Indiana University School of Social Work

Practice Review and Assessment Committee

Annual Report, 2012 – 2013 Academic Year

Introduction

The Indiana University School of Social Work (IUSSW) was founded in 1911 and recently celebrated its centennial anniversary. The School offers social work education at the baccalaureate, master's, and Ph.D. level and is one of the few remaining system schools at Indiana University. The bachelor (BSW) and master's (MSW) program both are accredited by the Council of Social Work Education (CSWE). Currently, there are no accreditations in social work at the Ph.D. level of education. During the spring of 2012, the BSW and MSW Programs completed their self-studies for reaffirmation by CSWE under curriculum policies that focus on competency-based education. An accreditation site visit was conducted, in January of 2013. The CSWE accreditation of the IUSSW extends to all other BSW and MSW Programs within the system school. The BSW Program is offered in Indianapolis, Bloomington, Richmond, Gary, and recently was approved for the South Bend campus. The MSW Program is offered in Indianapolis, Richmond, Fort Wayne, South Bend, Gary, and at IU Southeast. A fully online MSW Program, MSW Direct, was implemented in December, 2012.

Since July, 2007, the Division of Labor Studies merged with the School of Social Work. Labor Studies is also a system-wide program with offices in 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 transitioning to competency-based education as specified by the CSWE 2008 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS), the faculty in the BSW and MSW programs operationalized the 10 CSWE-identified core competencies at each of the two educational levels. This report summarizes these efforts by program level.

Bachelor of Social Work – PRAC Report for 2012 -- 2013

The development, implementation of curriculum, and assessment of student learning in the BSW program rests on two contexts: CSWE required competency-based education, and the Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PUL) in each course. The BSW Program is evaluated with regard to the following 10 competencies, as articulated by the CSWE. Within each competency, practice behaviors were identified, totaling 41 points of assessment.

Table 1 – BSW Student Educational Learning Outcomes

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 services.
9. Respond to contexts that shape practice.
10. Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate services with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities.

The second context of student educational outcomes, the PULs, were identified by having each faculty to identify those principles for which their courses had major, moderate, or minor emphasis.

Assessment

After implementing the competency-driven curriculum in 2010, a preliminary assessment was conducted in the 2011 – 2012 Academic year, which resulted in a 6-item plan. This plan was developed and approved by the BSW Curriculum Committee. Two items were identified for improvement under the CSWE competency-based educational program and 4 items were identified as needing improvement under the IUPUI PULs. These follow.

Competency-Based Education

1. Convene faculty teaching in the research sequence to identify approaches to better prepare students in the area of research based knowledge.

2. Collect and evaluate data from the e-Portfolio.

PUL Assessment Plan

1. Improve participation of faculty in assessing PULs.

2. Develop specific criteria for identifying competence in using and applying PUL assessment.

3. Discuss challenges and possible solutions related to PUL #1a (written, oral, and visual communication skills) and PUL #2 (critical thinking). It should be noted that two approaches had already been implemented: stressing scholarly writing in BSW admission sessions and New Student Orientation, and adding an elective S490 Scholarly Writing for Social Work course.

4. Research faculty will meet during the summer to enhance research courses to emphasize critical thinking, scholarly writing, and quantitative reasoning.

Research faculty convened and discussed methods by which to enhance students' critical thinking and quantitative reasoning. These meetings continued into 2013 but to date have resulted only in changes at the individual course level to focus assignments on critical thinking essays, rather than quizzes. Evaluation of the e-Portfolio resulted in a plan to systematically collect and evaluate data from student demonstrated outcomes. Faculty continue to work on developing a coherent PUL assessment plan.

NILOA Assessment Framework

This portion of the report responds to the six (6) assessment questions required by the Office of Assessment on the IUPUI campus in response to the assessment of student learning outcomes. We use both the CSWE Assessment of Competency-based data and the campus specific Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PUL) assessment.

1.   *What general outcome are you seeking – Student Learning Outcomes?*

Competency: Upon graduation, the BSW program seeks to have 85% of its graduating seniors achieve competency on 100% of the 13 competencies demonstrated through the 41 identified practice behaviors and assessed in their field practicum and e-Portfolio.

PUL: The educational outcome sought from the assessment of PULs, through coursework, is that 85% of Senior social work students will achieve competency on the major 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 the outcome if you saw them?*

Competency: Two measures are used as evidence of the outcome, the Learning Evaluation Tool (LET) from students' field practica and students' e-portfolios. Each of the 13 competencies is linked to 41 practice behaviors that are assessed in the field practica using the LET. Students are expected to provide documentation of each of the practice behaviors and both students and agency-based field instructors assess the level of competency. In addition, the products demonstrating each practice behavior are uploaded into an e-Portfolio and evaluated by the graduating Senior students' assigned faculty liaison.

PUL: The PULs are stated in each syllabus with a notation of major, moderate, or minor emphasis across the BSW curriculum. Faculty members, including associate faculty, are offered a workshop in assessing the PULs as part of their academic responsibilities in teaching BSW courses.

3.   *What opportunities do students have to learn it?*

Competency: Students were offered 13 required courses in the BSW Program, not including practica, where content is delivered and opportunities offered for practice and application of the competencies. Each course has articulated objectives systematically linked to the core competencies to create an educational matrix (See matrix in Appendix D).

PUL: Administrative faculty and staff have developed a matrix identifying major and moderate emphasis for each PUL in the required BSW program courses. It has been determined that these

courses provide educational content and experiences allowing students to build competency on identified PULs. The matrix has been reviewed to ensure that all PULs are covered at some point in the BSW professional curriculum.

4. ***How are you measuring each of the student learning outcomes identified in #2 above?***

Competency: Two measures are used. The LET and e-portfolios are graded. The thirteen (13) competencies articulated through the 41 practice behaviors and collected using the LET are assessed by students and their field instructors during the senior practicum (S481 and S482) in Fall and Spring Semesters, respectively. Evaluators use a 7-point scale rating with 7 being '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 for student products uploaded into the ePortfolio, using the same scale as above. A goal of the BSW committee is to create specific rubrics for each of the practice behaviors.

PUL: The summary report produced by the IUPUI Office of Information Management and Institutional Research helps to measure the outcomes on the PULs. Data collection took place in Spring/Fall 2010; Spring/Fall 2011; Spring/Fall 2013; and, Spring 2013. 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 were evaluated according to a 4-point scale, with 3 or above being considered "competent".

5. ***What are the assessment findings?***

There were three data points on the level of competency: (1) The ePortfolio as evaluated by faculty members; (2) Students' self-report from the field practicum, and (3) Field Instructors' (agency-based professional social workers) from field practica. Scores of 5 or higher were identified as being 'competent' for each measure. The percentage of students who were rated as 'competent' were calculated to ascertain success of benchmark for success at 85%. The scores represent what percentage of students were rated at '5' or above, for each of the 41 practice behaviors (See Appendix D).

Competencies as measured by the LETs and ePortfolios:

LETs: Using data from the S482 LETs, Field Instructors rated 98% to 100% of students as 'competent' or above on the identified practice behaviors. Student self-evaluations tended 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 exceeded our identified benchmark of 85% for all practice behaviors (See Appendix B). Scores for students' final field evaluations were uploaded and analyzed by program staff and 63 of 68 final field evaluations were available for analysis (89%). This was an increase from last year (62% of students and 20% of Field Instructors) as these data were hand-collected, rather than asking students and Field Instructors to upload data into an online survey collector.

E-Portfolio: For the 2012-13 ePortfolio, students were rated competent (more than 85% of the faculty responding rated students at a '5' or higher) on 37 of 41 practice behaviors, or 90% of the behaviors. This is a clear improvement over 2011-12, when students were rated 'competent' on only 19 of 41 practice behaviors or 46%.

For the ePortfolio, students' participation rates in uploading materials ranged for the 41 items from 35 to 54 (48% to 81%) with an average of 61%. This is a slight increase in response rate from the previous year (49% to 76%) which was a goal for our assessment project.

PULs: It is interesting to note that there is significant overlap between the identified competencies of and the PULs. For instance, critical thinking, values and ethics, and understanding culture and society are a few principles that also are measured as competencies. The School of Social Work received a report from the Office of Information Management and Institutional Research, dated May, 2013, 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. Table 2 below summarizes these results.

Table 2. PUL analysis for 400 level courses – Major Emphasis

PUL	Mean Score	Total Number of responses	% Effective/Very Effective (3 or 4)
1. Written, oral & visual communication	3.28	2,367	85.6%
1b. Quantitative skill	3.09	1,364	77.3%
1c. Information resource skills	3.11	278	76.6%
2. Critical thinking	3.20	2,373	83.7%
3. Integration & App. of Knowledge	3.43	6,220	91.5%
4. Intellect. Breadth, Depth & Adapt.	3.36	2,987	88%
5. Society and culture	3.30	1,737	83.1%
6. Values and Ethics	3.48	1,030	87.2%

These results indicate that Senior BSW students achieved the 85% benchmark for competency on 4 (PUL #1, #3, #4, & #6) of the 8 PULs, and were nearing competency on 2 additional PULs (PUL #2, & #5).

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

Competency Improvements: 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. Students continue to struggle to delineate behaviors that demonstrate competency in practice behaviors. As a result, faculty worked to reduce the number of practice behaviors and rewrote them to be measurable and easier to understand. We realize that without specific rubrics to calibrate measurement of student products in the e-Portfolio and in the field, there is likely to be a wide range of what is considered 'competent' among evaluators.

In addition to the above improvements, the Field Committee has worked during the past year to develop a more concise and 'user-friendly' Learning and Evaluation Tool (LET) for evaluation of students' performance in field. Within the BSW Program, we have increased the amount of training time for faculty who measure students' compentencies.

PUL Improvements: We are pleased and proud that BSW students continue to do well, as measured by the PULs. Our BSW students excel in the following areas: integration and application of knowledge; intellectual breadth, depth and adaptiveness; and, values and ethics. Further, both the PULs for society and culture and critical thinking approached the 85%

benchmark, vital areas of the social work curriculum. It is not surprising to see that BSW students struggle with demonstrating strong competencies in quantitative skills and information resource skills. These are areas that are often a challenge for students and we remain committed to advancing our students' skills in those areas through challenging coursework in research (required), statistics (elective), and scholarly writing (elective). They will serve as areas for improvement in the future. Additional training has been offered for faculty in capstone course on PUL integration with student competencies. This training allowed faculty members to provide more helpful consultation to students on which products might best demonstrate given competencies.

Assessment plan

We anticipate that we will continue with our stated plans to facilitate success and achievement of student learning outcomes. These results will be presented at our fall BSW Curriculum Committee meeting for review, approval, and next steps. The faculty will then have the opportunity to determine how these findings might influence curriculum development and implementation. In review of both the LET and ePortfolio data, there are a number of interpretations that may be made of these data, including major limitations to the validity and reliability of the ePortfolio assessment process which are specified below.

1.   Program faculty and staff from the IUPUI campus will continue to consider the findings and work to improve participation of faculty in assessing PULs.

2.   We will hold a workshop in fall, 2013 for 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 CSWE BSW program competencies.

3.   We will discuss the issues relating to PUL #1b and #1c (quantitative and information resource skills), as these two areas seems to problematic for some of our students at the 400-level. It is encouraging to note that two areas of concern from last year's report (written oral and visual communication and critical thinking) showed improvement during the current reporting period.

4.   Two activities that had been implemented to address challenges in the areas above included stressing scholarly writing in our BSW admissions info sessions and during New Student Orientation and the addition of an elective course, S490 Scholarly Writing for Social Work. These activities will be continued during the next academic year.

To support the findings discussed in this report, Appendix A provides a full list of the CSWE competencies and practice behaviors. Appendix B provides a summary of the 2012-13 program assessment data based on the CSWE competencies/practice behaviors. Appendix C is a matrix that connects the CSWE competencies to the PULs. Finally, Appendix D demonstrates the connections between each course objective for social work courses (200 level and above) and the CSWE competencies/practice behaviors.

Conclusion

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 students' competencies and outcomes. We continue to provide 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.

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, 2012-13

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	68	44	65%	40	90.9%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	55	81%	53	96.4%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	42	62%	40	95.2%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	52	76%	48	92.3%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	41	60%	41	100%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	51	75%	50	98%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	51	75%	46	90.2%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	37	54%	36	97.3%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	36	53%	35	97.2%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	36	53%	36	100%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	52	76%	46	88.5%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	68	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	68	38	56%	31	81.6%	N
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y

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

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
ePortfolio	68	53	78%	48	90.6%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	40	59%	33	82.5%	N
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	62	98%	Y

Student	**68**	**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	68	53	78%	45	84.9%	N
Field Instructor	**68**	**63**	**89%**	**63**	**100%**	**Y**
Student	**68**	**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	68	49	72%	45	91.8%	Y
Field Instructor	**68**	**63**	**89%**	**63**	**100%**	**Y**
Student	**68**	**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	68	45	66%	42	93.3%	Y
Field Instructor	**68**	**63**	**89%**	**63**	**100%**	**Y**
Student	**68**	**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	68	47	69%	46	97.9%	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	68	44	65%	39	88.6%	Y
Field Instructor	**68**	**63**	**89%**	**63**	**100%**	**Y**
Student	**68**	**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	68	35	53%	32	91.4%	Y
Field Instructor	**68**	**63**	**89%**	**62**	**98%**	**Y**
Student	**68**	**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	68	37	54%	30	81.1%	N
Field Instructor	**68**	**63**	**89%**	**63**	**100%**	**Y**
Student	**68**	**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	68	45	66%	40	88.9%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	37	54%	33	89.2%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	60	95%	Y
Student	68	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	68	45	66%	43	95.6%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	68	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	68	45	66%	43	95.6%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	37	54%	32	86.5%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	41	60%	39	95.1%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	33	48%	31	93.9%	Y

Assessment Measure	Total # of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	# Competent (Score of 5+)	% Competent	Benchmark of 85% (Y/N)
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	61	97%	Y
Student	68	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	68	44	65%	41	93.2%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	61	97%	Y
Student	68	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	68	43	63%	41	95.3%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	34	50%	34	100%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	68	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	68	43	63%	42	97.7%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	43	63%	42	97.7%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	33	48%	31	97.7%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	34	50%	32	94.1%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	68	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	68	42	62%	40	95.2%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	68	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	68	33	48%	31	93.9%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	68	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	68	44	65%	39	88.6%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	62	98%	Y
Student	68	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	68	34	50%	30	88.2%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	41	60%	40	97.6%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	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	68	43	63%	40	93%	Y
Field Instructor	68	63	89%	63	100%	Y
Student	68	63	89%	62	98%	Y

APPENDIX C: Matrix of CSWE Competencies and PULs

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

APPENDIX D - BSW Required Courses Matrix w/ CSWE Competencies/Practice behaviors

Competencies	Final Semester	IUPUI		IUB		IUNW		IUE		IUSB	
		Obs	% ≥ 5*	Obs	% ≥ 5	Obs	% ≥ 5	Obs	% ≥ 5	Obs	% ≥ 5
Identify as a professional social worker & conduct oneself accordingly (PB 1: N=6)	Student	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
	Field instructor	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice (PB 2: N=4)	Student	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
	Field instructor	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Apply critical thinking to inform & communicate professional judgments (PB 3: N=3)	Student	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
	Field instructor	66	98.5%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Engage diversity & difference in practice (PB 4: N=4)	Student	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
	Field instructor	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Advance human rights and social and economic justice (PB 5: N=3)	Student	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
	Field instructor	66	100%	49	97.8%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research (PB 6: N=2)	Student	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
	Field instructor	66	100%	49	97.8%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Apply knowledge of human behaviour and the social environment (PB 7: N=2)	Student	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
	Field instructor	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Engage in policy-practice to advance social & economic well-being & to deliver effective social work (PB 8: N=2)	Student	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
	Field instructor	66	100%	49	97.8%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Respond to contexts that shape practice (PB 9: N=2)	Student	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
	Field instructor	66	100%	49	97.8%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Engagement (PB 10A:N=3)	Student	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
	Field instructor	66	98.5%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Assessment (PB 10B:N=4)	Student	66	98.5%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
	Field instructor	66	98.5%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Intervention	Student	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A

(PB 10C:N=5)	Field instructor	66	100%	49	97.8%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
Evaluation	Student	66	98.5%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A
(PB 10D:N=1)	Field instructor	66	100%	49	100%	25	100%	30	100%	0	N/A

*Students were evaluated on the following 1-7 rating scale: (1) Not Demonstrated, (3) Apprentice, (5) Proficient, and (7) Distinguished. The '% $\geq$ 5' column represents the percentage of students who achieved a score of 5 or more to demonstrate mastery of that particular competency.

Defining Student Learning Outcomes

The MSW Program is a competency-based curriculum, as articulated in the Council of Social Work Educations 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 students' 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 Addictions, 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. Measures of student mastery of competencies, as operationalized by each concentration's practice behaviors, logically come at the end of the concentration field placement.

Measuring Student Learning Outcomes

The Learning Evaluation Tools (LETs) are instruments that link practice behaviors that are associated with competencies to specific tasks and products. The LETs are completed by both the agency field instructor and as a self-report by the student. Each concentration has its own LET, measuring behaviors and competencies specific to a given concentration.

A second 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. This year marks the third year of implementation. The Schools concentration utilizes a student portfolio as a final product to measure outcomes. The Leadership concentration has used a student self-efficacy scale in the past but expects to develop competency-based measurement this year. The Child Welfare concentration previously utilized a student portfolio. However, as indicated in the 2012 PRAC report, faculty was not pleased with the response rate due to the high number of associate faculty teaching in the concentration who did not correctly use the rubric. Therefore, the Child Welfare concentration opted to utilize a case presentation to measure the competencies. The students now present a case to the field liaison (faculty member) and the field instructor (community practitioner) when the liaison visits the field site. The Health and Mental Health & Addictions concentrations initially used multiple choice examinations which were administered after students have finished their required courses in those concentrations. The response rates were weak and the exam had several flaws. Faculty reviewed the outcomes from those exams and made a decision to change to case presentations similar to that of the Child Welfare Concentration. The Mental Health and Addictions concentration piloted their second measure during summer 2013 and data is still forthcoming. The Health concentration implemented their second measure during spring semester, 2013.

Findings

   LETs

The results of the 2nd measures or competencies as measured by the Learning Evaluation Tool used in the field placements are promising. The School of Social Work has set a benchmark of 80% attainment of a score of 5 out of 7 on a Likert scale for these measures. The

Health concentration met that benchmark with all competencies ranging from 98.7 to 100%. The Child Welfare concentration also met the benchmark with all competencies ranging from 93.2 % to 100%. The Schools concentration met the benchmark on all competencies at 100%. The Leadership concentration competencies were all measured in the 90% to 100% range. The Mental Health and Addictions concentration met the benchmark with those competed LETs ranging from 93.1% to 99.3%; however the return rate from faculty liaisons in this concentration was only 37% at the time of this report.

Second Measures

As previously indicated, faculty in each of the five concentrations developed a second 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 and this has occurred in Child Welfare, Mental Health & Addictions, and Health as previously noted. Second measure data has been collected in the Child Welfare, Health, and Schools concentrations during spring semester 2013. The Child Welfare concentration met benchmarks on the student competencies ranging from 92.3% to 100%. The Health concentration met benchmarks ranging from 82.9% to 100%. The Schools concentration range of scores on the second measure was from 68.8% to 100%. The Mental Health and Addictions concentration did not begin their process until summer 2013 and is still in the process of collecting data on the second measure.

Improving Assessment to Improve Student Learning

The IUSSW MSW program continues to develop and improve our measurements to ensure that we accurately assess, and then improve, student learning. During the past year this has entailed major modifications in measures for three of the concentrations as previously mentioned. The case presentations added in the Child Welfare, Health, and Mental Health and Addictions concentrations are being piloted this year. In the case presentation method, students in these placements present a case to the field liaison and field instructor when the liaison (a faculty member) visits the agency. The case presentation includes the theories underlying practice, an assessment of the case, and evaluation of client progress. The liaison assesses the student on the competencies and practice behaviors as demonstrated in the case presentation.

Faculty liaisons, field instructors, and field coordinators continue to provide input and feedback as to the utilization of the Learning Evaluation Tool in the evaluation of competencies as the 2nd measure. This is an ongoing process and these tools continue to be modified accordingly. In addition, with the new processes, we find that collection of data can be challenging. For example, some faculty liaisons have not been timely in their return of the documents, thus slowing down the collection and interpretation process. We are providing ongoing training and input to address this problem.

Social Work Ph.D. – PRAC Report for 2012 – 2013

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 service and advocacy that

contributes 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) as 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, national and international

conferences; the completion of oral and written qualifying exams; and successful defense of their

dissertations. Although all of the required Ph.D. courses address the above SLOs at least to

some extent, the following sections outline specific coursework and learning experiences 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), in addition to foundation research and/or statistics courses that may be taken 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 (SWK-S 725), in which they participate in faculty members' new or on-going research. 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 a 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. The scholarly writing course (S721) also includes content on ethical issues related to scholarship including academic integrity, plagiarism, copyright, and collaborative writing.

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 four SLOs. Throughout their doctoral education, students are encouraged to present their scholarly work in a variety of venues. These publications and presentations may be solo-authored by students, co-authored with other students, or co-authored 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 in April each year. Other venues in which students demonstrate the acquisition of the SLOs include 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, national and even international 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. Faculty 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 as well as epistemology and ethical issues. 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. Students are also expected to integrate content from their external minor courses.

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 other members of the academic community.

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 the final dissertation defense are key measurement methods used to assess students' acquisition of knowledge and skills in the Social Work Ph.D. Program.

Assessment Results for the 2012-2013 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 of the Appendix. There were a total of 49 PhD students in Social Work in the 2012-2013 academic year. Of these, 3 students left the program. Two were dismissed for poor grades and one decided to discontinue the program due to the commute and responsibilities at home. Another 4 students have completed coursework but have not made measureable advances toward the Ph.D. at either the qualifying exam or dissertation proposal or defense. Of the remaining 42 students, 7 are enrolled part-time in the Ph.D. Program. Two of these part-time students have completed coursework, and the other 5 are still taking courses. The part-time students are generally employed full-time and take a reduced

number of course credit hours. Two-thirds (30/46) of the students who remain in the program

have satisfactorily completed coursework. Of these 30 students, 20 are at the qualifying exam

stage. The other 10 have completed the qualifying exam and have been admitted to candidacy.

Six of the 10 PhD candidates have approved dissertation proposals (5 of which were defended in

the 2012-2013 academic year). Three students completed their Ph.D. degrees during the 2012-

2013 academic year. A fourth will graduate in August 2013.

Table 2 of the Appendix 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; and

IU or school-sponsored presentations. The PhD students have been very productive in the area

of scholarly dissemination. Based on reports from 29 students, in the 2012-2013 academic year

students presented or co-presented 39 paper, poster, and workshop presentations and published

or have in press 12 journal articles, 7 technical reports, and at least one book chapter. Ten

students presented 11 poster presentations at the School of Social Work Ph.D. Symposium in

April 2013. Two students participated and presented posters at the IUPUI Research Day event.

Others presented at the Edward C. Moore Symposium, the TRIP Showcase, and similar

academic conferences at IU Northwest.

On-going assessment of student progress and program needs have continued throughout

the 2012-2013 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 in 2011 about their perceptions of the qualitative methods coursework. The results from

the survey indicated that students, in general, did not believe they were receiving sufficient

course content in qualitative methods. Students' agreed that one course 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 sequence that was already in place. The first of the 2-sequence course in qualitative methods was taught in fall, 2012 with the second course offered in spring, 2013.   Students seem to respond well to the two course qualitative sequence. The end-of-semester data is still being evaluated.

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 expressed 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 some 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, 20 students who completed coursework have not yet completed their exams. Five of the 20 students just completed their coursework in May 2013 and so are not expected to have completed their qualifying exam as yet. One student failed in the first attempt to complete the qualifying exam. The 15 remaining students have not yet submitted their 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, 10

students are 'ABD'. These students have successfully completed their qualifying exams and have been admitted to candidacy but as yet 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 are then faced with potential financial difficulties and 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 has discussed 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 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.

APPENDICES

Table 1 – Social Work Ph.D. Students' Academic Progress for the 2012-2013

Academic Year

Coursework	Qualifying Exams	ABD	Dissertation
Taking coursework = 19 students*, with 2 students dismissed and 1 who chose to leave the program Completed and passed all coursework = 30	Preparing their qualifying paper = 20 students	**A**ll **B**ut the **D**issertation = 10, with 6 having approved proposals	Completed the dissertation during the current year = 3 (a 4th will defend in August 2013)

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

Table 2 – Social Work Ph.D. Students' Scholarly Products for the 2012 – 2013 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 = 25 Accepted Paper/Panel Presentations = 6 Proposed Presentations = 4 Poster Presentations = 3	Completed workshops = 1	Published journal articles = 7 In press journal publications = 5 Technical Reports = 7 Book Chapters = 1	IU Social Work Spring Symposium = 11 IUPUI Research Day = 2 Edward C. Moore Symposium- 1 TRIP Showcase-1 IUNW events-3

** Data may be incomplete as it is based on reports from 29 PhD students who produced scholarly presentations/publications in the 2012-2013 academic year.