

Indiana University School of Social Work 2021-22 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. The school's doctoral program is available on the Indianapolis campus only. 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 listed below.

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 with 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 2021-2022 year. The report also discusses the current status of our work on the IUPUI Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success. Further, the report provides an update on the beginning assessment efforts of our labor studies programs. Finally, the report discusses our impending curriculum revision, which gets underway Spring 2023. Because all Social Work students are required to complete practicum placements that are closely assessed and monitored, there is no plan to use The Record. The Department of Labor Studies may elect to use it at some point in time as they are considering adopting e-portfolios as their primary assessment strategy.

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 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 IUSW 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 BSW program level practice behaviors that correspond to them are available via the following link – [BSW Program 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 using the Final Field Practicum Rating Scale below by the Field Instructor at the end of the practicum. 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 is rarely expected. 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
				Expected performance level by end of practicum	Rarely expected score	Rarely expected score

Presentation and Summary of BSW Assessment Data, 2021-22

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 as the competency benchmark of 80% for course embedded signature assignments was met. Findings also indicate variance in competency achievement across campuses and competencies. The 80% benchmark for each of the nine competencies was met across campuses with the exception of students at IU Bloomington for Competency 4 (Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice). Seventy-seven percent of students there demonstrated the competency, falling just below the benchmark. This finding is not surprising in that some social work students do not understand the role research plays in professional practice. In addition, some express apprehension with regard to learning and applying quantitative approaches to data analysis. It should be noted that signature assignment data for the 2021-22 assessment cycle shows improvement over the previous reporting period (i.e., 2020-2021). This may be due, at least in part, to the return to in-person instruction. Many students struggled academically during the height of the COVID pandemic when instruction shifted to an online delivery format.

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. As noted earlier in this report, the benchmark for the final field practicum evaluation is 90%. As can be seen in the table, 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. Although the findings from the current report period (i.e., 2021-22) mirror

Table 1
Signature Assignment Assessments
BSW Program
2021-22

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK						
		IUPUI (n=583)	IU Bloomington (n=411)	IU South Bend (n=143)	IU East (n=66)	IU Northwest (n=62)	IU Fort Wayne (n=33)	All Programs (N=1298)
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	80%	92.3	89.7	85.2	83.3	91.4	86.2	89.5
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	80%	84.6	87.6	100	100	90	83.3	87.5
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	80%	90.3	90.9	86.3	100	93.3	100	90.8
Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	80%	88.7	77.6	92.1	95.9	*	90.8	88.5
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	80%	92.8	93.8	92.5	89.1	96.8	84.1	92.4
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	90.1	88.7	96.3	93.9	86.9	100	91.2
Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	93.1	89.8	97.2	94.2	85.	100	93.0
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	95.4	82.2	98.6	95.1	100	100	93.4
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	94.5	88.5	98.6	95.1	100	100	94.5

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

Table 2
Final Field Practicum Evaluation
BSW Program
2021-22

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK						
		IUPUI (n=90)	IU Bloomington (n=51)	IU South Bend (n=33)	IU East (n=16)	IU Northwest (n=30)	IU Fort Wayne (n=5)	All Programs (N=225)
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	90%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	90%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	90%	100	100	100	100	96.7	100	99.5
Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	90%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	90%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	100	100	100	100	100	90.0	98.3
Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	100	100	100	100	100	93.3	98.9
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

previous reporting periods (i.e., 2019-2020, 2020-2021), the overall percentage of students across the five campuses who demonstrated the competencies was higher this assessment cycle.

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.

Assessment of Social Work Competencies at the MSW Program Level

The MSW curriculum is comprised of 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 as well as 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 level 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 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 in this report, 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 using the Final Field Practicum Rating Scale below by the Field Instructor at the end of the practicum. 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, 2021-22

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 90% 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 with the exception of IU Northwest for competency 1 (Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior). Only 53% of students on that campus demonstrated the competency at the foundation/generalist level. This finding is surprising in that 47% students failed to demonstrate competency.

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 failed to meet the 80% benchmark for some competencies. IU Northwest failed to meet benchmark for competencies 6 (Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities) and 9 (Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities). Nearly 77% and nearly 79% of students demonstrated competency for competencies 6 and 9 respectively, approaching but below the 80% benchmark. IU East did not reach the benchmark for competency 6 (Engage in Policy Practice).

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 the table, 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)
2021-22

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENT OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK							
		Generalist Practice							
		IUPUI (n=104)	MSW Direct (n=271)	IU Bloomington (n=36)	IU South Bend (n=28)	IU Northwest (n=16)	IU Fort Wayne (n=28)	IU East (n=0)	All Programs (N=483)
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	80%	95.2	93.1	**	100	56.3	**	**	92.2
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	80%	100	94.7	100	100	100	**	**	96.7
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	80%	100	94.7	100	100	100	**	**	96.7
Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	80%	96.3	98.9	91.2	94.8	**	93.5	**	97.3
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	80%	98.3	96.5	**	**	**	90.1	**	96.2
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	89.5	98.0	100	100	**	96.4	**	96.7
Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	93.3	90.5	100	96.3	**	94.5	**	92.0
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	92.0	96.7	100	96.3	**	94.5	**	95.8
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	92.0	97.4	100	96.3	**	92.7	**	96.0

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

Table 4
Signature Assignment Assessments
MSW Program (Advanced/Concentration Level)
2021-22

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENT OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK								
		Clinical and Community Practice								
		IUPUI (n=304)	MSW Direct (n=412)	IU Bloomington (n=65)	IU South Bend (n=116)	IU Northwest (n=48)	IU Fort Wayne (n=25)	IU East (n=19)	IU Southeast (n=13)	All Programs (N=1002)
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	80%	100	98.0	91.4	91.5	**	**	87.5	**	96.6
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	80%	100	98.6	91.4	91.5	**	**	81.3	**	96.6
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	80%	97.0	97.6	100	**	**	**	91.7	**	97.4
Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	80%	86.3	88.8	100	94.0	**	100	**	100	91.5
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	80%	97.3	90.9	100	89.0	100	**	72.5	**	93.5
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	96.2	96.2	95.5	94.6	76.6	**	88.2	**	95.1
Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	96.3	94.2	96.4	94.6	94.7	**	97.7	**	95.1
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	95.1	95.6	95.5	94.6	80.9	**	88.2	**	94.6
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	80%	90.6	95.6	98.9	95.0	78.7	100	**	100	94.1

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

**Table 5
Final Field Practicum Evaluation
MSW Program (Advanced/Concentration Level)
2021-22**

COMPETENCY	COMPETENCY BENCHMARK	PERCENT OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK Clinical and Community Practice								
		IUPUI (n=165)	MSW Direct (n=165)	IU Bloomington (n=26)	IU South Bend (n=50)	IU Northwest (n=36)	IU Fort Wayne (n=27)	IU East (n=0)	IU Southeast (n=9)	All Programs (N=478)
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior	90%	99.7	100	99.0	99.0	99.3	99.1	**	97.2	99.0
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice	90%	99.8	100	100	100	100	100	**	100	99.97
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice	90%	100	100	100	100	100	100	**	100	100
Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice	90%	98.5	99.4	100	99.0	100	100	**	100	99.5
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice	90%	99.1	99.4	100	99.0	100	98.1	**	100	99.7
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	100	100	100	99.3	100	100	**	100	99.9
Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	100	100	100	100	100	100	**	100	100
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	100	100	100	100	100	100	**	100	100
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities	90%	100	100	100	100	100	100	**	100	100

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

The above findings illuminate the need to explore demonstration of competencies at IUN as the 80% benchmark was not met for several 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.

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.

Department of Labor Studies, Indiana University School of Social Work

The IUSSW Department of Labor Studies continued to build the requisite foundation for program review and assessment during the 2021-22 year. As a place of departure toward this, faculty developed five department-level student learning outcomes (SLOs). They are 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.

Faculty also generated a curriculum map over the course of 2021-22 that 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). The curriculum map is available via the following link – [IUSSW Department of Labor Studies Curriculum Map](#). Further,

faculty developed 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 four courses: L100, *Unions and Collective Bargaining*; L110, *Labor and Society*; L272, *White Privilege in the Workplace: Origins, Culture, and Ideology*; and L289, *Work Like a Girl: Women’s Evolving Workplace Role*. A standardized rubric for evaluating signature assignments was also developed and is available via the following link [Standardized Rubric for Course-Embedded Signature Assignments \[IUSSW Department of Labor Studies\]](#). Signature assignments for L100, L110, L272 and L289 are also available via the following links – [L100](#), [L110](#), [L272](#), [L289](#).

Signature assignments were implemented in three Labor Studies courses Fall 2022: L110, L272, and L289. The signature assignment for L100 was not implemented as planned due to increased enrollments and time constraints. To be consistent with the benchmark set for course-embedded signature assignments in social work programs, Labor Studies faculty set a benchmark of 80% - that is, 80% of students enrolled in L110, L272, and L289 would receive a score indicative of exemplary or superior work on the course signature assignment.

Presentation and Summary of Labor Studies Signature Assignment Assessment Data

Signature assignment assessment data for Fall 2022 is presented below in Table 6. As can be seen in the table, the 80% benchmark was met for two courses, L110 and L289. The percentage of students whose signature assignment was evaluated as superior or exemplary for L272 fell just below the benchmark at 79.6%. These findings, overall, suggest that labor studies students who enrolled in these courses demonstrated an understanding of the social, cultural, economic, and political institutional structures and their interaction as related to labor and its organization.

Table 6
Signature Assignment Assessment Data
Department of Labor Studies
Fall 2022

<i>Course</i>	Exemplary (4)	Superior (3)	Adequate (2)	Need Improvement (1)	Total Students	Percentage of Students who achieved a score of 3 (Superior) or 4 (Exemplary)
L110	9	8	1	2	20	85.0
L272	23	20	6	5	54	79.6
L289	30	0	0	5	35	85.7

The Department of Labor Studies is small, made up of five full-time faculty. At present, signature assignments have been developed for four courses and implemented in three as detailed above. Going forward, faculty plan to build on this by creating one new signature assignment each semester until there is a sufficient number of signature assignments to measure the five department-level student learning outcomes. Faculty also plan to collect signature assignment data on an ongoing basis for the purpose of continuous quality improvement. Under the leadership of the department chair, faculty are

exploring e-portfolios as an alternative assessment strategy as collection of signature assignment data proved cumbersome for the department.

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. 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 2023 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 in the new standards. 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 revision. Faculty who have expertise in curriculum design and assessment are well represented on the committee. Particular attention is being given to strengthening ADEI in the BSW and MSW curricula. In addition, attention is being given to the updating the curriculum to reflect the knowledge and practice skills social workers currently need to practice effectively in specific areas of practice. To that end, professionally trained social workers in various fields of practice areas will be surveyed to inform curricular changes. The curriculum revision began Spring 2023 and 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.