

Indiana University School of Social Work

PRAC Annual Report

2011-2012 Academic Year

Introduction

The Indiana University School of Social Work (IUSSW) was founded in 1911, and recently celebrated its centennial anniversary. The School currently offers social work education and the Baccalaureate, Master, 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). During the spring semester of 2012, the BSW and MSW programs completed their self-study for reaffirmation by CSWE under a new curriculum policy statement that focuses on competency-based education. A site visit is scheduled for November 2012. The national accreditation covers all the programs of the system school. The BSW program is offered in Indianapolis, Bloomington, Richmond, Gary, and has recently been approved for IU South Bend. The MSW program is offered in Indianapolis, Richmond, Fort Wayne, South Bend, Gary as well as a one-time cohort in southern Indiana at IU Southeast which began in January 2012. We are planning to implement a fully online MSW program, MSW Direct, in December 2012.

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 Field Instructor, 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 have been 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 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 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 IUPUI campus, which is also facing an accreditation process in Fall of 2012. The BSW program has been actively involved in the identification of the Principles of Undergraduate Education (PUL) as major and moderate emphasis in each of the social work courses offered. 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. Students will also self-assess their competency at the benchmark of 85%.

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. 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 are 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 2011, and evaluation was completed in Spring 2012.

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 reviewed each syllabi and the designated linkages between competencies/practice behaviors and course objectives during the Fall 2011 retreat. A copy of the matrix is included in Appendix D.

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

Each of the 41 practice behaviors was assessed by both the student themselves and their field instructors during their Senior practicum, S482 during Fall 2011. The Learning Evaluation Tool (LET) was 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 again 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 professional social worker) 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%.

Scores for student final field evaluations were uploaded and analyzed by program staff and 63 of 71 final field evaluations were available for analysis (89%). This was an increase from last year (62% of students and 20% of Field Instructors) as we hand-collected the data rather than asking them to upload it themselves into an online survey collector. Using data from the S482 LETs, Field Instructors rated 98% to 100% of students as “competent” on the identified practice behaviors. Student self-evaluations trended to be slightly lower than those of the Field Instructors, however, 95% to 100% of students rated themselves “competent” on their practice behaviors. These scores exceed our identified benchmark of 85% for all practice behaviors.

For the ePortfolio, the percent participation of students uploading materials ranged among the 41 items, from 35 to 54 (49% to 76%). This is also an increase in response rate from the previous year (25% to 40%) which was a goal for our assessment project. We continue to strive for 100% participation from students in this important process and have expanded the academic credit to facilitate student and faculty time to allow this to happen. However, students were rated “competent” on only 19 of 41 practice behaviors or 46%, clearly lower than last year’s results.

The results which indicated competency were clustered around social work identity, advancing human rights and social justice as well as assessment which could be considered strengths of the current curriculum. There were challenges with critical thinking, research, human behavior and the social environment, contexts and intervention which could be considered curricular areas where additional work is needed.

There are a number of interpretations that may be made of these data, including major limitations to the validity and reliability which are discussed below. The ePortfolio data is NOT consistent with the student self-evaluation or Field Instructor evaluation of the students' practice behaviors. It is possible that classroom instructors have higher standards for evaluating students and increased familiarity with the new competency-based system than the Field Instructors. The faculty instructors were encouraged NOT to just give everyone a 5 (competent) if the student product did not demonstrate competent practice.

A document summarizing the data with is presented in Appendix C. The program achieved our benchmark of 85% on all three measures for 19 of 41 practice behaviors (46%). For the 23 practice behaviors which did not meet benchmark, only one of three scores did not reach the benchmark and many (13) just missed the benchmark (80% or above). Generally speaking, these results indicate that the program is doing a reasonably good job of achieving the identified outcomes of the BSW program. However, there were 4 scores in the 60% range that need additional study: PB # 10, PB # 22, PB #36 and PB #41. These four will receive further attention during the instructor orientation for the seminar class to clarify what behaviors are being assessed and possible products which would provide evidence for that behavior, as well as determine if course content needs to be strengthened.

These results are limited by many factors. Both students and agency-based field instructors continue to struggle with some of the changes and higher expectations for evaluation. We changed the method of hand-loading data from the student LET evaluations which increased the response rate for that data. We also provided additional training and support for faculty instructors to encourage students to upload products for the ePortfolio, as well as adding participation points in the course for doing so. In our curriculum revisions, we have added additional course credit for the field seminars so students and instructors are truly given credit for the time they need to upload and evaluate the products.

It is probably not surprising that as the response rate went up, and a broader range of students uploaded products to the ePortfolio, that there were a broader range of scores with additional students NOT meeting the 85% benchmark. We were pretty sure last year that those who uploaded products tended to be our strongest students! It seems that students are struggling to delineate the actual behaviors that they must demonstrate for each practice behavior. We believe that as the students become more familiar with the competencies and practice behaviors from better integration in EACH social work course, they will do a better job selecting products that truly reflect their competency.

We continue to know that without specific rubrics to calibrate measurement of student products in the ePortfolio as well as in the field, 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?

After these findings were presented to the BSW curriculum committee in Spring 2012, it was again decided that it would not be appropriate to make significant changes to curriculum based upon them due to the limitations discussed above. The general picture of the program was quite positive so there were few clear areas where change seemed to be needed. As the Indiana University School of Social Work is a system school, data was presented across all campuses and the IUPUI ePortfolio data was the only area with consistent concerns. 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 from all campuses. However, it WAS identified again for IUPUI students and the program director will be convening the faculty who teach in the research sequence to review curriculum and see whether we might find ways to better prepare students in the research area.

After working to change the field assessment tools and develop the ePortfolio, we made some changes in our plans for collecting and evaluating data. The program provided data entry to ALL the LET field tools and increased the response rate on this data to 89%. We provided training to students and field instructors on how to effectively utilize the tools to comprehensively assess student progress. For the ePortfolio, we began collecting products in the Spring 2011 Junior practicum which provided a two-semester time period to complete

the ePortfolio. We gave credit for class participation in the Junior practicum for uploading products. In addition, we added the Presentation Maker 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, although only a few students took advantage of training offered to allow them to do this.

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 85% (reduced from 90% last year to provide consistency with the competency analysis discussed earlier) 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, have previously been offered a workshop in assessing the PULs as part of their academic responsibilities in teaching BSW courses. This occurred in Fall semesters 2009 and 2010 (it was not offered in Fall 2011 due to emphasis on our

disciplinary accreditation process – it is planned again for Fall 2012). 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/Fall 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 or above 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 June 2012 which provided faculty ratings from both Social Work and Labor Studies from data collected in Spring/Fall 2010, Spring/Fall 2011 and Spring 2012. 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 4 of 12 measures and 85% levels for 300/400 students were achieved for 7 of 12 measures (although an additional three scores just missed benchmark at 83%).

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 PUL #2 Critical Thinking. These findings are all the more concerning since our students rated THEMSELVES as significantly above the IUPUI mean score on Written, oral & visual Skills and slightly above the mean score on Critical Thinking. 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	3.09	95
	Moderate	3.20	60
2. Critical thinking	Major	2.65	17
	Moderate	3.20	336
3. Integration & App. of knowledge	Major	3.22	443
	Moderate	3.13	112
4. Intellect. breadth, depth & adapt.	Major	2.45	22
	Moderate	NA	NA
5. Society and culture	Major	3.03	558
	Moderate	3.22	62
6. Values and Ethics	Major	NA	NA
	Moderate	3.20	504

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	3.17	6
1b. Quantitative skill	Major	3.34	80
	Moderate	NA	NA
2. Critical thinking	Major	NA	NA
	Moderate	3.32	268
3. Integration & App. of knowledge	Major	3.22	464
	Moderate	3.4	80
4. Intellect. breadth, depth & adapt.	Major	3.37	254
	Moderate	NA	NA
5. Society and culture	Major	NA	NA
	Moderate	3.46	125
6. Values and Ethics	Major	3.29	49
	Moderate	3.19	176

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

PUL	% Effective (3 or 4)	Course Level	Total Number (n)
1a. Written, Oral & Visual Communication	NA	100	NA
	90.6%	200	95
	66.7%*	300	5
1b. Quantitative Skills	96.3%	400	80
2. Critical Thinking	83.3%*	100	246
	52.9%	200	17
	86%*	300	164
	83.6%*	400	104
3. Integration & App. of Knowledge	57.8%	100	109
	79.2%	200	87
	88.9%	300	334
	83.2%	400	77
4. Intellect. Breadth, Depth & Adapt.	58.4%	100	12
	30%	200	10
	83.8%	300	166
	89.8%	400	88
5. Society and Culture	78.5%	100	469
	86.8%	200	89
	87.5%*	300	16
	91.7%*	400	109
6. Values and Ethics	71.5%*	100	281
	95.1%*	200	223
	79.6%*	300	176
	93.8%	400	49

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

Program faculty and staff from the IUPUI campus will continue to 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 2012 for both new Associate faculty and those who have been teaching at IUPUI over time to view the PUL results as well as the assessment of the BSW program around CSWE competencies.

We will discuss the issues relating to PUL #1a (Written, oral and visual communication skills) and PUL #2 Critical Thinking in our BSW curriculum committee and will continue to work to identify 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.

The faculty who teach in the research sequence will also meet during the summer to discuss ways to enhance those courses to emphasize critical thinking, scholarly writing and quantitative reasoning in the two required research courses.

Appendix A provides a full list of the CSWE competencies and practice behaviors. Appendix B provides a summary of the 2011-12 program assessment data based on the CSWE competencies/practice behaviors. Appendix C is a matrix that connects the CSWE competencies to the PULs. And finally, Appendix D demonstrates the connections between each course objective for social work courses (200 level and above) and the CSWE competencies/practice behaviors.

Master of Social Work

Defining Student Learning Outcomes

The MSW Program has completed the transition of moving from an objectives-based curriculum to a competencies-based curriculum as articulated in the CSWE 2008 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS). The faculty in the MSW program linked competencies to the objectives of each course in the curriculum, and the competencies are now assessed in the classroom and in the field practica.

In addition to a foundation year of study, the MSW Program has five concentrations from which a student may chose for their advanced study. These are: child welfare, health, leadership, mental health, and schools. Throughout the foundation and concentration years MSW students are expected to achieve knowledge and skills for entry-level social work practice through the following core competencies:

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

Student Learning Opportunities

The faculty, through the MSW Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate, establishes course learning outcomes for each course. The learning outcomes of all courses are linked to the core competencies above. The learning outcomes are, in turn, linked to assessment measures. In the past years, the assessment tools used within courses have been considered formative and the program has not relied on these for overall measures of success. With the move to competency-based education, a new set of assessment measures has been implemented. These are linked to competencies in both the field and the classroom.

The field practica (12 credits) at the intermediate and advanced levels provide students with the opportunity to learn and apply the course work and demonstrate expected learning outcomes. Field seminars were added to the intermediate practicum as well, in order to promote greater integration between classroom and field.

Measuring Student Learning Outcomes

Measures of student mastery of competencies, as operationalized by each concentration's practice behaviors, logically come at the end of the concentration field placement. The Learning Evaluation Tool (LET) is an instrument that links practice behaviors that are associated with competencies to specific tasks and products. The LET is completed by both the agency field instructor and as a self-report by the student. In this way, the LET serves as two measurements.

A third measure of student mastery of competencies was designed by faculty teaching in each of the five concentrations. The MSW Program Curriculum Committee affirmed the use of the different measurement instruments and procedures for each concentration and planned for ongoing evaluation of the utility and quality of the measure after several implementations. The Child Welfare concentration and the Schools concentration are now using a student portfolio as a final product to measure outcomes. The Health and Mental Health & Addictions concentrations are using multiple choice examinations which are administered after students have finished their required courses in those concentrations. The Leadership concentration requires student to fill out a self-efficacy scale. In Spring 2012 these tools were utilized for the second time.

Findings

As indicated above, faculty in each of the five concentrations developed a third measure of student competencies. The past academic year has been informative with respect to how the process of measuring student learning outcomes can be strengthened. In some instances, we have also realized that the measurement tool itself needs to be redesigned.

For example, the faculty in the child welfare concentration opted to use a portfolio of student products. The products were assessed using a 7 point rubric to assess student mastery of competencies as reflected in the products. Out of 54 students in the child welfare concentration, only 6 had at least 75% of the assessment scores reported. This troublesome response rate was due to the fact that associate (adjunct) faculty teaching child welfare courses did not utilize the rubric to assess the students with respect to the competencies.

The faculty in the schools concentration designed a measure similar to a portfolio, in which students, over the course of the academic year, submit 13 journal entries. Each entry is the student's critical reflection on (not just description of) their classroom and field experiences related to a particular competency and the practice behaviors associated with each competency. Faculty liaisons assess student mastery based on the journal entries. The benchmark used for the reflective journals is 90% of students in the concentration will score at '5' or higher on the practice behaviors associated with each competency. Assessments taken in Spring 2012 indicate that there are 4 practice behaviors out of 34 where the benchmark was not achieved. For these 4 practice behaviors, however, the 89% of students scored '5' or higher, indicating the benchmark was almost achieved. The response rate was 100%.

Two concentrations opted to design and use comprehensive evaluations as the third measure of competencies. Faculty in the health concentration created questions that reflected the content of the three required health concentration courses. On the IUPUI campus, 42 health concentration students completed the exam. This represents a 100% response rate. Only 2 students (4.8%) correctly answered at least 80% of the questions (a benchmark) correctly. The average score was 63.4. These scores, obtained in Spring 2012, are similar in nature to the scores obtained in Spring 2011, where only one student correctly answered at least 80% of the questions correctly and where the average score was 67.5

Faculty in the mental health and addictions concentration also utilized a comprehensive exam. On the IUPUI campus, 16 students took the exam, representing a 19% response rate. 68.8% students (n=11) correctly answered at least 80% of the questions. The average score was 69.56.

Finally, faculty in the leadership concentration utilized a self-efficacy survey as the third measure of competency. The items on the survey are aligned to the concentration's practice behaviors, and students taking the survey rate their confidence at two time periods. For the first, they reflected back on what they believed was their confidence level at the time at which they entered the program. For the second, they reported on their current level of confidence (i.e. at time of nearing graduation). The leadership response rate was 100%. Analysis of the data indicated that the students in this concentration perceived significantly higher levels of self-efficacy at graduation time than the time at which they began the program.

Improving Assessment to Improve Student Learning

Clearly, there are ways in which we need to address our measurements in order that we can accurately assess, and then improve, student learning. In some instances, this means addressing the process of evaluation. For example, given the low participation rate of adjuncts, faculty in the child welfare concentration have opted to return to a method of measuring students' practice behaviors and competencies that was utilized in 2011. In this method, students in child welfare placements presented a case to the field liaison and field instructor when the liaison (a faculty member) visited the agency. The case presentation included the theories underlying practice, an assessment of the case, and evaluation of client progress and the liaison assessed the student on the competencies and practice behaviors as demonstrated in the case presentation.

In the fall 2012 semester, faculty in the health concentration and in the mental health and addictions concentration will be reviewing the outcomes that are presented here. Some of the steps to be considered are re-evaluating the design of the exam, reviewing potential other measures, and determining areas of content that may need to be addressed more comprehensively in coursework. Additionally, faculty in the mental health concentration will consider making the exam mandatory rather than voluntary as it is now, in order to obtain a more accurate picture of results.

Doctorate in Social Work

The Social Work Ph.D. Program prepares graduates to conduct original research and develop knowledge in social work; to teach in programs and schools of social work at the baccalaureate and graduate levels; and, to engage in professional services that contribute to the profession and to the academy. The Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for Social Work are derived from the *IUPUI Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning* (www.iupui.edu/~gradoff) and were approved by the Ph.D. Curriculum Committee. These Student Learning Outcomes are listed below.

Graduates of the Indiana University School of Social Work Ph.D. program will

1. Demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to design and conduct original research that contributes to social work scholarship;
2. Think critically and creatively to solve problems in their area of specialization;
3. Communicate effectively, both in writing and orally, the nature and outcomes of scholarly work; and,
4. Understand and adhere to ethical standards relating to the conduct of scientific research.

Methods of Knowledge and Skill Acquisition:

Students acquire the above knowledge, skills, and professional ethics through the completion of didactic coursework; direct mentoring by faculty; research internships; preparation of publications of peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters; submitting peer-reviewed proposals and presentations of their scholarly work at state, regional, and national conferences; the completion of oral and written qualifying exams; and, completion and successful defense of their dissertations. Although all of the required Ph.D. courses address at least to some extent the above SLOs, the following sections outline specific coursework and learning experiences in courses that directly contribute to students' acquisition of knowledge, skills, and professional ethics.

Coursework and Direct Mentoring by Faculty:

SLO 1— Demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to design and conduct original research that contributes to social work scholarship

Students gain knowledge in designing and conducting original research through formal coursework in both qualitative (SWK-S 726 and SWK-S 736) and quantitative (SWK-S 727 and SWK-S 737) research methods courses, where they carry out original research. These required courses are sequenced across the academic year and are offered in alternative academic years. Students' quantitative skills in data analyses are enhanced through two required statistics courses in the social work curriculum (SWK-S 718 and SWK-S 728), and additional required research and/or statistics courses in other academic disciplines of Indiana University.

In addition to the above-mentioned courses, Ph.D. students are partnered with faculty mentors for a 2-semester, 6 credit-hour, research internship course (SWK-S 725), in which they participate in faculty members' new or on-going research. In this course, students may assist faculty in conducting preliminary literature reviews, designing new research projects, participating in data collection and analyses of new or ongoing research, and writing research and/or technical reports.

SLO 2 – Think critically and creatively solve problems in their areas of specialization

The first aspect of SLO 2, to think critically and creatively solve problems, is addressed through students' successful completion of several courses. Students further their critical thinking skills in courses that address the philosophy of science and social work (SWK-S 720); theories of human development (SWK-S 710); and in course that prepares students to teach through examining pedagogical theories, practices, and assessment of social work teaching (SWK-S 724).

SLO 3 – Communicate effectively, both in writing and orally, the nature and outcomes of scholarly work

One course in the Ph.D. Program (SWK-S 721: Preparing to Publish: Seminar in Advanced Scholarship Skills) specifically addresses effective communication of the nature and outcomes of scholarly work. This course prepares students for academic scholarship by focusing on the expectations and standards for scholarly discourse, analytical thinking and the development of logical arguments, and scholarly writing. In most courses in the Social Work Ph.D. Program, students are required to complete written papers and oral presentations. In the qualitative (SWK-S 726 and SWK-S 736) and quantitative

research methods (SWK-S 727 and SWK-S 737) course sequences, students present orally and submit written reports of the methods and results of their qualitative and quantitative research projects.

SLO 4 – Understand and adhere to ethical standards relating to the conduct of scientific research

Students acquire knowledge and skills in adhering to ethical standards as these relate to scientific research in a number of their courses. Ethical use and reporting of statistical analyses are key components of acquiring skills in statistical analyses and are included in both the required intermediate and advanced statistics courses (SWK-S 718 and SWK-S 728). Students acquire further knowledge of ethical standards in research as these relate to qualitative and quantitative methods in the first of these two-course sequences (SWK-S 726 and SWK-S 727). Further, students complete all training in the conduct of ethical research as a prerequisite for submitting Institutional Review Board (IRB) applications for approval to conduct research. These IRBs are completed by students in consultation with faculty in their qualitative and quantitative research sequences, the research internship for new or amended research projects, and for their dissertation research.

Journal Articles, Book Chapters, Technical Reports, and Presentations

Student-authored journal articles, book chapters, technical reports, and presentations provide evidence of students' acquisition of the SLOs listed above. Throughout their doctoral education, students are encouraged to present their scholarly work in a variety of venues. These publications and presentations may be sole-authored by students, co-authored by students, or co-authored by students with faculty. In addition, after having completed each of the qualitative and quantitative research methods sequences, students are expected to present their research results in poster presentations of their work at the Ph.D. Social Work Spring Symposium, which is held each year, in April. Other venues in which students demonstrate the acquisition of the SLOs is through peer-reviewed publications in professional journals; authorship of peer-reviewed book chapters, sometimes in co-authorship with faculty mentors; written technical reports related to grants; and paper and poster presentations at state, regional, and national professional conferences.

Completion of Oral and Written Qualifying Exams

After students complete coursework, they must pass a qualifying exam prior to admission to Doctoral Candidacy. Students work independently on the qualifying exam. Students' advisory committees review the written exam, attend and hear the students' oral defense of the exam, and make

a final decision about the extent to which the student has demonstrated mastery of the area of specialization and a sufficient level of scholarship. This exam consists of both a written paper and oral defense that focuses on the student's area of specialty. For the qualifying exam, students integrate their areas of specialization and demonstrate the linkages between the specialization and social work practice, policy, human behavior, and research. The written portion of the examination includes a thorough literature review of the student's area of specialization and how this area relates to topics that span the social work curriculum.

Completion and Successful Defense of the Dissertation

The dissertation is the definitive demonstration during the Ph.D. Program of students' acquisition of knowledge, skills, and professional ethics. Usually, students' areas of specialization from the qualifying exams are carried forward as the focus of their dissertation proposals. Individual students work with their dissertation committee chairs to develop a proposal for their dissertation research. This proposal is then reviewed by their appointed dissertation committee, which consists of 3 social work faculty members and an additional faculty member who represents the student's area of specialization. Upon successful defense of the dissertation proposal, students carry out the research agreed upon by themselves and their Committee. After the research has been completed and the written dissertation has been submitted to and deemed defensible by the Dissertation Chair, students present their research and findings to their Committee and attending interested parties.

Measurement of Students' Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills

Students' attainment of the knowledge and skills reflected by the SLOs are assessed using a variety of methods. Course grades are measures of acquisition of SLOs at the course-level. Successful completion of research internships, peer-reviewed publications, technical reports, and presentations that were accepted or presented provide further evidence of students' acquisition of the knowledge and skills needed to demonstrate successful learning outcomes. Successful completion of qualifying exams, dissertation proposals, and dissertation defenses are the final measurement methods of students' acquisition of knowledge and skills in the Social Work Ph.D. Program.

Assessment Results for the 2011 – 2012 Academic Year

Each of the above measurement methods were used to identify student progress in the Social Work Ph.D. Program and are presented in Table 1. There are a total of 47 Ph.D. students. Of these, there are 7 students whose current status is unknown, i.e., they are no longer taking coursework or have completed coursework but recently have not made measureable advances toward the Ph.D. at either the qualifying exam or dissertation proposal or defense. Of the remaining 40 students, 7 students are enrolled part-time in the Ph.D. Program. Six of these 7 students are still enrolled in coursework. Most of these part-time students are employed full-time and take a reduced number of course credit hours. Of the 15 students enrolled in coursework during the 2011 – 2012 academic year, only one student earned less than passing in two courses. This student currently is on academic probation. Thirty-two students have satisfactorily completed coursework. Nineteen students are at the point of qualifying exams. Eleven students have completed the qualifying exam and are at the 'ABD' point in their academic progress. Of these, 1 student's dissertation proposal has been approved, 1 student's dissertation proposal defense has been scheduled, and 1 student has submitted a dissertation proposal defense. Three students completed their Ph.D. degrees during the academic year.

Table 1 – Social Work Ph.D. Students' Academic Progress for the 2011 – 2012 Academic Year

Coursework	Qualifying Exams	ABD	Dissertation
Currently taking course-work = 15 students*, with 1 student failing 2 courses and on academic probation Completed and passed all coursework = 32	At the point of the qualifying exams = 19 students	All But the Dissertation = 11, with 1 student having submitted a dissertation proposal, 1 student having an approved dissertation proposal, and 1 student whose dissertation proposal defense is pending	Completed the Dissertation during the current year = 3

* Part-time as well as full-time students are counted together as currently taking coursework.

Table 2 provides additional information about evidence of students' SLOs through paper, poster, and panel presentations at state, regional, and national conferences; workshops presented; journal articles published or in press; technical reports; book chapters; manuals; and, IU or School-sponsored presentations. It is obvious that students have been very productive in the area of scholarly dissemination. Nineteen students authored or co-authored 28 paper, poster, and panel presentations; conducted 5 workshops, and published or have in press 6 journal articles, 7 technical reports, 4 book chapters, and 1 manual. Twenty-two students presented 15 poster presentations at the School of Social Work Ph.D. Symposium this past year. Two students participated and presented posters at the IUPUI Research Day event.

Table 2 – Social Work Ph.D. Students' Scholarly Products for the 2011 – 2012 Academic Year**

Paper/Poster Presentations at State, Regional, and National Conferences	Workshop Presentations	Journal Articles, Technical Reports, Book Chapters	IU or School- Sponsored Presentations
Completed Paper Presentations = 15 Accepted Paper/Panel Presentations = 6 Proposed Presentations = 4 Poster Presentations = 3	Completed workshops = 5	Published journal articles = 5 In press journal publications = 1 Technical Reports = 7 Book Chapters = 4 Manuals = 1	IU Social Work Spring Symposium poster presentations = 15, with 22 students participating IUPUI Research Day = 2 student presentations

** The total number of students participating in the above activities/products, except the IU or School-sponsored presentations = 19.

On-going assessment of student progress and program needs have continued throughout the 2011 – 2012 academic year, and three areas were identified that needed to be addressed. First, the Ph.D. student representatives to the Ph.D. Curriculum Committee conducted a survey of their peers about their perceptions of their qualitative methods coursework. The results from this survey was that students, in general, did not believe they were receiving sufficient course content in qualitative methods and found it difficult to identify additional qualitative methods courses in other IUPUI academic units where they would not duplicate knowledge and skills already attained and would further their knowledge and skills in qualitative research. Students' agreed that the one course that we had was insufficient to allow for completion of an actual qualitative study. Upon learning of students' concerns, the Ph.D. Curriculum Committee decided to make the qualitative methods a 2-course sequence, as was the case with the quantitative methods 2-course sequence that was already in place. This fall, the first of the 2-sequence course in qualitative methods is being taught, with the second course planned for spring, 2013.

Second, the Ph.D. Director conducted a focus group with students at the end of spring, 2012, in relation to two Ph.D. practice theory courses. Students believed that there was a great deal of overlap between the two courses. The Ph.D. faculty reviewed the syllabi from these two courses and agreed that there was extensive overlap in course content. This overlap likely had resulted from changes in the instructors assigned to teach these two courses, potentially resulting in content 'drift' across the two courses. As a result, the Ph.D. Curriculum Committee voted to combine the content from both theory courses and drop the requirement that students take both courses.

Third, a review of student progress during spring, 2012 revealed that students' progress toward their academic goals tends to slow when they reach the point of completing the qualifying exam and dissertation proposals. As can be seen in Table 1, there are 19 students at the point of the qualifying exam who have not yet completed their exams. Of these students, only 2 students have failed in their first attempt to complete the qualifying exam. The remaining students have not yet submitted a qualifying exam. Many of these students seem to be 'on track', given the substantially greater amount of time that is needed to prepare and submit these two products. Similar to those who have not yet submitted the qualifying exam, 11 students are 'ABD'. These students have successfully completed their qualifying exams and have been admitted to Candidacy but have not completed the Ph.D. dissertation.

The Ph.D. Curriculum Committee discussed some of the reasons that students' progress slows at these two points. Obvious reasons include the fact that these two points in the academic progression represent substantially independent, internally driven work. Besides the sheer nature of the process at these two points in time, students face other obstacles to successfully completing their qualifying exams and dissertations. Our full-time students receive two years of tuition remission, research assistantships, and health and dental insurance coverage, along with coverage of other student fees. However, at the end of the second year, students' funding ceases, and students then are faced with potential financial difficulties or the need to work part-time or full-time. Many of our students have had coursework and practice teaching at this point in the baccalaureate and master's programs. The Ph.D. Director monitors the number of courses that students teach by requesting that the BSW and MSW Directors keep her informed of Ph.D. students receiving teaching assignments to try to limit the potential that students are teaching so many courses that they are unable to pursue their doctoral studies. Other students become or already are employed part-time or full-time in social work agencies across the state. Meanwhile, part-time students, many of whom have been continuously employed full-time, continue their efforts to balance work and other responsibilities, in addition to working toward their degrees.

The Ph.D. Director and the Curriculum Committee recognize that the above impediments can be and are overcome by students who are focused on completing the degree. In that regard, the Ph.D. Committee plans to examine how we can facilitate students' focus on completion. For several years, the Ph.D. Program has maintained a stance of a 'culture of completion'. In the coming year, the Acting Ph.D. Director and the Ph.D. Curriculum Committee will focus on how to continue to facilitate and develop a 'culture of completion' at the qualifying exam and dissertation points.

APPENDIX A

Foundation Competencies and Practice Behaviors for BSW Graduates (CSWE, 2008)

CSWE I. 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*

CSWE II. 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*

CSWE III. 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*

CSWE IV. 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*

CSWE V. 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*

CSWE VI. Engage in Research-Informed Practice and Practice-Informed Research

21. *Use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry*

22. Use research evidence to inform practice

CSWE VII. 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

CSWE VIII. 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

CSWE IX. 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

CSWE X. 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

Appendix B: Assessment data for IUPUI BSW Seniors, 2011-12

Competencies/Practice Behaviors Data Summary

Competency 1: Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.

Practice Behavior #1: Advocate for client access to the services of social work

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	44	62%	34	77%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #2: Practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	53	75%	47	89%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #3: Attend to professional roles and boundaries.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	44	62%	39	89%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #4: Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance and communication.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	50	70%	47	94%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #5: Engage in career-long learning.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	41	58%	32	78%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #6: Use supervision and consultation.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
EPortfolio	71	48	68%	45	94%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Competency #2: Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice

Practice Behavior #7: Recognize and manage personal values in way that allows professional values to guide practice

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	54	76%	47	87%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #8: Make ethical decisions by applying standards of the NASW Code of Ethics and, as applicable, of the IFSW/IASSW Ethics in Social Work, Statement of Principles.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	55	77%	53	96%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #9: Tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	36	51%	29	81%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #10: Apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	38	54%	25	66%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	64	100%	Y

Competency #3: Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.

Practice Behavior #11: Distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	54	73%	42	77%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #12: Analyze model of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	39	55%	30	77%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #13: Demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, commAssessment Measureies, and colleagues.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	50	70%	44	88%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Competency #4: Engage diversity and difference in practice.

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

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	41	58%	33	80%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Practice Behavior #15: Gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	50	70%	43	86%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #16: Recognize and communicate their understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	49	69%	39	80%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #17: View themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	48	68%	41	85%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Competency #5: Advance human rights and social and economic justice.

Practice Behavior #18: Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	52	73%	45	87%	Y
Field Instructor	25	19	76%	19	100%	Y
Student	14	2	14%	2	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #19: Advocate for human rights and social and economic justice.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	54	76%	50	93%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Practice Behavior #20: Engage in practices that advance social and economic justice.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	39	55%	34	87%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Competency #6: Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research

Practice Behavior # 21: Use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	40	56%	33	83%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	N

Practice Behavior #22: Use research evidence to inform practice.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	52	73%	35	67%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Competency #7: Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.

Practice Behavior # 23: Utilize conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	41	58%	41	80%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	60	95%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Practice Behavior # 24: Critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	54	76%	43	80%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Competency #8: Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.

Practice Behavior # 25: Analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	54	76%	45	83%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior # 26: Collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	37	52%	30	81%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Competency #9: Respond to contexts that shape practice.

Practice Behavior #27: Continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	49	69%	39	80%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Practice Behavior #28: Provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	41	58%	33	80%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	61	97%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Competency 10 (a): Engagement

Practice Behavior #29: Substantively and affectively prepare for action with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	46	65%	40	87%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	61	97%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Practice Behavior #30: Use empathy and other interpersonal skills.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	52	73%	47	90%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #31: Develop a mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	71	37	52%	29	78%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Competency # 10 (b): Assessment

Practice Behavior #32: Collect, organize, and interpret client data.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
Eportfolio	71	46	65%	40	89%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #33: Assess client strengths and limitations.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
Eportfolio	71	50	68%	48	96%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #34: Develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
Eportfolio	71	40	58%	35	88%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #35: Select appropriate intervention strategies.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
Eportfolio	71	35	49%	32	91%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Competency #10 (c): Intervention

Practice Behavior #36: Initiate actions to achieve organizational goals.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
Eportfolio	71	48	68%	31	65%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Practice Behavior #37: Implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
Eportfolio	71	35	49%	29	83%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Practice Behavior #38: Help clients resolve problems.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
Eportfolio	71	44	62%	37	84%	Y
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #39: Negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
Eportfolio	71	32	45%	26	81%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Practice Behavior #40: Facilitate transitions and endings.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
Eportfolio	71	38	54%	30	79%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y

Competency #10 (d): Evaluation

Practice Behavior #41: Critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions.

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
Eportfolio	71	42	59%	27	64%	N
Field Instructor	71	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	71	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Appendix C: Matrix of CSWE Competencies and PULs

PUL #1A	PUL # 1B	PUL #2	PUL #3	PUL #4	PUL #5	PUL #6
Written Communication	Quantitative Reasoning	Critical Thinking	Integration Application	Breadth, Depth & Adaptiveness	Society and Culture	Values and Ethics
CSWE I	CSWE VI	CSWE III	CSWE X	CSWE VI	CSWE IV	CSWE II
CSWE III	Research	Critical Thinking	Practice	CSWE VIII	CSWE V	Values and Ethics
Professional identity and Critical Thinking				CSWE IX	CSWE VI	
				Human Behavior, Social Policy and Contexts	CSWE IX	
					Diversity, Social Justice, Human Behavior and Contexts	

		221	251	322	331	332	352	371	423	433	442	472	401	402
EP 2.1.2.. Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.	<u>2.1:</u> Recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice.	#7			#2 #3	#3			#6			#2	#3	#2
	<u>2.2:</u> Make ethical decisions by applying standards of the NASW 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		#4			#3		#7 #8	#6	#10	#4	#2	#3	#2 #3
	<u>2.3:</u> Tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts.													#3
	<u>2.4:</u> Apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions.				#3		#5							#2 #3

		221	251	322	331	332	352	371	423	433	442	472	401	402
EP 2.1.3. Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional knowledge.	<u>3.1</u> Distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom.		#8		#8	#9	#6	#1 #3		#3 #5 #8	#5	#3 #4 #8 #9	#4	#4
	<u>3.2:</u> Analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation.		#4			#4		#2		#1 #7	#5	#3 #4 #6 #7		#7
	<u>3.3:</u> Demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues.				#7	#1	#10		#3	#1 #3			#4	#3

		221	251	322	331	332	352	371	423	433	442	472	401	402
EP 2.1.4. Engage diversity and difference in practice.	<u>4.1:</u> Recognize the extent to which a culture's structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create/ enhance privilege and power.	#5 #6	#4		#5	#1 #3	#4 #11		#6 #7 #8	#9			#6	#8
	<u>4.2:</u> Gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups.	#5 #6		#3	#3	#5 #6	#4		#6	#9 #10			#5	#1
	<u>4.3:</u> Recognize & communicate understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences.	#5 #6		#3	#5	#5 #6	#4			#9 #10	#7		#5	#8
	<u>4.4:</u> View themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants.	#5 #6		#3	#1 #3	#1 #3			#6	#1,#2, #3,#4, #5,#6, #7,#8, #9, #10			#5	#8

		221	251	322	331	332	352	371	423	433	442	472	401	402
EP 2.1.5. Advance human rights and social and economic justice.	<u>5.1:</u> Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination.		#4	#2		#5 #6		#7 #8	#7 #8				#6	
	<u>5.2:</u> Advocate for human rights and social and economic justice.		#4						#7 #8				#6 #9	#2
	<u>5.3:</u> Engage in practices that advance social and economic justice.						#2		#7 #8	#7		#2	#6 #9	#2
EP 2.1.6. Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.	<u>6.1:</u> Use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry.					#9		#4 #5 #6 #7 #8				#1 #7 #8 #9	#7	
	<u>6.2:</u> Use research evidence to inform practice.				#8			#2 #5 #7 #8			#5 #6	#1 #2 #4 #7 #10	#7	#3 #4

		221	251	322	331	332	352	371	423	433	442	472	401	402
EP 2.1.7. Apply knowledge of human behavior & the social environment.	<u>7.1:</u> Utilize conceptual framework to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation.	#1 #2 #3		#1 #4 #5	#6	#8			#1 #2	#2			#8	#5
	<u>7.2:</u> Critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.	#4 #5 #7		#4	#6	#8		#6	#1 #2	#2			#5 #8	
EP 2.1.8. Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.	<u>8.1:</u> Analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being.		#1 #2 #3 #4 #6 #7				#1 #2 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8 #9 #10 #11		#5		#2		#9	
	<u>8.2:</u> Collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action.						#3		#5					

		221	251	322	331	332	352	371	423	433	442	472	401	402
EP 2.1.9. Respond to contexts that shape practice.	<u>9.1:</u> Continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services.			#9		#7	#11	#3	#3		#1		#10	#6
	<u>9.2:</u> Provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services.						#5						#10	#6

		221	251	322	331	332	352	371	423	433	442	472	401	402
EP 2.1.10(a) – (d). Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	<u>10a.1:</u> Substantively and affectively prepare for action with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.			#5 #6 #7 #8	#1 #3 #4 #6	#5		#3		#1 #2		#1	#11	
	<u>10a.2:</u> Use empathy and other interpersonal skills.			#5 #6 #7 #8	#1 #3 #4 #6	#2				#6		#6	#11	
	<u>10a.3:</u> Develop mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes.			#5 #6 #7 #8		#2				#6		#6	#11	
10b. Assessment	<u>10b. 1:</u> Collect, organize, and interpret client data.				#6	#4		#5	#1 #3	#4	#6	#11	#11	
	<u>10b.2:</u> Assess client strengths and limitations.					#4				#4	#6	#11	#11	

		221	251	322	331	332	352	371	423	433	442	472	401	402
	<u>10b.3:</u> Develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives.					#4				#6	#6		#11	#7
	<u>10b.4:</u> Select appropriate intervention strategies.					#4		#4		#8	#6			#7
10c. Intervention	<u>10c.1:</u> Initiate actions to achieve organizational goals.					#1			#1 #2 #4	#6	#5 #6		#11	#7
	<u>10c.2:</u> Implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities.					#1				#6	#5			#7
	<u>10c.3:</u> Help clients resolve problems.					#1				#6	#5		#11	#7
	<u>10c.4:</u> Negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients.								#4	#6 #8	#5		#11	#7

		221	251	322	331	332	352	371	423	433	442	472	401	402
	<u>10c.5</u> : Facilitate transitions and endings.				#5 #6 #7 #8	#10				#6 #8	#5			#7
10d. Evaluation	<u>10d.1</u> : Social workers critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions.					#10		#4	#7 #8	#6			#11	#7