



## SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

### 2022-2023 PRAC Annual Report

The Indiana University School of Social Work (IUSSW) was founded in 1911 and is the oldest university-affiliated School of Social Work in the nation. IUSSW offers social work education at baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral levels on seven IU campuses throughout the state. The BSW program is offered in Indianapolis, Bloomington, Fort Wayne, Richmond, Gary, and South Bend. The MSW program is offered in Indianapolis, Bloomington, Fort Wayne, Richmond, Gary, South Bend, and New Albany. The MSW program is also offered fully online. In summer 2024 we will launch an MSW Program in Lafayette. The school's doctoral program is available on the Indianapolis campus. IUSSW also offers associate and baccalaureate degree programs in labor studies through its Department of Labor Studies. Labor Studies programs are available online at nine campus locations.

Both the Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) and the Master of Social Work (MSW) programs are accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the sole accrediting body for social work education in the United States. IUSSW's MSW program has been continuously accredited by CSWE since 1923. Since its inception in 1975, the BSW program has also been continuously accredited. CSWE re-accredited both programs in February 2021 for eight years, the maximum length of time for an accreditation cycle. The school's accreditation for its BSW and MSW programs covers all campuses.

Social work offers a competency-based curriculum as articulated in the 2015 Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS). The competencies for both BSW and MSW programs are:

1. Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior
2. Engage diversity and difference in practice
3. Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice
4. Engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice
5. Engage in policy practice
6. Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities
7. Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities
8. Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities
9. Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities

This report summarizes the assessment process of students' acquisition of CSWE competencies via course-embedded signature assignments and field practicum assessments at BSW and MSW program levels for the 2022-2023 academic year. The report discusses the current status of our work on the IUPUI Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success. Further, the report provides an update on the assessment efforts of our Labor Studies programs, as well as DEI and global engagement initiatives

related to the IUSSW strategic plan. Finally, the report discusses our curriculum revision effort which commenced in Spring 2023. While we relied upon the 2015 CSWE EPAS competencies during the 2022-2023 school year, the new curriculum that is under development will align with the 2022 CSWE EPAS competencies.

### Assessment of Social Work Competencies at the BSW Program Level

The BSW curriculum prepares students for generalist social work practice in a variety of settings through completion of 15 required courses, totaling 52 credit hours. Included in these course requirements is a 560-hour field practicum that provides students the opportunity to apply course content and demonstrate competencies in real-world and supervised practice situations.

Mastery or demonstration of the nine CSWE competencies at the BSW program level is assessed in two ways: 1) course embedded signature assignments, and 2) the final field practicum evaluation. Course-embedded signature assignments are formative measures of students’ mastery of the nine CSWE competencies completed by course instructors at the end of the semester. Signature assignments take the form of projects, papers, or other assignments that assess knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive/affective processes related to the specific competencies addressed within the course. The list of signature assignments used to measure each competency at the BSW program level is available via the following link – [BSW Courses and Corresponding Signature Assignments](#). After evaluating each students’ signature assignment and assigning a grade, faculty rate each student’s performance on the specific competency indicator based on their performance on the signature assignment. As can be seen below, the signature assignment rating scale is anchored at 1, indicating that a student does not meet the expected competency at the BSW level, and 5, indicating that the student far exceeds the expected competency at the BSW level. A rating of ‘3’ is indicative of demonstration of the competency. The competency benchmark for the BSW program level is 80%, i.e., 80% of students will achieve a score of 3 or above on all indicators of the nine competencies.

#### Signature Assignment Scale

1	2	3	4	5
Does not meet expected competency at the BSW generalist level	Minimally demonstrates expected competency at the BSW generalist level	Meets expected competency at the BSW generalist level	Somewhat exceeds expected competency at the BSW generalist level	Far exceeds expected competency at the BSW generalist level

The final field practicum evaluation serves as the second measure of student mastery or demonstration of the nine CSWE competencies. This summative evaluation captures students’ ability to demonstrate behaviors associated with each competency. Students are supervised in the field practicum by a BSW or MSW-level instructor (i.e., Field Instructor) and a member of the IUSSW faculty who is charged with overall oversight of the practicum (i.e., Field Liaison). At the beginning of the practicum, students work with their Field Instructor and Field Liaison to generate activities at their assigned agency that will help them learn and demonstrate competency in each of the required areas. Activities generated by the student, Field Instructor, and Field Liaison need to correspond with practice behaviors that reflect the nine competency areas. The nine competencies and the 22 corresponding

BSW program level practice behaviors are available via the following link – [BSW Program Level Practice Behaviors Assessed with the Learning Evaluation Plan](#).

These practice behaviors and the related planned agency activities are incorporated into a Learning Evaluation Plan (LEP) document submitted by the student and approved by the Field Instructor and Field Liaison. Students use the LEP to document and reflect upon the agency activities they have performed that correspond with the competencies. The LEP is completed and evaluated at two time-points. The midpoint evaluation occurs at the end of the fall semester and the final evaluation occurs at the end of the spring semester involving both the student and field instructor. The final practicum evaluation is a summative measure of students’ ability to demonstrate behaviors associated with each of the nine CSWE competencies. Students are assessed by the Field Instructor at the end of the practicum using the Final Field Practicum Rating Scale (see below). The 7-point scale is anchored at 1 and 7. A rating of ‘1’ indicates an inability to demonstrate a skill, and a rating of ‘7’ indicates demonstration of the skill at the level of a seasoned, highly experienced BSW practitioner, a rating that should be very rarely achieved by BSW students. By the end of the practicum, students at the BSW level are expected to achieve a rating of ‘5’ which indicates a level of skill consistent with a new BSW graduate. The competency benchmark for the Final Field Practicum evaluation at the BSW program level is 90%, meaning that 90% of students will achieve a score of 5 or above on all practice behaviors associated with the nine CSWE competencies.

#### Final Field Practicum Scale

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Complete inability to demonstrate skills	Demonstrates skill at a basic, rudimentary level of someone having no formal undergraduate coursework	Demonstrates skills at the level of beginning level BSW coursework with no more than one semester of courses	Demonstrates skill at the mid-point level of BSW level education	Demonstrates skills at the level expected of a new BSW graduate	Demonstrates skill at the level expected of a relatively highly experienced post-BSW practitioner	Demonstrates skill at the level of a seasoned, highly experienced post-BSW practitioner
				<i>Expected performance level by end of practicum</i>	<i>Rarely expected score</i>	<i>Rarely expected score</i>

#### Presentation and Summary of BSW Assessment Data, 2022- 2023

Table 1 shows the percentage of BSW students on each campus that scored a 3 or above (on a scale of 1 – 5) on indicators of the nine CSWE competencies measured through course-embedded signature assignments. Overall, findings indicate that IUSSW BSW students demonstrated the nine competencies at and above the benchmark of 80% for course-embedded signature assignments, with systemwide findings ranging from 84 to 95 percent (There was no data from IU Northwest due to a technical issue with our collection system and limited data from IU Fort Wayne because of when classes are delivered on the different campuses). Findings also indicate variance in competency achievement

across campuses and competencies. Since we use model syllabi, consistent texts, and we share teaching and mentoring resources systemwide, these differences may reflect heavier reliance upon new adjuncts at some campuses. Only one campus demonstrated a score below the benchmark. At IU East, 77.8% of students reached the benchmark for the competency around “Engaging Diversity and Difference” in practice. This score was measured entirely on one section of class reflecting the declining enrollment of the IU East program. While we are demonstrating that our students are learning the social work competencies as we expect, a number of our scores declined in comparison to the 2021-2022 year. This was particularly the case at IUPUI which boasted the largest number of students in 2022-2023. At IUPUI we had an exceptionally high number of new adjuncts that year who are dependent upon quality course materials shared with them by full-time faculty mentors. Few full-time faculty at IUPUI are currently teaching in the BSW program. This is a concern the administration is aware of and is brainstorming ways to address.

Table 2 shows the percentage of BSW students on each campus that scored a 5 or above (on a scale of 1 – 7) on indicators of each of the nine competencies as measured via the final field practicum evaluation. The strength of this assessment is that the field supervisors are evaluating the students based on witnessing their real-world completion of practice activities linked to each of the nine competencies. As noted earlier in this report, the benchmark for the final field practicum evaluation is 90%. As can be seen in Table 2, the benchmark was achieved for all nine competencies across all program sites, indicating that nearly all IUSSW BSW students satisfactorily demonstrated the competencies at the end of their BSW education. The systemwide average was over 99% for every competency. The findings from the current report period (i.e., 2022-2023) are consistent with previous reporting periods.

Benchmarks for both signature assignment and final field practicum evaluation are consistently being achieved at the BSW program level. The findings detailed above will be presented to the school’s assessment committee this Spring semester for discussion and next steps and will be used to inform the steering committee around the curriculum revision.

**Table 1**  
**Signature Assignment Assessments**  
**BSW Program**  
**2022-2023**

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK						
		IUPUI (N=525)	IU Bloomington (N=456)	IU South Bend (N=149)	IU East (N=58)	IU Northwest (N=0)	IU Fort Wayne (n=26)	All Programs (N=1214)
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	80%	83.2	85.9	92.5	98.6	**	**	86.8
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	80%	90.7	83.7	100	77.8	**	88.9	86.1
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	80%	80.9	86.4	100	83.3	**	**	84.8
Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	80%	85.7	95.2	99.5	97.2	**	**	90.4
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	80%	85.7	92.9	100	83.3	**	**	90.5
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	85.7	87.7	99.5	83.3	**	100	89.3
Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	90.7	82.8	99.5	85.5	**	100	89.9
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	95.2	91.7	98.6	93.8	**	100	95.1
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	92.1	88.4	98.7	95.4	**	100	93.0

\*\* Course not offered during measurement period due to cohort course sequencing.

**Table 2**  
**Final Field Practicum Evaluation**  
**BSW Program**  
**2022-2023**

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK						
		IUPUI (N=88)	IU Bloomington (N=46)	IU South Bend (N=33)	IU East (N=14)	IU Northwest (N=26)	IU Fort Wayne (n=10)	All Programs (N=217)
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	90%	99.8	99.6	100	100	100	100	99.9
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	90%	99.4	98.9	100	100	100	100	99.7
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	90%	100	97.8	100	100	100	100	99.6
Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	90%	98.9	97.8	100	100	100	100	99.4
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	90%	100	97.8	100	100	100	100	99.6
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	100	98.9	100	100	100	100	99.8
Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	98.1	99.3	100	97.6	100	100	99.2
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	98.3	98.4	100	100	100	100	99.4
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	98.5	99.3	100	100	100	100	99.6

## Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success

The IUPUI Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success (Profiles) continue to be demonstrated throughout the BSW curriculum. BSW students develop their capacity as communicators, problem-solvers, innovators, and community contributors. Alignment of the profiles, the nine CSWE competencies (i.e., program level outcomes), primary courses within the BSW curriculum linked to the profiles and competencies, and the course-level signature assignments used to assess learning outcomes are available via the following link – [Alignment of IUPUI Profiles with BSW Program Learning Outcomes](#). The profiles have also been mapped to SWK-S482 *Social Work Practicum II*, the BSW program's identified capstone course – see [Alignment of IUPUI Profiles with BSW Capstone Course \(SWK-S482\)](#). The school will continue to implement the profiles as guided by the IUPUI Division of Undergraduate Education and the Undergraduate Affairs Committee.

## Assessment of Social Work Competencies at the MSW Program Level

The MSW curriculum comprises three levels of study: foundation/generalist, concentration, and focus area. The foundation level of study consists of 16 credit-hours of coursework designed to orient students to the social work profession and the knowledge and skills that form the base of social work practice. Building upon knowledge, skills, professional values, and affective and cognitive processes acquired through the foundation area of the curriculum, students complete 15 credit-hours of study at the concentration level, clinical and community practice, which further immerses them in content designed to impart the knowledge, skills, professional values, and affective and cognitive processes necessary to work effectively across the social work practice continuum, that is, social work practice with individuals, families, small groups, communities, and on the level of social welfare policy. Finally, students select an area of focus for their final 29 credit-hours. The focus area portion of the curriculum provides students with the knowledge, skills, professional values, and affective and cognitive processes to work within a specialized area of practice. The five focus areas from which students can choose are: children, youth, and families; community and organizational leadership; health; mental health and addictions; and schools.

Throughout the foundation curriculum, students are expected to achieve basic competency in the knowledge, skills, professional values, and cognitive and affective processes necessary for entry-level social work practice. Students then build upon those competencies during the concentration level of the curriculum and in the specialized area of focus toward practicing proficiently in the field. Students complete an 8 credit hour practicum in the focus area of the curriculum. This advanced practicum provides students the opportunity to apply knowledge gained through their coursework in real-life agency settings with clients. Four 3-hour field seminars designed to assist and support students in integrating classroom-derived knowledge in their work with clients accompany the practicum.

Similar to the BSW program, mastery or demonstration of the nine CSWE competencies at the MSW program level is assessed in two ways: 1) course-embedded signature assignments in the foundation and concentration/advanced levels; and 2) the final field practicum evaluation. Course embedded signature assignments are formative measures of students' mastery of the nine CSWE competencies completed by course instructors at the end of the semester. As previously noted, signature assignments take the form of projects, papers, or other assignments that assess knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive/affective processes related to the specific competencies addressed within

the course. A list of signature assignments used to measure competencies at the foundation and advanced levels of the MSW curriculum is available via the following link – [Foundation/Generalist and Concentration/Advanced MSW Courses and Corresponding Signature Assignments](#).

As noted earlier, faculty review each student’s signature assignment and assign a grade. Thereafter, faculty rate each student’s performance on the specific competency indicator based on their performance on the signature assignment. The signature assignment rating scale is anchored at 1, indicating that the student does not meet the expected competency at the MSW foundation or advanced level, and 5, indicating that the student far exceeds the expected competency at the MSW foundation or advanced level – see Signature Assignment scale below. A rating of ‘3’ is indicative of demonstration of the competency. The competency benchmark for the MSW program level is 80%, i.e., 80% of students will achieve a score of 3 or above on all indicators of the nine competencies.

**Signature Assignment Scale**

1	2	3	4	5
Does not meet expected competency at the MSW foundation/MSW advanced level	Minimally demonstrates expected competency at the MSW foundation/MSW advanced level	Meets expected competency at the MSW generalist/MSW advanced level	Somewhat exceeds expected competency at the MSW generalist/MSW advanced level	Far exceeds expected competency at the MSW generalist/MSW advanced level

The final field practicum evaluation serves as the second measure of student mastery or demonstration of the nine CSWE competencies. This summative evaluation captures students’ ability to demonstrate behaviors associated with each competency. Students are supervised in the field practicum by a MSW-level instructor (i.e., Field Instructor) and a member of the IUSSW faculty who is charged with overall oversight of the practicum (i.e., Field Liaison). At the beginning of the practicum, students work with their Field Instructor and Field Liaison to generate activities at their assigned agency that will help them learn and demonstrate competency in each of the required areas. Activities generated by the student, Field Instructor, and Field Liaison need to correspond with practice behaviors that reflect the nine competency areas. The nine competencies and the 26 MSW advanced level practice behaviors that correspond to them are available via the following link – [MSW Concentration/Advanced Level Practice Behaviors Assessed with the Learning Evaluation Plan](#).

Practice behaviors and the related planned agency activities are incorporated into a Learning Evaluation Plan (LEP) document submitted by the student and approved by the Field Instructor and Field Liaison. The LEP is completed and evaluated at two time-points (midpoint and final) by both the student and field instructor. The final practicum evaluation is a summative measure of students’ ability to demonstrate behaviors associated with each of the nine CSWE competencies. Students are assessed by the Field Instructor at the end of the practicum using the Final Field Practicum Rating Scale (see below). The 7-point scale is anchored at 1 and 7. A rating of ‘1’ indicates an inability to demonstrate a skill, and a rating of ‘7’ indicates demonstration of the skill at the level of a seasoned, highly experienced MSW practitioner, a rarely expected rating. By the completion of the practicum, students at the MSW level are expected to achieve a rating of ‘5’ which indicates a level of skill consistent with a new MSW graduate. The competency benchmark for the Final Field Practicum evaluation at the MSW program level is 90%, that is, 90% of students will achieve a score of 5 or above on all practice behaviors associated with the nine CSWE competencies.



**Final Field Practicum Scale**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Complete inability to demonstrate skills	Demonstrates skill at a basic, rudimentary level of someone having no formal graduate coursework	Demonstrates skills at the level of beginning level MSW coursework with no more than one semester of courses	Demonstrates skill at the mid-point level of MSW level education	Demonstrates skills at the level expected of a new MSW graduate	Demonstrates skill at the level expected of a relatively highly experienced post-MW practitioner	Demonstrates skill at the level of a seasoned, highly experienced post-MSW practitioner
				Expected performance level by end of practicum	Rarely expected score	Rarely expected score

**Presentation and Summary of MSW Assessment Data, 2022-2023**

Tables 3 and 4 present signature assignment assessment data for students at both the foundation/generalist and concentration/advanced levels. These tables show the percentage of MSW students on each campus that scored a 3 or above (on a scale of 1 – 5) on indicators of the nine CSWE competencies measured through course-embedded signature assignments. At the foundation/generalist level, the competency benchmark of 80% was far exceeded for all nine competencies in aggregate. In fact, the average score across all campuses for each of the nine competencies was 94.5% or higher. Although competency achievement exceeded the 80% threshold overall, the proportion of students who demonstrated competency varied by campus and by competency. Nearly all campuses met or exceeded the benchmark of 80% for each of the competencies except for IU South Bend for competency 1 (Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior). Three-quarters (75.3%) of students on that campus demonstrated competency at the foundation/generalist level. While about five points lower than our benchmark on competency 1, IU South Bend met or exceed the benchmark on all other measured competencies.

Signature assignment assessment data at the concentration/advanced level show similar results for MSW students across all programs. The average percentage of students who achieved competency was 90% or higher for each of the nine competencies. At the campus level, however, some programs did not meet the 80% benchmark for some competencies. IU Bloomington did not meet the benchmark for competencies 4 (Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice) and 9 (Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities). About 62% and nearly 69% of students demonstrated competency for competencies 4 and 9, respectively.

Final Field Evaluation data at the concentration/advanced level is presented in Table 5. This table shows the percentage of MSW students on each campus that scored a 5 or above (on a scale of 1 – 7) on indicators of each of the nine competencies as measured via the final field practicum evaluation. As can be seen in Table 5, students overall and across each of the campuses met or exceeded the benchmark of 90% for all nine CSWE competencies.

**Table 3**  
**Signature Assignment Assessments**  
**MSW Program (Foundation/Generalist Level)**  
**2022-2023**

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENT OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK								
		Generalist Practice								
		IUPUI (N=83)	MSW Direct (N=191)	IU Bloomington (N=23)	IU South Bend (N=35)	IU Northwest (N=11)	IU Fort Wayne (N=1)	IU East (N=0)	IU Southeast (N=9)	All Programs (N=353)
<b>Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior</b>	80%	100	96.9	100	75.3	**	100	**	**	94.9
<b>Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</b>	80%	100	97	**	100	**	**	**	100	98.3
<b>Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</b>	80%	100	96.6	**	100	**	**	**	100	98.1
<b>Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice</b>	80%	96.9	99.5	83.8	97.1	**	**	**	**	97.3
<b>Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice</b>	80%	96.4	97.1	96.3	100	100	**	**	**	97.2
<b>Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	80%	95.9	99.5	100	100	**	**	**	**	98.8
<b>Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	80%	95.9	97.3	100	100	**	**	**	**	97.6
<b>Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	80%	98.6	96.3	100	100	**	**	**	**	97.6
<b>Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	80%	91.9	98.4	100	100	**	**	**	**	97.4

\*\* Course not offered during the measurement period due to cohort course sequencing.

**Table 4**  
**Signature Assignment Assessments**  
**MSW Program (Advanced/Concentration Level)**  
**2022-2023**  
**Signature Assignments**

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENT OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK Clinical and Community Practice								
		IUPUI (N=301)	MSW Direct (N=447)	IU Bloomington (N=71)	IU South Bend (N=113)	IU Northwest (N=23)	IU Fort Wayne (N=9)	IU East (N=0)	IU Southeast (N=0)	All Programs (N=964)
<b>Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior</b>	80%	99.0	100	**	100	**	**	**	**	99.7
<b>Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</b>	80%	99.0	100	**	100	**	**	**	**	99.7
<b>Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</b>	80%	98.3	95.8	82.4	100	**	100	**	**	95.2
<b>Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice</b>	80%	85.4	95.4	62.5	96.4	**	**	**	**	89.9
<b>Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice</b>	80%	97.5	90.8	100	100	95.7	**	**	**	94.7
<b>Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	80%	96.8	92.4	88.0	96.4	**	100	**	**	94.0
<b>Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	80%	95.8	93.2	89.7	98.2	**	100	**	**	94.6
<b>Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	80%	97.6	92	86.0	96.4	**	100	**	**	93.9
<b>Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	80%	98.4	90.6	68.8	96.4	**	100	**	**	91.9

\*\* Course not offered during the measurement period due to cohort course sequencing.

**Table 5**  
**Final Field Practicum Evaluation**  
**MSW Program (Advanced/Concentration Level)**  
**2022-2023**

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENT OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK								
		Clinical and Community Practice								
		IUPUI (N=138)	MSW Direct (N=131)	IU Bloomington (N=32)	IU South Bend (N=52)	IU Northwest (N=49)	IU Fort Wayne (N=0)	IU East (N=16)	IU Southeast (N=1)	All Programs (N=419)
<b>Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior</b>	90%	98.9	99.8	97.7	98.6	100	**	100	100	99.3
<b>Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</b>	90%	99.8	99.8	100	98.6	100	**	100	100	99.7
<b>Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</b>	90%	100	99.7	99.0	98.7	100	**	100	100	99.6
<b>Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice</b>	90%	98.9	100	96.9	99.0	100	**	100	100	99.3
<b>Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice</b>	90%	99.3	99.2	98.4	100	100	**	100	100	99.6
<b>Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	90%	99.8	100	97.9	100	100	**	100	100	99.7
<b>Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	90%	100	100	100	100	100	**	100	100	100
<b>Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	90%	99.8	100	100	98.7	100	**	100	100	99.8
<b>Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</b>	90%	100	100	99.0	100	100	**	100	100	99.9

\*\* Course not offered during the measurement period due to cohort course sequencing.

The above findings illuminate the need to explore the demonstration of competencies as the 80% benchmark was not met for three competencies measured through signature assignments. It is highly suspected that faculty there, particularly associate faculty, may need additional orientation and training regarding completing and inputting signature assignment assessment data. The school's assessment committee will explore this pattern at its Spring meeting.

### **Department of Labor Studies, Indiana University School of Social Work**

The IUSSW Department of Labor Studies (DLS) continued to build the requisite foundation for program review and assessment during the 2022-23 academic year. Faculty developed department-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) as follows:

1. Develop and utilize a comprehensive knowledge of the discipline of Labor Studies to promote social and economic justice through collective action and democratic participation, eliminate oppressive structural barriers, and ensure equitable treatment for all.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of the theories and concepts associated with Labor Studies.
3. Demonstrate an understanding of the social, cultural, economic, and political institutional structures and their interactions as related to labor and its organization.
4. Apply research methods and statistical analysis to examine complex labor and employment issues and associated societal problems.
5. Prepare for career, future academic endeavors, and life-long learning through a series of academic, experiential, and service-learning opportunities.

The DLS curriculum map was updated to include four revised courses: L490 Class and Power in Politics; L399 Prior Learning Assessment; L199 ePortfolio Development Workshop, and L203 Labor and the Political System. The curriculum map links department-level student learning outcomes, course-level student learning outcomes, the IUPUI Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success, and the Statewide Transfer General Education Core (STGEC) and is available via the following link – [IUSSW Department of Labor Studies Curriculum Map](#).

Faculty continued to develop signature assignments that correspond to department-level student learning outcome #3, *Demonstrate an understanding of the social, cultural, economic, and political institutional structures and their interactions as related to labor and its organization*. These signature assignments are embedded in the following five courses L110, *Labor and Society*; L205, *Contemporary Labor Problems*; L272, *White Privilege in the Workplace: Origins, Culture, and Ideology*; L275: *Protecting Workers' Rights in Global Supply Chains*; and L289, *Work Like a Girl: Women's Evolving Workplace Role*. The Labor Studies faculty set a benchmark of 70% representing adequate, superior, and exemplary achievement.

### **Presentation and Summary of Labor Studies Signature Assignment Assessment Data**

The DLS goal is that 70% of students enrolled in L110, L205, L272, L275, and L289 would receive a score indicative of exemplary, superior, or adequate work on the course signature assignment.

**Table 6. Student learning outcomes (SLOs) and levels of achievement rubric for assessment**

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Score/Benchmark: Level of Achievement			
	4: Exemplary	3: Superior	2: Adequate	1: Needs Improvement
	Consistently does all the following: Addresses the questions. State a relevant, justifiable answer. Presents arguments in a logical order.	Does most of the following: Addresses questions explicitly and state relevant/justifiable answer. Presents arguments in a logical order.	Does some of the following: Addresses an adequate understanding of the question but does not back conclusions with data.	Does not address the question. States few relevant answers. Reveals misconceptions. Is not clearly organized.

Signature assignment assessment data for Fall 2023 is presented in Table 7. As can be seen in Table 7, the 70% benchmark was met for all courses except for L110: Labor and Society (full semester course). These findings, overall, suggest that labor studies students who enrolled in these courses demonstrated at least an adequate understanding of the social, cultural, economic, and political institutional structures and their interaction as related to labor and its organization.

**Table 7. Signature Assignment Assessment Data for Labor Studies**

<i>Course</i>	<b>Exemplary (4)</b>	<b>Superior (3)</b>	<b>Adequate (2)</b>	<b>Need Improvement (1)</b>	<b>Total Students</b>	<b>Percentage of Students who achieved a score of Adequate, Superior, or Exemplary</b>
L110	8	8	7	2	25	64%
L110 (c)	15	10	6	7	33	76%
L272	34			5	39	87%
L205	32	2		6	40	85%
L275	14			5	19	74.0%
L289 section 1	8	9	2	5	24	71%
L289, Section 2	19	12	1	2	34	91%

The Department of Labor Studies has five full-time faculty. Going forward, faculty plan to replace the signature assignment assessment and evaluation with an ePortfolio assessment to measure the five department-level student learning outcomes for our majors.

### **Proposed Changes to Assessment**

Because Labor Studies students are comprised of traditional and non-traditional students, many of whom take Labor Studies courses as electives, the DLS plans on assessing the learning outcomes for our majors using the ePortfolio assessment tool. The DLS plans to transition from signature assignments to implementing the ePortfolio tool in fall, 2024.

The chair received a Curriculum Enhancement Grant in 2023 to move the original Portfolio Development Workshop (L199) from a paper/pencil platform to an electronic portfolio platform. Direct measures of student learning outcomes (SLO) will be assessed using a faculty-designed rubric gauging artifacts produced for the e-Portfolio. Indirect measures will be assessed via end-of-semester questionnaires. Sustainability of the platform rests on adding the e-Portfolio into additional core DLS courses, Prior Learning Assessments (PLAs), and future internships. E-Portfolio inclusion will assist with achieving:

- 1) Student Learning Outcomes by preparing students for future careers and lifelong learning,
- 2) Career readiness competencies identified by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE), i.e., self-development and equity and inclusion, and
- 3) Indiana University Profiles of Undergraduate Success (PLUS): Communicator and Innovator.

Currently, the ePortfolio is embedded in L399: Prior Learning Assessment. The ePortfolio will allow the DLS to move away from the cumbersome data collection via signature assignments. Faculty will collect data on an ongoing basis for the purpose of continuous quality improvement.

### **IUSSW Future Plan for Program Review and Assessment**

Benchmarks for both course-embedded signature assignments and the final field practicum evaluation are consistently being achieved at the BSW program level. We are addressing data collection issues to make sure that we have the data from all campuses. We are also exploring how to best integrate full-time faculty expertise into the BSW curriculum to ensure students continue to meet competencies at high levels. Findings for signature assignments at the MSW program level show the benchmark was not met for several competencies at IU Northwest. Moreover, the Department of Labor Studies' structure for program review and assessment needs to be further developed. These findings and challenges will be presented to the school's assessment committee for discussion and action at our Spring 2024 meeting.

In addition to the above, the BSW and MSW curricula are currently being revised to align with the Council on Social Work Education's 2022 Educational, Policy, and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) released July 2022. A major change in the new standards is the addition of anti-racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion (ADEI) as one of five elements of an integrated program design. In addition, engaging anti-racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion in practice is one of nine professional practice competencies students are expected to demonstrate by the end of their social work education. ADEI as a professional practice competency in EPAS 2022 replaces competency #2 (engaging diversity and difference in practice) in the 2015 standards.

A steering committee made up of IUSSW faculty and senior administrators is leading the school-wide curriculum revision. Faculty who have expertise in curriculum design and assessment are well represented on the committee and an external consultant experienced in CSWE curricular redesigns is advising the committee. Particular attention is being given to strengthening ADEI in the BSW and MSW curricula. In addition, attention is being given to updating the curriculum to reflect the knowledge and practice skills social workers currently need to practice effectively in specific areas of practice. During the 2023-2024 academic year, we plan to gather the perspectives of current full time and adjunct faculty, recent BSW and MSW alumni, and community partners to assess curricular strengths and needs. The curriculum revision will continue over Academic Years 2023-24 and 2024-25. CSWE expects all accredited social work programs to operate under the new standards by July 2025.