

## **Third Year Review Document: The Division of Social Work Executive Summary**

The Indiana University South Bend MSW Program has been in existence for 12 years and is a System School in which our main campus is located at IUPUI. We are an off site three year part time program. The Indiana University School of Social Work received full accreditation in February 2005. We were granted the honor of going up for accreditation under a special project which focuses upon assessment. Thus, we are nationally recognized for our work in this aspect of Social Work Education. Selected materials from our accreditation documents are integrated into this third year review document. In preparation for our site visit, we developed and launched a new MSW curriculum on all campuses beginning in the summer of 2003. This required a two year process in which data were gathered from all relevant stakeholders (faculty, students, field instructors, and community advisory boards). Since then we have continued to solicit feedback from our students on the new curriculum. As a consequence we will be reconfiguring the order in which classes are taught in the concentration year (3rd year in our program). A draft of changes in the sequencing of classes has been developed in which feedback will be solicited from third year students and faculty before the final plan will be submitted to the registrar's office. A second area in which changes will be made concerns advising. The new curriculum is somewhat more complicated than the old curriculum necessitating changes in advising and communication between the program and its students.

### **MSW Program Goals**

The Master of Social Work program derives its program goals directly from the mission statement of Indiana University School of Social Work. They are also informed by the CSWE Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPS) (2002). The program goals are to:

1. Educate students to be effective and knowledgeable professionals prepared for advanced social work practice.
2. Build upon a liberal arts perspective to prepare students to continue their professional growth and development through a lifetime of learning, scholarship, and service.
3. Educate students to understand and apply the fundamental values and ethics of the social work profession in their practice.
4. Prepare students for social work practice with diverse populations and with client systems of all sizes.
5. Educate students about the social contexts of social work practice, the changing nature of those contexts, the behavior of organizations, and the the dynamics of change.
6. Engage in scholarly activity including the discovery, integration, application, dissemination, and evaluation of knowledge for practice.
7. Promote and advocate for social and economic justice.

These seven MSW program goals generate fourteen program objectives listed below:

On completion of the MSW Program, graduates will be able to:

1. Apply social work values and ethics, including an understanding of and respect for human diversity, in the context of social work practice with diverse populations, an understanding of distributive justice, and with systems of various sizes and types.
2. Understand and interpret the history of social work profession and its current structures and issues.
3. Understand and interpret the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination in the context of the professional practice of social work and understand and apply strategies and skills of change that advance social and economic justice.
4. Understand, analyze, and apply knowledge of biological, sociological, cultural psychological, and spiritual variables that affect human development and behavior across the life span, and apply theoretical frameworks to understand the interactions among individuals and between individuals and social systems (i.e., families, groups, organizations, and communities), and the ways these systems promote or deter people in maintaining or achieving health and well-being.
5. Analyze the impact of social policies on client systems, workers, and agencies and demonstrate skills for influencing policy formulation and promoting social and political change consistent with social work values.
6. Practice within the structure of organizations and service delivery systems and advocate for necessary organizational change.
7. Use communication and cultural competence skills differentially with a variety of client populations, colleagues, and members of the community.
8. Understand and evaluate relevant research studies and apply findings to to practice, and demonstrate skills in ethical approaches to quantitative and qualitative research design, data analysis, and knowledge distribution.
9. Conduct ethical, culturally competent empirical evaluations of their own practice interventions and those of other relevant systems.
10. Apply the knowledge and skills of a generalist social work perspective to practice with systems of all sizes.
11. Apply the knowledge and skills of a generalist social work perspective to practice in an area of concentrations (i.e., Child Welfare, Families, Health, Leadership or Mental Health and Addictions).
12. Apply critical thinking skills within professional contexts; including synthesizing and applying appropriate theories and knowledge to practice interventions.
13. Demonstrate the professional use of self.
14. Use supervision and consultation appropriate to advanced practice in a concentration area.

### **Means Used to Inform Our Constituencies**

- School Bulletin
- MSW Admission Brochure
- MSW Student Handbook
- IUSSW Web Site
- Mission posted at the School
- IUSSW display shown at conferences, meetings, and other colleges and universities throughout the state of Indiana as well as the CSWE Annual Program meeting.

### **The IUSSW Model of Assessment**

Throughout the years, our approach to assessment has evolved from conceptualizing assessment as a requirement for our accrediting body, the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), and a way to measure student satisfaction as assessment as an integral component of what we do. Our goal is to implement a assessment road map that, as described by Palomba and Banta (1999), is linked to “decision making about the curriculum, is owned by faculty, leads to reflection and action by faculty, staff, and students, and allows for continuity, flexibility , and improvement in use for BSW II assessment” (p 16). That is, we want to create an assessment culture that leads to quality enhancement of our programs (formative review) and ensures accountability to our diverse constituencies (summative review). Furthermore, to borrow Banta and Associates’ metaphor, we want to move from scholarly assessment to ‘scholarship of assessment.’ In order to do so, the School has established an assessment road map that:

- Promotes the emergence of a cohesive vision about the goals and role of assessment in our School among faculty and other school constituencies.
- Promotes assessment as a central component of what we do.
- Develops a systematic and on-going view of assessment that includes processes and outcomes.
- Creates opportunities for developing assessment questions and assessment approaches in collaboration with all of our partners.
- Provides the necessary resources required for assessment.
- Encourages assessment data utilization to improve curriculum/programs, services, and the assessment process itself.
- Presents and publishes results.

Based on our road map, we can identify concrete assessment activities to measure student learning, instructors’ teaching, consumers’ satisfaction, curriculum analysis and transformation, and other more intangible approaches with all of them lading to scholarship assessment.

The School has recently developed two key assessment approaches: The Course/Instructor and Student Learning Assessment (CISLA System and the Course Learning-Objective (CLO) Classification System. We should note that based on our conceptualization of assessment, we also use other assessment approaches to support a ‘culture’ of continuous assessment. While those approaches are discussed in our Compliance Audit documents, we are listing them below to provide a more realistic view of our assessment road map. These are:

- A Course/Instructor and Student Learning Assessment (CISLA) System.
- Course-Learning Objectives (CLO) Classification System.
- The Baccalaureate Education Assessment Project (BEAP). This assessment packet includes: 1) Entrance Survey; 2) Social Work Values (pretest); 3) Exit Survey; 4) Social Work Values – Posttest; 5) Alumni/ae Survey; 6) Employer Survey.
- Alumni surveys.
- Focus groups with different constituencies.
- Assessment by Program committees.
- Retreats focused on assessment.
- Individual student assessment in the classroom.
  - Student produced media such as videotaped real or simulated interviews.
  - Written products such as essays, reports, papers, dissertations, research projects.
  - Student portfolios (in the works).
- Peer reviews: Of students and faculty.
- Input from the Dean’s advisory Council (a group of external constituents with interest in social work practice and education).
- Reviews by campus administration.

From the above list, it is clear that the School believes that assessment should include both formative and summative procedures to gather input and to assure accountability and institutional improvement all within the frame of reference of scholarship of assessment.

In order to start a systematic process of assessment, the School has identified a corporate vision and goals as well as visions and goals for each of its educational programs (BSW, MSW, Ph.D.). Similar to other social work programs, our School goals focus on educating students to be effective and knowledgeable professionals, to engage in scholarly activities, and to conduct service that promotes the welfare of all segments of society and enhances social and economic justice. This conceptualization of School goals originates from our 1995 mission statement.

The mission and goals of the School of Social Work are woven in the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of each of its three degree programs. The goal of the Master in Social Work (MSW) program is to prepare graduates in an advanced area of practice, such as Child Welfare, Families, Health, Leadership, or Mental Health and Addictions. Finally, the primary goal of the Ph.D. program is to develop scholars who, through the conduct of original research and the generation of theory, will contribute to the knowledge base of the social work profession. The only concentration which we are able to offer on this campus is Mental Health and Addictions.

Each academic program within the School has identified program objectives. The BSW program has 19 program objectives, the MSW program 14 program objectives, and the Ph.D. program 13 program objectives. The academic programs also derive their educational mandates from the NASW Social Work Code of Ethics and the missions and visions of Indiana University. They are informed by the 2001 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards set forth by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE,

2001), and the Standards of the Groups for Advancement of Doctoral Education (GADE) Quality Guidelines.

The curriculum of each degree program has been carefully developed to promote the program's vision, mission, goals, and objectives. More information about our programs is available at the School's web site, <http://socialwork.iu.edu>.

The approval by the faculty of a unified understanding of our mission, goals, and objectives has facilitated the implementation of the two assessment approaches discussed below.

### **A Course/Instructor and Student Learning Assessment (CISLA) System**

The Course/Instructor and Student Learning Assessment (CISLA) System was developed by Dr. Barry Cournoyer with the cooperation of faculty and administrators in mid 1990's (Cournoyer, 2001; Cournoyer & Queiro-Tajalli, 1999). This approach captures students' perceptions of their learning experience in individual courses. Historically, the School of Social Work relied upon the university's 'cafeteria' based system for course evaluations which encouraged instructors to select items considered applicable to the course. However, this approach to course evaluation fell short of providing standardized data to perform system-wide analysis and/or comparison for Part II from course to course or year to year. In order to implement the CISLA System the School created an end-of-semester instrument composed of twenty common course/instructor assessment items and the specific learning objectives for each course. This instrument was to be used in all social work courses and on all campuses. The School also purchased needed equipment (e.g., Optical Scanners) and all related computer software to process all course evaluations. In 2003, the original twenty common assessment items were revised and approved by the faculty resulting in an instrument that currently has twenty-two common items. The revisions have moved from a total focus on the instructor to a more balanced assessment of both student's efforts and instructor's performance. As currently designed the CISLA instrument is divided into two distinctive components:

- 1) Twenty-two common items (CI) for all social work courses in all programs  
(BSW, MSW, Ph.D.) and on all campuses.
- 2) The discrete Course Learning Objectives (CLO) of each course.

Table 1 depicts the twenty-two common items in the Course/Instructor and Student Learning Assessment instrument.

Table 1 Course/Instructor and Learning Assessment Instrument Twenty-two Common Items						
1. I worked hard in this course	SA	A	U	D	SD	
2. I valued the required textbooks and readings	SA	A	U	D	SD	
3. I completed course readings and assignments on time	SA	A	U	D	SD	
4. I had to think critically in this course	SA	A	U	D	SD	
5. I learned to address ethical issues that pertain to course content	SA	A	U	D	SD	
6. I assumed personal responsibility for my own learning	SA	A	U	D	SD	
7. I regularly collaborated with my classmates in learning activities	SA	A	U	D	SD	
8. I actively sought out and discovered relevant knowledge	SA	A	U	D	SD	
9. I analyzed the credibility of information	SA	A	U	D	SD	
10. I applied professional knowledge to real social issues	SA	A	U	D	SD	
11. I learned a great deal in this course	SA	A	U	D	SD	
12. The professor expected scholarly work	SA	A	U	D	SD	
13. The professor provided prompt feedback	SA	A	U	D	SD	
14. The professor respected students' individual characteristics	SA	A	U	D	SD	
15. The professor was enthusiastic about teaching	SA	A	U	D	SD	
16. The professor valued diversity	SA	A	U	D	SD	
17. The professor was available for consultation	SA	A	U	D	SD	
18. The professor was well prepared	SA	A	U	D	SD	
19. The professor communicated clearly	SA	A	U	D	SD	
20. The professor evaluated my work in a fair manner	SA	A	U	D	SD	
21. The professor encouraged students to think critically	SA	A	U	D	SD	
22. The professor cared about students	SA	A	U	D	SD	

*SA=Strongly Agree; A= Agree; U= Undecided; D= Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree*

The inclusion of the Course Learning Objective related-items on the second half of the instrument allows students to assess the perceived degree of learning in relation to each course learning objectives. Students are asked: “Please reflect upon each of the following statements as they pertain to this particular course experience (e.g., classroom or practicum). Circle the response that best reflects the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.” Table 2 provides an example of the CLO as it appears in the assessment instrument.

<b>Table 2 Course/Instructor and Student Learning Assessment Instrument Course Learning Objective S433 Generalist Social Work Practice III: Theory and Skills</b>					
1. Analyze the interaction between people and environment as the context for generalist social work practice.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Articulate social work values and ethical value dilemmas as they relate to use of self, work with clients, and work with colleagues and relevant others.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Analyze the effect of discrimination, economic deprivation, political marginalization, and oppression upon various populations-at-risk.	SA	A	U	D	SD
<i>SA=Strongly Agree; A= Agree; U= Undecided; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree</i>					

Therefore, the twenty-two common items allow for an analysis and comparison of students perception of their learning efforts in the course (as measured by items 1-11) and the perceived quality of instructor teaching (items 12-22) by factors such as individual course, difference sections of the same course, program levels, campus, course level, semester, year, program format (full-time, part-time, evening, etc.) Table 3 exemplifies this point.

<b>Table 3-Course/Instructor and Student Learning assessment Different ways to analyze data from the Twenty-two Common Items for a given Course</b>										
<b>Common Items</b>	<b>Different sections, same course</b>		<b>Educational Programs</b>		<b>Campuses</b>			<b>Years</b>		
			BSW	MSW	IUB	IUPUI	East	2000	2001	2002
#1	4.20	0.75	4.28	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.41	4.49
#2	4.07	0.81	3.72	3.89	3.97	3.63	3.75	3.90	4.15	4.10
#3	4.31	0.69	3.97	3.97	4.08	3.97	3.95	4.18	4.18	4.03
1. <i>I worked hard in this course</i>										
2. <i>I valued the required textbooks and readings</i>										
3. <i>I completed course readings and assignments on time</i>										

Responses to the second component of the instrument, Course Learning Objectives, can be used for analysis and comparison as is done for the twenty-two common items. For example, if we want to know how students in all sections of S100 Understanding Diversity in a Pluralistic Society offered in the Fall semester of 2003

perceived their learning related to objective #1 “Understand the concepts of race, ethnicity, cultural diversity...”, after the statistics are calculated, we receive at a minimum the number of responses, Mean, and Standard Deviation for each section and the aggregate for all sections of the course.

In using this approach the information collected is based on the student’s own perceptions of their learning and efforts rather than on the competencies gained in that particular course. However, this approach is one more piece of information gathering which can be added to direct assessment measurements such as standardized testing, student portfolios, qualifying examinations (Ph.D. students), scores on licensing exams, etc.

The University Testing Center analyzes the responses to the CISLA instrument and provides faculty specific results; descriptive statistics for all sections of a particular course; and descriptive statistics for all courses in each academic program (e.g. BSW, MSW, Ph.D.).

Program Directors review the responses, including the open-ended narrative responses, along with the descriptive statistics prior to forwarding the results to the appropriate faculty member. The Dean and Program Directors also receive summary descriptive statistics, (e.g., school as a whole, program as a whole, score for an individual campus, comparisons between part-time and full-time faculty, etc). The general data analysis reports often lead administrators to look more closely into certain areas of an educational program. The reports are used by the program directors to identify possible professional development needs of faculty and associate faculty. Most valuable in this process is that these reports open the door for dialogue with faculty about individual teaching issues and course modifications. Also, it helps to make program-specific changes. For example, in the BSW program we have the policy of a common required textbook for all sections of

the same course. Based on assessment results from common item #2, 'I valued the required textbooks and readings' showing continuous and generalized dissatisfaction with the required textbook for a given course, the BSW committee was in a position to make an informed decision and changed the textbook.

### **Course-Learning Objective Classification System**

Another innovative assessment method that emerged in mid-1990s is the Course-Learning Objectives (CLO) Classification System, which is a formative assessment approach given that it is exclusively used for program improvement and change. This approach facilitates curriculum analysis on the basis of classifying course learning objectives according to multiple dimensions based on the 'assessment question(s)' posed by the faculty. Currently, the dimensions include the School goals; academic program goals and objectives; the Educational Policy Foundation Objectives; Content Areas mandated by the CSWE Educational Policy Statement; and Bloom's Taxonomy. We also use other dimensions when appropriate. For example, the BSW Program has classified the BSW course learning objectives by the Indiana University Purdue University (IUPUI) Principles of Undergraduate Learning and the MSW has classified its course learning objectives by the NASW Cultural Standards.

Once a program embraces the above-mentioned dimensions the course learning objectives are classified according to the desired dimension. Thus, a program can determine the extent to which the curriculum addresses those dimensions through its courses.

As stated in the executive summary, the Indiana University South Bend Division of Social Work is resequencing the third year concentration curriculum in response to student feedback. It is expected that we will be able to implement this reconfiguration

beginning in the Summer 2006. Additionally, a plan for strengthening our advising system will be implemented beginning in July. Also, we will be administering our own exit survey this April to get overall feedback from our students with regard to the extent to which our stated learning objectives of the program have been met, the overall strengths of the program and any recommendations they can make with regard to program or curriculum changes that they would like to see made. Beyond that the system school on all campuses will be conducting an alumni survey in 2008. This date has been selected in order to allow two cohorts of students to graduate who have matriculated under the new curriculum. Our first such cohort will be graduating in May 2006