



**Committee for the Evaluation of
Social Work and Human Services Study Programs**

**Haifa University
Spitzer Department of Human Services
Evaluation Report**

March 2016

Contents

Chapter 1:	Background	3
Chapter 2:	Committee Procedures	4
Chapter 3:	Department of Human Services, University of Haifa	5
Chapter 4:	Recommendations	8

Chapter 1- Background

The Council for Higher Education (CHE) decided to evaluate study programs in the field of Social Work and Human Services during the academic year of 2015.

Following the decision of the CHE, Vice Chair of the Council of Higher Education on behalf of the Minister of Education, appointed a Committee consisting of:

- **Prof. Allan Borowski**- School of Social Work and Social Policy, La Trobe University ,Melbourne, Australia (Ageing; Retirement; Migration; Cohesion; Delinquency) Committee Chair
- **Prof. Michàlle Mor Barak** - School of Social Work & Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California, USA (social work and management)
- **Prof. Ram Cnaan** - School of Policy and Practice, University of Pennsylvania, USA (faith based social services, social policy)
- **Prof. David Biegel** - Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, USA (family as a unit, family welfare)
- **Prof. Zahava Solomon**- School of Social Work, Tel-Aviv University, Israel (Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and secondary PTSD)
- **Prof. Sven Hesse**-School of Social work, Stockholm University, Sweden (poverty and children and their families in an international perspective as well as International social work)

Ms. Alex Buslovich Bilik was the coordinator of the Committee on behalf of the CHE.

Within the framework of its activity, the Committee was requested to:¹

1. Examine the self-evaluation reports, submitted by the institutions that provide study programs in Social Work and Human Services and to conduct on-site visits at those institutions.
2. Submit to the CHE an individual report on each of the evaluated academic units and study programs, including the Committee's findings and recommendations.
3. Submit to the CHE a general report regarding the examined field of study within the Israeli system of higher education including recommendations for standards in the evaluated field of study.

The entire process was conducted in accordance with the CHE's Guidelines for Self-Evaluation (of October 2014).

¹ The Committee's letter of appointment is attached as **Appendix 1**.

Chapter 2-Committee Procedures

The Committee held its first meetings on March 8th 2015, during which it discussed fundamental issues concerning higher education in Israel, the quality assessment activity, as well as Social Work and Human Services Study programs in Israel.

In March 2015, the Committee held its visits of evaluation, and visited The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Tel Hai Academic College, Haifa University, Ariel University, Emek Yizrael Academic College, Ashqelon Academic college, Tel Aviv University, Ben Gurion University, Sapir Academic College and Bar Ilan University. During the visits, the Committee met with various stakeholders at the institutions, including management, faculty, staff, and students.

This report deals with the Department of Human services at Haifa University. The Committee's visit to Haifa University took place on Monday March 9th ,2015.

The schedule of the visit is attached as **Appendix 2**.

The Committee thanks the management of Haifa University and the department of Human services for their self-evaluation report and for their hospitality towards the committee during its visit at the institution.

3. The Department of Human Services, University of Haifa

1. Executive Summary

The Department of Human Services at Haifa University was the first in Israel and has an interdisciplinary focus. Its resources are stretched thinly and it is very short of office space for faculty members and classrooms to deliver its courses. Nevertheless, students are enthusiastic about the Department.

The Department's mission and goals require greater clarity and focus. The curriculum needs to deliver knowledge and skills related to the real world of employment and more congruent with student expectations. The field experiences provided by the Department are highly valued by students but need to be expanded.

While appreciative of the desire to introduce a PhD program, it is premature to do given the small number of faculty members in the Departments. Indeed, any expansion in programs will require additional faculty.

Intended learning outcomes for programs and courses require greater specificity.

Faculty members make important contributions to the advancement of knowledge in several areas. However, it is not clear that together they make a contribution to the emerging field of services research.

2. Organizational Structure

The Department of Human Services was established in 1995 as part of the Faculty of Social Welfare and Health Sciences. The interdisciplinary nature of the Department is an area of strength, combining elements of sociology, psychology, business and health and welfare. The core faculty, though small in number, is highly dedicated and accomplished.

The Department's interdisciplinary focus fits well within the mission of the Faculty of Social Welfare and Health Science, which aims to encourage and promote "the exchange and transmission of knowledge among disciplines" (p. 12 of the Department of Human Services self-study report). The Department's senior faculty members have strong and viable connections with other schools and departments both within the Faculty and with other faculties in the university and feel that the Faculty of Social Welfare and Health Sciences is a natural home for them.

The Department of Human Services at Haifa University was the first in Israel. It was followed by a department by the same name in the Emek Jezreel College and there are plans to open similar departments in other colleges in the country. There is, however, a certain lack of clarity regarding the focus of the Department, something that was noted in the previous committee's report. This was echoed in recent student surveys and in the current Committee's conversations with the Rector, the Dean and students.

The core faculty is extremely dedicated and has managed to attract an increasing number of students over the years. The program was budgeted for 80 students and currently has more than 120. This has resulted in the stretching of all resources as reflected, for example, in large classes and inadequate office space. The Department reports a growing demand of students who wish to enter the program.

Given the severe shortage of space for faculty offices and classrooms, we were encouraged to learn that the university is in the process of building a new building for the Faculty of Social Welfare and Health Sciences.

Recommendations:

Essential Changes:

1. Make sure the Department relocates to the new building along with the other schools and departments in the Faculty.
2. Provide resources to accommodate the larger numbers of students who wish to, and are qualified for, enrolling in the Department or, alternatively, limit the number of students to fit the available resources.
3. Increase the number of core faculty. The current number is too small to accommodate the teaching and scholarly needs of the Department.

3. Mission and Goals

In a world with increasingly complicated challenges, interdisciplinary approaches, such as that espoused by the Department of Human Services, hold great promise for providing viable and creative solutions to real world problems. Yet, the Department's mission and goals require greater clarity and focus. The Committee found its discussions regarding the mission of the Department quite confusing. This confusion was echoed in the surveys of students and graduates as well as in the meetings with a select group of students during the Committee's visit.

The Department identifies its focus as "a unique field of studies and research associated with the world of *services* in its broadest sense" (page 3 first paragraph of the self-study report). Some of the confusion stems from similarity in terms used to describe different concepts and domains of study. The "service sector" represents a growing segment of the economy and includes many different types of services, of which "human services" is only one type (other types include, for example, financial services or communication services). Therefore, understanding organizations in the "service sector" is a much broader area of scholarly inquiry and academic instruction than understanding organizations providing "human services". The latter term typically refers specifically to health and welfare services. "Human resource management" (HRM), on the other hand, is a *profession* that covers an area of specialty related to the management of an organization's workforce, such as hiring, training and firing employees. Although these three

areas have terms in common (“services” and “human”), they refer to distinct areas of scholarship, instruction and professional skills.

The Department of Human Services’ mission statement (at the bottom of page 21 of the self-study report) seems to imply that it aims to cover *all* of the areas noted above. It states: “... the Department aims to focus on issues related to characteristics of services and of service recipients and service processes, the management and improvement of services, and the challenges involved in the provision of high quality services in a diverse society, and on the development and management of needed human resources”. The Committee understands this statement to mean that the Department focuses on the entire service sector (not just human services) and also aims to cover human resource management but not necessarily only in the human services field or even in the larger areas of service sector but much more broadly in all sectors of the economy. A very broad interpretation that emerges from some parts of the report regarding the Department’s focus is that it deals with *any services to humans* (or to people). Although the Committee admires the ambitious nature of the Department’s mission, it is concerned that this very broad mission may not be achievable in a relatively small department, might lead to redundancy with other departments or schools on campus, and could be the source of the confusion and frustration expressed by students and graduates.

The group of students who met with the Committee were appreciative and enthusiastic about the faculty but shared their frustration regarding the focus of the Department. Although not a representative sample, some students indicated that when they signed up for study in the Department they thought that they would be studying human *resources* rather than human *services*. As they explained it, the similarity in terms in Hebrew (*sherutei enosh* vs. *mashabei enosh*) was the source of their confusion. Another source of confusion was the students’ expressed desire to work with all kinds of organizations, not only human service organizations, and not necessarily in the service industry. This might explain the students’ wish for more focus on HRM studies as indicated in the Department’s self-study report and might also explain the dropout rate (about 10%) in the first year. Additionally, some students indicated that it would be difficult for them to explain their area of expertise to potential employers because they themselves were not clear about it.

The committee commends the Department for recognizing in its own self-study the lack of congruence in its programs (as it relates to students’ wish for more HRM content vs. the Department’s focus on the broad area of services) as one of the Department’s weaknesses and for recognizing the need to resolve it (p. 4 of the self-study report).

The Department in its self-study report notes the need for “alignment of students’ expectations and program content at the BA and MA”. The Department’s explanation for this lack of alignment is that there is “a growing expectation among BA students that university studies provide them with practical knowledge relevant in any area of employment they enter”. The Department’s surveys indicate that students and graduates alike want to see more applied content in the BA program (p.34). The report further implies that these expectations for practical skills persist

“despite continuous efforts by the Department to clarify the goals and content of the program and align expectation”. The Committee wishes to note that the Department’s own web site seems to promise practical skills by stating that “The goal of the Department is twofold: to provide students with the necessary skills to improve the services systems and apply them to the needs of special populations, and to develop the theoretical and empirical knowledge relating to the unique domain of service”. It is, therefore, not surprising that students indeed expect a more practical course of studies and, based on the survey results, they find the program lacking in this important regard.

(<http://hw2.haifa.ac.il/index.php/en/departments/human/266-mainhuman>)

The Committee recommends that the faculty of the Department engage in a process that would provide greater clarity and specificity to the Department’s mission and would enable it to communicate this focus more succinctly to students. Once the mission and message are more focused, the course of studies needs to be congruent with this mission. For example, if the focus is not only on human service organizations but also on other types of service organizations and beyond, more content needs to be provided on other sectors of the economy. Or, if the focus is shifting from human services to HRM, then more courses related to the professional skills of managing human resources would be needed. In the latter case, the University might want to check for redundancy with any courses on HRM that might be offered in its School of Business.

This Committee joins the previous CHE review committee in observing that the location of the Department within the Faculty of Social Welfare and Health Sciences is not necessarily obvious. We believe, however, that with a sharper and more focused mission, this connection could become more apparent. It is important to note that the Department’s senior faculty members feel strongly that the Faculty of Social Welfare and Health Sciences is a good home for them and they do not have any desire to move elsewhere.

Recommendations:

Essential Changes:

1. Formulate a clearer and more focused mission for the department. We should note that similar concerns regarding lack of clarity with respect to the focus of the Department were raised by the previous CHE committee.
2. Make the link between the mission and the objective more succinct.
3. Articulate the connection between the Department’s mission to that of the Faculty for Social Welfare and Health Sciences more clearly.

4. Study Programs

The Department of Human Services' BA degree is currently a double major degree - 60 credits out of the 120 required for completion of a BA degree. The Department has also been offering MA studies since 2009 in two tracks – a research focused track requiring a thesis (28 credits) and a final exam track (36 credits). During the academic year 2013-2014, 275 BA students and 110 MA students were registered for study in the Department.

The Department should be commended for establishing a field experience component to its academic programs. In response to students' requests and to the previous CHE review that indicated concern regarding the extent to which the studies were of practical utility and recommended more field-based studies, the Department has incorporated an optional supervised practicum experience into the BA study program. This new component is an improvement in that it offers students the opportunity to make some connections between their academic course work and the world of work. It is, however limited in the number of field experiences it offers to the students. Currently the Department offers three practicum-style field-based courses of 4-8 credits: 1. Management in Social Organizations; 2. Young Entrepreneurs Program; and 3. Volunteering in Social and Non-profit Organizations. Though these various field opportunities vary considerably from one another and appear to lack an organizing conceptual framework, they seem to offer valuable learning experiences to the students who choose to participate in them.

The Committee recognizes that the Department does not offer professional training and operates its BA program in a double major context with only 60 credits available. Within those parameters, offering a limited number of field experiences in an elective/selective format rather than a required component makes sense as this is more typical for professional education. In fact, even offering this limited field experience opportunities represents a serious strain on the Department's limited resources. Students appreciate these opportunities and would like to see more of them offered, particularly in the business for-profit sectors. Some students expressed frustration at not being able to secure a field experience due to the limited number of placements offered by the Department.

The Committee commends the Department for its plan to expand the range of experiential internships in order to provide the BA students with additional opportunities to gain hands-on experience and further improve their employability. Along with that expansion, the Committee recommends making the linkages to the Department's mission more explicit (i.e., which organizations and what type of experiences should qualify as a field experience for the Department).

The Department's educational program seems to be, to some extent, out of sync with students' wishes and expectation (and might be related to the lack of clarity of the Department's focus). A survey of current students and graduates indicates that students prefer their future employment to be in business organizations more than in the public and non-profit sectors (p. 23). The vast majority of the field experiences is offered currently in non-profit and governmental agencies whereas students have a strong preference for the business sector. Similarly, students

would like their courses to reflect more content related to the business sector, including finance and management content.

A survey of the Department's graduates indicates that the majority (81%) of their suggestions for improvement are related to the study program. More specifically, they would like the program to be more focused (some noted the confusion between human services and human resource management) and oriented more toward providing practical skills.

The Department faculty leadership also plans to submit for university approval an "expanded BA" degree program that will require 76 credits from the Department, rather the currently 60 credits. If approved, this program would allow the Department to supplement its curriculum with additional required courses in areas that are sorely needed such as economics, budgeting or some specific aspects of HRM.

The Department's proposed 5 year strategic plan could address some of the challenges of the misalignment between student expectations and the program's focus. As part of this strategic plan, the Department plans to open a track within the MA program focusing on management of human resources (HRM) in service organizations, and another sub-track on service management. Given the small size of the faculty, it might be wise to collaborate with other departments, such as the Faculty of Sociology or the Faculty of Management whose faculty members might have some expertise in this area.

Regarding the Department's plan to open a PhD program, the Committee recognizes that this would be an important next step in the Department's development as outlined in its strategic plan. The Committee is concerned, however, that with only 6 senior (tenure-track) faculty members, the Department may not have the capacity to open its own independent PhD program. Although Department faculty have been successfully supervising PhD dissertations of students from other departments, having a *PhD Program* requires resources for supporting doctoral students with specialized methods and content-related courses as well as having a wide range of faculty research and expertise. Additionally, such a program might stretch the capacity of an already thinly stretched and extremely hard working faculty. Perhaps a model of joining forces with another department to create a joint PhD program could provide a solution to this challenge.

Recommendation:

Essential Changes:

1. Provide a clearer focus to the study program that would include more knowledge and skills related to the real world of employment and more congruent with student expectations such as management, finance, and human resource management.

2. Communicate the focus of the Department more clearly to prospective applicants to avoid the confusion and misconceptions related to the similarity of the terms “human services” and “human resources.”

Advisable Changes:

3. Help current students understand the focus of the Department better so that they can explain their area of specialization better to prospective employers.

4. Expand the field experience opportunities so more students who wish to take advantage of these learning experiences could do so. The Faculty would need to dedicate additional funds to permit this expansion.

5. Expand the field experiences to include organizations in the business sector.

5. Human Resources/Faculty

The Department shares faculty members with other departments. The core number of faculty members currently includes 6 senior (tenure-track) faculty members. This is an increase from the 5 core faculty in the previous year when the report was written, but a decrease from the 8 faculty members it had in 2009, which was the largest core faculty the Department has had in its history. Of the 6 core faculty, one is an associate professor, one is a lecturer without tenure and the others are tenured senior lecturers. Affiliated with the Department are 4 TA's who teach research methods and a large number (14) of adjunct faculty members. Faculty members' areas of expertise include diverse disciplines such as psychology, sociology, organizational behavior, and management. Adjunct faculty members enhance the academic faculty's expertise by bringing more practice hands-on experience.

Recommendations:

Essential Changes:

In order to carry out its plans for growth (increase units for the BA, two tracks for the MA and adding a PhD program), the Department needs to increase its capacity for instruction and supervision by adding more members to its core faculty, particularly in the more senior ranks.

6. Students

Students were enthusiastic about the core faculty members of the Department as well as many of their other instructors. They were very pleased with the content of many of the courses, the quality of the instruction and the personal attention that they have received from faculty members. Although they enjoyed their courses and found them beneficial, they felt that they did not get enough real world job skills. As a result, they were apprehensive about their job prospects. As mentioned earlier in this report, students were concerned about their ability to communicate their

area of expertise to future employers because they were not clear about it themselves. Students would like the BA program to be oriented more toward skills that would be needed in the job market such as more content related to management, economics, budgeting, finance, and HRM. This was also corroborated in the alumni survey (see earlier comment).

Students in the Master's program were also very pleased with the core faculty and generally enjoy their courses. They expressed appreciation for the individual attention they have received. MA students who have also completed the BA at the Department noted that some of the courses at the Masters level repeated topics and content covered in the BA, particularly when taught by the same instructor.

Despite the concerns expressed by students regarding their job prospects, the data indicated that most of the students found a job within half a year after they graduated and some were already working while in school. Faculty members provided students assistance in finding a job. According to the self-study report, a preliminary analysis of the kind of work-places showed that of those employed, 64% worked in business organizations, 21% in public organizations, and 15% in not-for-profit organizations.

Recommendations:

Essential changes:

1. Offer courses oriented toward skills that would be needed in the job market such as more content related to management, economics, budgeting, finance, and HRM.

Advisable Changes:

2. Provide students with job interviewing seminars to help them gain more confidence for facing potential employers.
3. Invite graduates to talk to students and describe potential jobs that can be obtained after graduation.

7. Teaching & Learning Outcomes

Student surveys indicate a considerable degree of satisfaction with teaching in the program. This was corroborated during the Committee's meetings with select groups of BA and MA students. There also seemed to be ample opportunities for instructors to improve their teaching skills through work with their mentors or by taking workshops offered by the university. However, courses often have a large number of enrolled students which affects the quality and frequency of class discussion. In addition, students indicated that, in some courses and seminars, there was not sufficient space and students had to sit on the floor. There are no e-learning courses, but courses do have their own webpage which provide students access to course materials. Faculty members expressed interest in developing

some courses to be totally online, but noted that external help would be needed to accomplish this.

Similar to the mission statement, the learning outcomes for the program are very broad (p. 40 of the self-study report). As a result, it is difficult to assess the extent to which the overall learning outcomes have been accomplished. In addition, the Department's grade distribution is strongly skewed toward high grades, indicating a tendency for grade inflation. This is not unique to the Department but typical across many schools and universities. Nevertheless, grade inflation makes it difficult to use grades as an indicator of achievement of learning outcomes for individual courses and for the program as a whole. It also implies that the Department is not performing its gatekeeping function in terms of graduating students who have demonstrated mastery of the learning outcomes set forth by the Department.

Recommendations:

Essential Changes:

1. The Department needs to be provided with more resources to reduce class size to accommodate more productive discussion. Similarly, room assignments need to fit the number of students in the class.
2. To address grade inflation, the Department should find ways to provide grading methods that would produce more accurate grades that are reflective of the extent to which students master the learning outcomes set forth for *each* course *and* for the Department as a whole.
3. Once the mission statement and goals of the Department become clearer (see earlier recommendations), measurable intended learning outcomes need to be redefined accordingly.

8. Research

Senior faculty members engage in research that is impressive in its scope and productivity, particularly considering the small number of senior faculty (6 at the time of the Committee's visit). They place high emphasis on research and some of their work has been published in prestigious high impact journals. The very broad definition of the Department's mission allows faculty to engage in various types of research under the umbrella of services research. Although faculty members make important contributions to the advancement of knowledge in several areas, it is not clear that together they make a contribution to the emerging field of services research.

The Department's self-study report makes the case for its need to have a PhD program in order to enhance the Department's research activities. The Committee recognizes the contribution of doctoral students to research productivity. However, the Department in its present size and structure does not have the capacity to support a PhD program that would be conducive to preparing future

scholars. Although faculty members currently supervise the work of doctoral students in other departments, the Department lacks the infrastructure and resources to seriously undertake the responsibility of training future researchers and scholars who would become leaders in the field.

Recommendations:

Essential Changes:

Increase the number of senior faculty and Departmental resources *prior* to establishing a PhD program.

9. Infrastructure

Office space for senior and junior faculty members is limited and barely adequate. As noted earlier, classroom space is sometimes too small for the class size to the point that some students have to sit on the floor, according to the students. Library services are excellent.

Recommendations:

Essential Changes:

1. Ensure that the Department is allocated adequate space in the new building.
2. Allocate classrooms that fit the number of students per class.

10. Self-Study Process

The Committee is impressed with the self-study process and the quality and thoroughness of the report. It is clear that the Department of Human Services has implemented important changes following the previous report of the CHE Committee, changes that have strengthened the educational program and the Department as a whole. We strongly recommend the continuation of this process, particularly as it relates to strengthening the congruence between students' perception of the program's goals and that of the faculty. An important aspect of achieving this congruence should be the clarity of information that is communicated to applicants through the web site and written materials. We commend the Department for its efforts to strengthen the applied aspects of the program while preserving its academic strengths. These efforts include plans to provide much needed knowledge and skills in the areas of finance, management and HRM. The Committee would like to add a note of caution that a thorough review of the mission and aim of the Department should precede and therefore guide these efforts.

The Committee recognizes and is highly appreciative of the tremendous work of the faculty and staff in the preparation of the self-study report.

Chapter 4 - Summary of Recommendations and Timetable

Essential Changes:

1. Make sure the Department relocates to the new building along with the other schools and departments in the Faculty.
2. Provide resources to accommodate the larger numbers of students who wish to, and are qualified for, enrolling in the Department or, alternatively, limit the number of students to fit the available resources.
3. Increase the number of core faculty. The current number is too small to accommodate the teaching and scholarly needs of the Department.
4. Formulate a clearer and more focused mission for the department. We should note that similar concerns regarding lack of clarity with respect to the focus of the Department were raised by the previous CHE committee.
5. Make the link between the mission and the objective more succinct.
6. Articulate the connection between the Department's mission to that of the Faculty for Social Welfare and Health Sciences more clearly.
7. Provide a clearer focus to the study program that would include more knowledge and skills related to the real world of employment and more congruent with student expectations such as management, finance, and human resource management.
8. Communicate the focus of the Department more clearly to prospective applicants to avoid the confusion and misconceptions related to the similarity of the terms "human services" and "human resources."
9. In order to carry out its plans for growth (increase units for the BA, two tracks for the MA and adding a PhD program), the Department needs to increase its capacity for instruction and supervision by adding more members to its core faculty, particularly in the more senior ranks.
10. Offer courses oriented toward skills that would be needed in the job market such as more content related to management, economics, budgeting, finance, and HRM.
11. The Department needs to be provided with more resources to reduce class size to accommodate more productive discussion. Similarly, room assignments need to fit the number of students in the class.
12. To address grade inflation, the Department should find ways to provide grading methods that would produce more accurate grades that are reflective of the extent to which students master the learning outcomes set forth for *each* course *and* for the Department as a whole.

13. Once the mission statement and goals of the Department become clearer (see earlier recommendations), measurable intended learning outcomes need to be redefined accordingly.
14. Ensure that the Department is allocated adequate space in the new building.
15. Allocate classrooms that fit the number of students per class.

Advisable Changes:

1. 3. Help current students understand the focus of the Department better so that they can explain their area of specialization better to prospective employers.
2. 4. Expand the field experience opportunities so more students who wish to take advantage of these learning experiences could do so. The Faculty would need to dedicate additional funds to permit this expansion.
3. 5. Expand the field experiences to include organizations in the business sector.
4. 2. Provide students with job interviewing seminars to help them gain more confidence for facing potential employers.
5. 3. Invite graduates to talk to students and describe potential jobs that can be obtained after graduation.

Signed by:



Prof. Allan Borowski



Prof. Ram Can'an



Prof. Michàlle Mor Barak



Prof. David Biegel



Prof. Zahava Solomon



or Sven Hesse, Stockholm University, Stockholm

Prof. Sven Hesse

Appendix 1: Letter of Appointment

February 2015

Prof. Allan Borowski
School of Social Work
RMIT University
Australia

Dear Professor,

The Israeli Council for Higher Education (CHE) strives to ensure the continuing excellence and quality of Israeli higher education through a systematic evaluation process. By engaging upon this mission, the CHE seeks: to enhance and ensure the quality of academic studies, to provide the public with information regarding the quality of study programs in institutions of higher education throughout Israel, and to ensure the continued integration of the Israeli system of higher education in the international academic arena.

As part of this important endeavor we reach out to world renowned academicians to help us meet the challenges that confront the Israeli higher education by accepting our invitation to participate in our international evaluation committees. This process establishes a structure for an ongoing consultative process around the globe on common academic dilemmas and prospects.

I therefore deeply appreciate your willingness to join us in this crucial enterprise.

It is with great pleasure that I hereby appoint you to serve as the Chair of the Council for Higher Education's Committee for the Evaluation of the study programs in **Social Work and Human services**. In addition to yourself, the composition of the Committee will be as follows: Prof. Michàlle Mor Barak, Prof. Ram Cnaan, Prof. David Biegel, Prof. Zahava Solomon and Prof. Sven Hesse

Ms. Alex Buslovich-Bilik will be the coordinator of the Committee.

Details regarding the operation of the committee and its mandate are provided in the enclosed appendix.

I wish you much success in your role as a member of this most important committee.

Sincerely,

Prof. Hagit Messer-Yaron
Vice Chair,
The Council for Higher Education (CHE)

Enclosures: Appendix to the Appointment Letter of Evaluation Committees

Department of Human Services – Schedule of Site Visit

March 9, 2015

Time	Subject	Participants	Room/Location
09:30-10:00	Opening session with the heads of the institution (Joint meeting of the two academic units under evaluation)	Prof. David Faraggi , Rector Prof. Perla Werner , Vice Rector Ms. Ruchama Elad-Yarum , Manager, Unit for Academic Quality Evaluation, Office of the Rector Dr. Michal Daloya , Unit for Academic Quality Evaluation, Office of the Rector	Eshkol Tower, Room 712
10:00-10:45	Meeting with the Dean of Faculty of Social Welfare & Health Sciences (Joint meeting of the two academic units under evaluation)	Prof. Shay Linn , Dean of the Faculty of Social Welfare & Health Sciences Ms. Tova Grimberg , Head of Faculty Administration	Eshkol Tower, Room 712
10:45-11:30	Meeting with the head of the department of Human services	Dr. Gil Luria , Head of the Department of Human Services Dr. Iddo Gal , Head of the Department of Human Services during the self-evaluation process	Eshkol Tower, Room 501
11:30-13:00	Meeting with senior academic staff with and without tenure (representatives of relevant committees)*	Dr. Orna Blumen Goldberg (MA committee) Dr. Arik Cheshin (MA committee) Dr. Iddo Gal (BA committee) Dr. Rita Mano-Negrin (BA committee) Prof. Dana Yagil (Head of MA committee and program)	Eshkol Tower, Room 501
13:00-13:45	Lunch (Joint)		Eshkol Tower, Room 712
13:45-14:30	Meeting with BA and MA students** (up to 12 students)	Ms. Anna Haya Trostianitser (3rd year) Ms. Dima Abboud (Recent Bachelor) Ms. Hazar Ayoub (3rd year) Mr. Paz Almog (3rd year) Ms. Nina Petrosian (2nd year) Ms. Rotem Weisberg (2nd year) Ms. Hila Smotkin (Human Services, MA with Thesis, 2nd year) Ms. Marina Zamsky (Graduated MA program in 2014, MA with Thesis) Ms. Naama Bar-on Shmilovitch (Human Services, MA with Thesis, 2nd year) Ms. Rotem Moshe (Human Services, MA without Thesis, 2nd year) Mr. Shai Ben-Shushan (Graduated MA program in 2014, MA with Thesis) Ms. Shoshan Hayon (Human Services, MA without Thesis, 2nd year) Ms. Vered Palit (Human Services, MA with Thesis, 2nd year)	Eshkol Tower, Room 501
14:30-15:15	Meeting with internship coordinators	Ms. Yael Abada (Lead instructor, internship program) Ms. Sari Schiffer ("Young entrepreneurs" Internship coordinator)	Eshkol Tower, Room 501
15:15-16:00	Library		

Time	Subject	Participants	Room/Location
16:00-16:15	Closed-door meeting of the committee		Eshkol Tower, Room 712
16:15-16:45	Summation meeting with heads of institution, Dean and head of the school (Joint meeting of the two academic units under evaluation)	Prof. David Faraggi , Rector Prof. Perla Werner , Vice Rector Prof. Shay Linn , Dean of the Faculty of Social Welfare & Health Sciences Prof. Miri Cohen , Head of the School of Social Work Dr. Gil Luria , Head of the Department of Human Services Dr. Iddo Gal , Head of the Department of Human Services during the self-evaluation process Ms. Ruchama Elad-Yarum , Manager, Unit for Academic Quality Evaluation, Office of the Rector Dr. Michal Daloya , Unit for Academic Quality Evaluation, Office of the Rector	Eshkol Tower, Room 712

* The heads of the institution and academic unit or their representatives will not attend these meetings.

** The visit will be conducted in English with the exception of students who may speak in Hebrew and anyone else who feels unable to converse in English.

Committee Members:

- **Prof. Allan Borowski** – School of Social Work and Social Policy, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia (Ageing; Retirement; Migration; Cohesion; Delinquency)
- **Prof. Michàlle Mor Barak** – School of Social Work & Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California, USA (social work and management)
- **Prof. Ram Cnaan** – School of Policy and Practice, University of Pennsylvania, USA (faith based social services, social policy)
- **Prof. David Biegel** - Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, USA (family as a unit, family welfare)
- **Prof. Zahava Solomon** – School of Social Work, Tel-Aviv University, Israel (Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and secondary PTSD)
- **Prof. Sven Hesse** – School of Social work, Stockholm University, Sweden (poverty and children and their families in an international perspective as well as International social work)

CHE Representative:

- **Ms. Alexandra Buslovich-Bilik** – Committee Coordinator