained an appreciation for the effort that went into developing the program and getting it approved through all of the proper channels.

### **B. Renaming the Esprit Award**

By renaming the Esprit Award after Dr. Powers, we now have an ongoing way to honor Dr. Power's many contributions to the PhD Program in Social Work. The plaque listing the names of all the previous recipients is on display in the Dean's office suite where students, faculty, staff, and visitors to the school can see it.

### **C. Alumni Profile**

The alumni profile booklet was used to inform our current students about the variety of career paths and roles that our alumni have moved into as they build upon their doctoral education from Indiana University. The booklet is also a way of acknowledging the achievements of our alumni in their respective fields. It is being used not only to inform current students and faculty about the work of our PhD alumni, but will also be on display at our school booth at professional conferences.

## ***2. Strengthening Research Foundation Content***

**Year:** Fall 2010/Spring 2011

**Aim:** To strengthen the research foundation content PhD students receive to prepare them for the advanced coursework in research methods.

**Method Used:** Development of a 3 credit foundation research methods course to be required for all students as a prerequisite to the advanced quantitative methods course.

**Changes Made:** The Doctoral Program in Social Work requires that each PhD student complete 15 credits of graduate level foundation research—typically 5 courses--before moving on to the advanced qualitative and quantitative methods courses and the research internship. Most students transfer in 6 credits (or two courses) of graduate research from their masters programs. Typically, new students then take the *Intermediate Statistics* course (S718) and the *Scholarly Writing* course (S721) as two more foundation research courses. Most students then still need one more graduate-level research foundation course. In previous semesters, students selected any graduate level research or statistics course to complete their research foundation credits. Many students completed an independent study. Given this open policy for completing the foundation research content, there has been much variability in students' preparation for entering the advanced methods courses. The instructors for the advanced courses have repeatedly noted that some students do not seem prepared for the advanced content.

A proposal came forward to develop a new foundation research methods course that all students would take as preparation for the advanced quantitative methods course. Thus, the content would be expanded to a two –course quantitative methods sequence. The fall semester would focus on foundation content and students' proposals for a research project. The spring semester would focus on advanced quantitative methods and implementation of the proposed projects. Dr. Kim sought input about this proposal from her current students and they were in favor of the idea. After discussion of this issue in the PhD Committee meetings with both faculty and students present, a decision was made to pursue the development of our own foundation research methods course that will better prepare our students to enter the advanced course. Since the same instructor will teach both courses in the quantitative sequence, there will be greater likelihood that students will receive the instruction needed to prepare them for the advanced content.

**Impact of Changes:** During the 2010-2011 academic year the PhD Committee approved the new course description and course objectives for both the new foundation research methods course (S727) and the advanced companion course (S737). In fall 2010, the full syllabus for the foundation course was developed, approved by the PhD

Committee, and submitted to the Curriculum Sub-Committee of the Graduate Affairs Committee. In spring 2011 the course received approval and was put on the remonstrance list.

The foundation research methods course (S727) is being offered for the first time as a 3 credit course in fall 2011. While we will have to wait to receive the course evaluations, we expect that having all of the students take the same foundation course will ensure more even preparation of students as they move on to the advanced quantitative course and the research internship. Expanding the quantitative methods content to two 3-credit courses may have multiple benefits: 1) students can earn the additional foundation research credits they typically need, 2) the first semester would provide the grounding in basic research methods that many students have lacked, 3) the second semester could include additional advanced content such as conducting meta-analyses, and 4) two courses would better reflect the time and effort Dr. Kim devotes to teaching quantitative methods.

### ***3. Completing a cohort analysis of all former and current students and graduates***

**Year:** Fall 2010

**Aim:** To gain an overall perspective of the progress of applicants and students through the PhD Program and the PreDoc Option.

**Methods Used:**

- A. Creating spreadsheets to track the progression of applicants and of all former and current students
- B. Developing flow charts to graphically summarize student progression through the program
- C. Faculty review and discussion of student progression

## **Changes Made:**

### **A. Creating spreadsheets to track student progression**

While we already had a report tracking all of the program's applicants and students since the initial cohort entered the program in the fall of 1994, we converted our report from a Word document to an Excel file so that we could also track the numbers accurately over time. The spreadsheet allows us to monitor how many students are in various stages of the program, from application to coursework, the qualifying exam, the dissertation, and graduation. We are also able to use the data to track acceptance and enrollment rates over time.

### **B. Developing flow charts to summarize student progression.**

To facilitate understanding of the flow of students into and through the PhD Program and the PreDoc Option, we converted the data from the spreadsheet into figures that provided a graphical representation of student progression.

### **C. Faculty review and discussion of student progression.**

The spreadsheets and flow charts were used as a basis of discussion among the faculty members of the PhD Committee.

## **Impact of Changes:**

### **A. Creating spreadsheets to track student progression.**

### **B. Developing flow charts to summarize student progression.**

### **C. Faculty review and discussion of student progression.**

Both types of tracking reports that were developed have been helpful in providing a context for program decision-making, especially in relation to advising around admissions and program progression. Analyzing the cohort data over time helped us to see the need for additional resources to assist students who have completed coursework. For example, the data revealed that we have a high rate of students enrolled in courses getting to the point of course completion. However, about one-third of the students who complete coursework have not progressed to passing the qualifying exam and being advanced to candidacy. This information is being considered in relation to what types of policy changes or resources are needed to assist students who have completed coursework to continue making progress toward completing their remaining degree requirements.

**Indiana University School of Social Work  
PRAC Annual Report  
2010-2011 Academic Year**

## **Introduction**

The Indiana University School of Social Work (IUSSW) was founded in 1911, and in 2011, will celebrate its centennial anniversary. The School currently offers social work education at the Baccalaureate, Masters, and Doctoral level. The Bachelor (BSW) and the Master of Social Work (MSW) programs are both accredited by the Council of Social Work Education (CSWE). In the spring semester of 2012, the BSW and MSW programs will be reviewed for reaffirmation by CSWE under new Education Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS 2008) that focus on competency-based education. The national accreditation covers all the programs of the system school. The BSW program is offered in Indianapolis, Bloomington and Richmond (IU East) and is in the process of being approved for Gary (IU Northwest). The MSW program is offered in Indianapolis, Richmond, Fort Wayne, South Bend and Gary. A one-time cohort is being planned for southern Indiana at IU Southeast in 2011. It is important to note that both BSW and MSW programs at IUPUI have Interim Program Directors who began their positions in July of 2010.

Since July 2007, the Division of Labor Studies merged with the School of Social Work and is now an undergraduate program within IUSSW. Labor Studies is also a system-wide program with offices in Bloomington, Fort Wayne, IUPUI, Kokomo, IU Northwest and IU South Bend. The program offers a Bachelor of Science, an Associate of Science, a Certificate, and a minor in Labor Studies. The Labor Studies program is a fully online program.

In order to make the transition to competency-based education as articulated in the CSWE Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS 2008), the faculty in the social work programs has been working to operationalize the 10 identified core competencies for the various program levels and advanced graduate concentrations of the IUSSW social work program. Competencies are being linked to the objectives of each course in the curriculum and will be assessed in the field practica as well as by the faculty themselves. This report will highlight progress on preparation for the reaffirmation assessment as well as other ongoing efforts to assess the achievement of identified program outcomes that have been traditionally identified by IUSSW to facilitate high levels of student achievement of competencies. This report will summarize these efforts regarding the Master of Social Work Program.

## **Master of Social Work**

### **1. General Outcomes**



The MSW Program continues the transition, moving from an objectives-based curriculum to a competencies-based one as described above. For the 2010-11 academic year, students were expected to achieve knowledge and skills for entry-level social work practice at the graduate level through the following core competencies:

- Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.
- Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.
- Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.
- Engage diversity and difference in practice
- Advance human rights and social and economic justice.
- Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.
- Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.
- Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.
- Respond to contexts that shape practice.
- Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

## 2. Student Outcomes

Graduating students currently self-report through an exit survey how the program has prepared them for entry-level practice.

Agency-based field instructors observe students in their agency setting. Through observation and various assignments, they assess the extent to which students have achieved the learning outcomes.

Additionally, the School receives pass rates for the social work licensure exam. While there are limitations to the use of pass rates, they remain an indicator of overall student outcomes for most social work programs. Content on the licensure exam is closely related to curriculum areas and core competencies. However, programs do not get scores related to specific curriculum areas or learning outcomes.

## 3. Student Learning Opportunities

The faculty, through the MSW Committee, establishes course objectives/learning outcomes for each course. The learning outcomes of required courses (54-57 credit hours out of a total of 60 needed for the degree) are linked to the core competencies. The learning outcomes are in turn linked to assessment measures. Generally the assessment tools used within courses have been considered formative and the program has not relied on these for overall measures of success. This is in the process of changing with the move to competency-based education. Each of the 5 concentrations has begun to measure the competencies with

additional requirements. For example: The mental health and the health concentrations have designed and piloted a multiple choice exam which was administered after students completed the required courses in the concentration. The child welfare and the schools concentrations have added a student portfolio as a final product to measure outcomes. The leadership concentration asked students to fill out a self-efficacy scale and will design further tools during the next academic year.

The field practica (12 credits) at the intermediate and advanced levels provide students with the opportunity to fully learn and apply the program objectives and demonstrate expected learning outcomes. Field seminars were added for most of the intermediate practicum students and for some of the advanced levels as well.

#### 4. Measurement of each of the desired behaviors

On the exit survey, students respond to 46 Likert-scale items (1=very poorly prepared to 5=very well prepared) related to how well the MSW program has prepared them in all curriculum areas and expected outcomes.

The field practicum learning evaluation tool is used to measure student performance related to the program's expected competencies. These are completed by students and instructors separately. In the past, these have primarily been used as the basis for assignment of a pass-fail to the field experience but now will be aggregated for use at the program level.

#### 5. Assessment findings

Exit survey results indicate that students find themselves between adequately prepared and very prepared on all 46 dimensions of the learning outcomes. The area in which students felt least, but still adequately, prepared was statistical analysis, followed by quantitative and qualitative research methods. However, they did indicate feeling well prepared to apply research findings from the literature to practice.

In social work practice, students felt they were adequately to very prepared.

The highest scores were seen in the areas of social work values and ethics, components of critical thinking, and human diversity.

Licensure results: There is a lag in getting results from the licensure exam and there is no way of ascertaining the graduation year of students who take the test. In September 2011, the program received results for MSW grads taking the exam in calendar years 2009 and 2010.

In 2009, for the entry level licensure exam, the pass rate for Indiana University graduates (n=102) was 72% for those taking the test the first time. The national pass rate was 75% for first time examinees. For repeat examinees (n=28) the pass rate was 36% (including first and repeat test takers), compared to a national rate of 23%.

In 2010, for the entry level licensure exam, the pass rate for Indiana University graduates (187) was 83% for those taking the test the first time. This compares to the national pass rate of 74%. For repeat examinees (n=27) the pass rate was 30% compared to the national rate of 25%.

Some of the historical data are presented in the table below:

Year	Indiana University	National
2004	85% (n=86)	62%
2005	61% (n=82)	62%
2006	73% (n=108)	60%
2007	80% (n=115)	57%
2008	67% (n=124)	58%
2009	72% (n=102)	75%
2010	83% (n=187)	74%

## 6. Summary

In the 2010-2011 academic year, the MSW Program continues to be focused upon transitioning to competency-based education. The entire curriculum has been undergoing a shift from course objectives to prescribed core competencies (as determined by the Council on Social Work Education) as well as advanced practice behaviors for the five concentration areas. Newly developed assessment tools give the program a better sense of student outcomes (mastery of competencies) and inform program improvements. These tools were utilized during spring semester 2010. Data will be used to further refine the assessment tools.