



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

The Louis & Gabi Weisfeld
School of Social Work
Bar- Ilan University
Evaluation Report

March 2016

Contents

Chapter 1:	Background.....	3
Chapter 2:	Committee Procedures.....	4
Chapter 3:	School of Social Work at Bar-Ilan University.....	5
Chapter 4:	General Recommendations and Timetable.....	16

Appendices: Appendix 1 – Letter of Appointment

Appendix 2 - Schedule of the Visit

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**¹ - 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:²

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 1In accordance with CHE policy, Prof. Zahava Solomon did not participate in the evaluation in order to avoid the appearance of any conflict of interest.

² 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 School of Social Work at Bar Ilan University. The Committee's visit to Bar Ilan University took place on Wednesday March 12th, 2015.

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

The Committee thanks the management of Bar Ilan University and the School of Social Work for their self-evaluation report and for their hospitality towards the committee during its visit at the institution.

Chapter 3: Evaluation of the Social Work Study Program at Bar-Ilan University

This Report relates to the situation current at the time of the visit to the institution, and does not take account of any subsequent changes. The Report records the conclusions reached by the Evaluation Committee based on the documentation

provided by the institution, information gained through interviews, discussion and observation as well as other information available to the Committee.

1. Executive Summary

The Committee was impressed by the School's strong commitment to excellence both in professional education in social work for entry-level and experienced practitioners and in research. The School achieved this despite the real tension of being a professional school dedicated to educating social workers while simultaneously striving to meet the scholarly/research expectations associated with being a professional school within a university. The high level of research productivity, in terms of both quality and quantity, is admirable.

A major challenge facing the School in the coming few years is the looming retirement of many senior faculty members. If the School is to maintain its high standard of teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels and its hard-earned reputation as a highly research-active school, then Bar-Ilan University will have to fill the impending vacancies as they arise with faculty members who, like current faculty, are appropriately academically qualified to conduct significant research and also have a depth of professional social work practice experience.

The Committee was also impressed by the School's field education program and the improvements made since the last CHE review. However, the university has not acted on the recommendation of the previous evaluation committee as far as planful (rather than ad hoc) budgeting for fieldwork and clinical experts are concerned. This Committee is very concerned that this issue remains unresolved.

The School faces major infrastructure challenges, not least being the need for a dedicated building that would meet its special needs, such as rooms for small group teaching and facilities for clinical training and supervision.

There is also a considerable underinvestment in library resources – in both e-journal and e-books as well as journals and books in hard copy form. Further, as there is no elevator in the library, there is an access issue for all Bar-Ilan University faculty members and students with disabilities to access library resources.

2. Organizational Structure

Bar-Ilan University's primary campus is in Ramat Gan. The university also provides academic support for courses delivered at four regional colleges: Ashkelon College, the Western Galilee College, the Jordan Valley College and the Safed College.

Further, it conducts degree courses for the *haredi* population in Bnei Brak and Jerusalem. However, since the School's *Haredi* Program was reviewed in 2013-14, it is beyond the scope of the current evaluation.

In the 2013-14 academic year, Bar-Ilan University's student population was around 26,000 students with 19,000 students on the main campus at Ramat Gan. Of the latter number, about 10,000 students were studying towards a BA, 7,000 towards an MA and about 2,500 students towards a PhD.

The Faculty of Social Sciences includes 12 departments of which the School of Social Work is the largest with more than 700 students. The School was founded in 1966 and thus became the third academic School of Social Work in Israel. The number of students in BA program is now about 400, a number which has been relatively stable over the last five years.

In 1972 the MA program in social work was initiated. The program teaches advanced theory and intervention methods to social workers with at least two years of prior field experience. The MA program includes two tracks, one with a thesis requirement and one without. During the last five years there has been a decline in the number pursuing the MA thesis track from 78 students in 2010 to 63 students in 2014. Over the same period of time, the number enrolled in the MA without thesis track has increased substantially from 169 to 225.

In 1982, the School opened its PhD program for experienced social workers. The number of doctoral students over the years since the PhD program began has been "sizable". In recent years, however, the number has effectively been capped due to the limits on the School's supervision capacity. Over the last five years, about 40 students have been undertaking a PhD at any one time.

In 2014-15 the School introduced a new three-year MA retraining/*hasava* program for students with a BA in other disciplines. While this program is beyond the scope of this evaluation, brief reference will be made to it later in this report.

3. Mission and Goals

The main mission of the School is threefold: "...to train professional social workers to address diverse social problems facing multicultural populations, to advance knowledge and research, and to respond to ongoing changes in their field of specialization". At the graduate level the School aims "to provide students with advanced knowledge and skill to become leaders of change by pursuing management and supervision positions, including the development of new services and social policy" (Self-evaluation report, p. 19). The goals set out on pages 19-20 of the self-study report are consistent with this mission.

The Committee is supportive of the unequivocal primacy that the School attaches to preparing social workers for beginning- / entry-level practice and advanced practice while also acknowledging the importance of the acquisition of new knowledge through research and its application and dissemination.

This report offers further comments on the School's mission later in this report.

4. Study Programs

The School offers a Bachelor's degree program, a Master's degree program (with both thesis and non-thesis tracks) and a PhD program. (As noted above, the School recently introduced a three-year retraining / *hasava* MA program from this year, a replacement for its former two-year BA retraining / *hasava* program.)

BA Program

The BA curriculum includes basic introductory courses in the social and behavioral sciences, courses on methods of intervention with individuals, groups and communities, social policy, and research methods. It also offers courses relating to children at-risk and special need populations. All Bar-Ilan University students are required to take some additional courses in Jewish studies.

At the end of their first year, students select their specialization for the second year—either social work practice with individuals and groups or social work practice with groups and communities. It is arguable whether specialization so early in a professional course geared to preparing students for entry-level practice is advisable. This is especially so at Bar-Ilan University given the curriculum space occupied by the mandatory Jewish studies course requirements.

Further, given the School's mission "to train professional social workers to address diverse social problems facing multicultural populations," there does not appear to be any *dedicated* course on social work practice in diverse societies. While the self-study report makes reference to courses that include content on diversity, the Committee is of the view that the teaching of social work practice in diverse societies is of such importance that it warrants a dedicated course. Such courses are now frequently found as core curriculum content in social work qualifying programs (at the Bachelor's and Master's levels) elsewhere in the world.

Given the ethos of Bar Ilan University, the Committee acknowledges the importance of the mandatory Jewish studies courses that BA students are required to take. (Social work students are required to take seven Jewish studies courses offered by various departments in the Faculty of Humanities.) At the same time, the Committee is concerned about the class time demanded by these courses within the context of a program of professional education. The Committee believes that consideration should be given to directly tailoring perhaps two Jewish studies courses to the needs of a social work students, e.g., "Jewish Thought and Social Work", "Ethics in Judaism and Social Work," "Jewish Perspectives on the Welfare State", etc.

Fieldwork in the BA Program

Students undertake placements on a weekly basis that progressively increase from 7 hours weekly in their first year of studies to 16 hours weekly by the third year. The supervisor is always on site in the case of direct practice placements and, in community work placements, while not always on site, is employed in the same agency. Students are required to submit case reports to their supervisor on a regular basis.

Supervisors are selected through interviews and are required to undertake a formal supervision course. In the second and third year, students provide an evaluation of their supervisors and agency, one per semester. Of course, supervisors also evaluate students on a regular basis.

The Committee was impressed with the fieldwork education program and, in particular, commends the School for the steps taken since the last CHE review to improve the interrelationships and coordination between classroom-based curriculum content and the field. (See p. 180 of the self-report study.) However, the Committee is very concerned that Bar-Ilan University has still not acted on the recommendation of the previous evaluation committee as far as a priori (rather than ad hoc) budgeting for fieldwork and clinical experts. This situation makes it very difficult for the field education staff of the School to deliver the field education program in a planful manner.

MA Program

The MA program is intended for professional social workers with at least two years' practice experience. The goal of the program is to provide the students with additional and updated theoretical knowledge, to deepen their existing knowledge, and to teach them advanced practice and research skills all in order to improve their performance in the field. This advanced practice degree offers specializations in clinical practice, rehabilitation and health, and community and organizational development. All three specializations provide for a thesis track and a non-thesis track option. The MA program is actively geared towards integrating theory with practice by encouraging students to consume knowledge critically and potentially to also produce knowledge by conducting research. As in many other such programs in Israel, the clinical practice specialization is by far the most popular program.

While the focus of the MA on advanced practice is to be highly commended, the relationship between the specializations undertaken at the BA level and those at the MA level is unclear. That said, none of the stakeholders with which the Committee

met suggested there was content overlap between the two. What is unclear is the difference in intended learning outcomes between specialization at the BA level and specialization (especially in similar practice methods) at the MA level.

A new, three-year retraining / *hasava* MA Program was initiated this year for students with a BA in other disciplines. This program replaces the previously-offered two-year retraining program that led to a BA degree. Further, the MA thesis track, although initially conceived of as a two-year program, is now a three-year program for which the third year “is intended to finish [the] thesis only” (p. 180 of the self-study report). While this new *hasava* program is beyond the scope of this evaluation, it is nevertheless curious that what previously took two years (achieving an entry-level professional qualification in social work) now requires three years. (The self-study suggests that the three-year retraining / *hasava* students – in contrast to those who undertook the previous two-year program--will graduate with advanced practice skills ... even though they have no previous social work practice experience!) It seems inequitable to this Committee that different “streams” of the same degree (an MA in social work) can take different amounts of time to complete. This may suggest that the scope of the MA thesis needs to be reined in and, as far as the *hasava* program is concerned, greater weight needs to be accorded to the foundation knowledge which students bring from their prior studies.

Further, a three-year Master’s program (whether thesis track or *hasava*) is at odds with the Bologna model which prescribes that a Master’s degree should normally involve two years of study. The salience of this concern is underscored by the Rector’s comments during the course of the Committee’s site visit that Bar-Ilan University aspires to a degree structure that complies with the Bologna process.

PhD Program

The PhD program is aimed for a career in research as well as developing practice-oriented research in the field of social work (p. 27 of the self-study report). Students have at least one and sometimes two mentors. Students have one full day of courses. The time line for finishing program is four academic years. The majority of PhD students are drawn into research projects of the tenured/senior faculty members.

What is especially impressive about the PhD program is its highly structured nature. For example, there are formal coursework requirements, for instance, in qualitative and quantitative methods. There is also a PhD seminar that addresses such issues as academic skills, and critical reading and writing skills. A further component is the rotating courses designed to improve specific skills such as publishing research

articles, writing grant applications, evidence-based interventions, and advanced research designs.

The PhD program is no longer primarily designed, as it was when first established in 1982, for professionals with a graduate degree in social work who engage mainly in administration and planning or policy-making (p. 18 of the self-report study). It appears that it is now mainly geared towards preparing students for an academic research career in social work. Indeed, the formal coursework requirements do not reflect the program's (apparently secondary) aim of preparing "future leaders in the field of social policy and social work services" (p. 95 of the self-study report). Many PhD graduates will nevertheless find themselves working in such roles rather than as academics or researchers given the large number of PhD students graduating from Israeli Schools of Social Work relative to academic vacancies--the slew of retirements expected in many Israeli universities notwithstanding. It follows that the School should consider offering some other core PhD courses, for instance, in the management of complex human services organizations and leadership—knowledge that will stand PhD graduates in good stead should they return to the field or, indeed, be successful in finding employment in higher education in Israel.

PhD students are expected to publish their work and they receive departmental funding in order to present their work in scientific conferences. Indeed, the School encourages a PhD by publication in which three papers have to be accepted for publication with the student as the senior author. (This Committee is mixed in its views concerning the appropriateness of granting a PhD based on publications—whether actually published or "publishable".)

Recommendations

Essential changes required:

That the School introduces a dedicated course on social work practice in diverse societies at the BA level and, indeed, at the MA level as well.

Advisable changes:

That Bar-Ilan University ensures that an a priori (rather than ad hoc) budget allocation for fieldwork and clinical experts is made available to the School to permit careful advance planning for the important fieldwork education program.

That the School articulates the relationship between the specializations undertaken at the BA level and those at the MA level and specify the intended learning outcomes for all specializations.

That the School ensure that the requirements of its several MA degree programs are similar in terms of years of study and that they thereby comply with the Bologna model in this respect.

That the School offer two core courses in its PhD program that will enhance students' leadership, management and policy skills –whether they secure ongoing employment in the academy or remain in the field upon completion of their studies.

Desirable changes recommended:

That the School considers the advisability of offering specializations in its BA program, especially given the curriculum space occupied by the mandatory Jewish studies course requirements.

That consideration be given to directly tailoring perhaps two Jewish studies courses to the needs of a social work students.

5. Human Resources / Faculty

The school has 22.75 full time senior faculty positions. A major challenge facing the School in the coming few years is the looming retirement of many senior faculty members. If the School is to maintain its high standard of teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels and preserve (and, indeed, hopefully advance) its hard-earned national and international reputation as a highly research-active academic unit, then Bar-Ilan University will have to fill the impending vacancies as they arise with faculty members who, like current faculty, are appropriately academically qualified to conduct significant research and also have a depth of professional practice experience. Further “casualizing” the academic workforce of the School through increasing the already large number of adjunct faculty positions in lieu of filling core faculty positions is ill-advised.

The School, like others in Israel, also faces an acute shortage of thesis supervisors relative to the number of graduate students requiring supervision. While there are incentives for faculty members to undertake supervision (some teaching relief and the explicit recognition of this role in promotion processes), the School's supervision capacity is nevertheless very stretched. In the absence of additional faculty capable of supervising research theses or a move to alternative (and arguably less effective) models of supervision (e.g., group supervision), the School may have to consider further rolling back the numbers enrolled in those programs that have a thesis requirement.

Although the School does not have a formal mentoring program, junior faculty members reported that mentoring is heavily invested in by the senior faculty mentors. Nevertheless, the Committee is of the view that the introduction of a

formal mentoring program would ensure that junior faculty members do not “fall through the cracks,” especially in the coming years as senior faculty members begin to retire in significant numbers.

Adjunct faculty reported that they found the School a supportive working environment and valued the monthly group supervision that was provided to them. Unsurprisingly, however, they expressed concern about the lack of security in and predictability of their employment.

Recommendations

Essential changes required:

That the vacancies created by the impending retirements of senior faculty members be filled as they arise.

That retiring faculty are not replaced by part-time adjunct faculty given the already high level of casualization of the School’s academic staff.

Advisable changes:

That the School invest in the formal training and ongoing support of its faculty to optimize the limited resources available to supervise the theses of MA and PhD students.

That the Faculty or School introduce a *formal* mentoring program which, in the first instance at least, is focused on early career faculty members.

Desirable changes recommended:

That, in relation to adjunct faculty members, the Faculty/School put in place procedures that would enhance their security in and the predictability of their employment.

6. Students

Applicants to the BA program must be at least 19 years of age and have achieved a psychometric score of at least 600, a grade of at least 85 in English in the psychometric exam, and a full matriculation. Those applicants who completed pre-academic program are also interviewed. Due to the popularity of the clinical specialization in the MA program admission requirements are quite “strict.” One

admitted, students' across all programs generally complete their studies, as reflected in low dropout rates.

The BA students were generally very satisfied with their studies and especially valued the personal contacts with their teachers. However, students in the individual practice specialization expressed concern about the complete absence of policy practice content and insufficient exposure to community work practice. They also reported variability in the intellectual rigour of some courses, the inadequacy of feedback on work submitted for assessment in some courses, the dependence of final grades on just one piece of assessment in some courses, and the considerable out-of-pocket expenses (most notably transport) associated with field practice placements.

The MA students regarded the level of clinical social work training to be of a very high calibre and welcomed the ability to concurrently train as a supervisor. Faculty members were similarly highly regarded. While students undertaking a thesis reported satisfaction with the supervision they received, they noted that no training had been provided to them about the supervision process itself and how to optimally utilize it.

All students expressed considerably less satisfaction with the university's physical infrastructure and online data bases and other resources.

Recommendations

Advisable changes

That the School addresses the absence of policy practice content and insufficient exposure to community work practice in the BA individual practice specialization.

That the School reviews the matter of the intellectual rigor of some of its courses.

That the School ensures that instructors provide adequate feedback on student work submitted for assessment.

That the School ensures that final grades in all courses are based on at least two bases of assessment.

That a concerted effort be made to secure funds in order to help subvent the costs incurred by students in meeting their fieldwork requirements.

That students in programs with a thesis requirement be provided with some training in the thesis supervision process and how to optimally use it.

7. Teaching and Learning Outcomes

The teaching proficiency of faculty members is evaluated by means of online surveys, as well as by open evaluations in group meetings with students and program chairs. The majority of these evaluations have found values of 4+ on a five-grade Likert scale, scores which are reflective of a very high standard of teaching.

Although the self-report study presented the intended learning outcomes for the different degree program offered by the School, it is unclear whether each course offered within each program has specified learning outcomes.

Most courses do not rely on exams or multiple choice quizzes but on papers. Less than 30% of the courses have exams. Despite the commendable variety of approaches to assessment, grade inflation is very pronounced in the School of Social Work. This is by no means unique to the Bar-Ilan University School of Social Work. However, grades are so uniformly high that one could be forgiven for wondering why the School bothers with student assessments at all! There is an urgent need for a grading system that is capable of capturing the extent which intended learning outcomes are realized and which also permits clear, meaningful differentiation among students in terms of their mastery of curriculum content.

It is unclear from the self-study report who examines MA theses, the assessment criteria employed, and the scope of the theses. They certainly should not be assessed by anyone who has been involved in the supervision of the thesis.

Recommendations

Essential changes required:

That the School ensures that the syllabus for each course specifies (1) its intended learning outcomes and (2) the relationship of these learning outcomes to the intended learning outcomes of the overall program.

That the School introduces a grading system (1) that is capable of capturing the extent which intended learning outcomes are realized and (2) which also permits clear, meaningful differentiation among students in terms of their mastery of curriculum content.

That the School clarifies who examines MA theses, the assessment criteria and grading system employed, and the scope of the theses. (Theses should not be assessed by anyone who has been involved in the supervision of the thesis.)

8. Research

The Committee was impressed by the School's strong commitment to excellence both in social work professional education for entry-level and experienced practitioners and in research. The high level of research productivity, in terms of

both quality and quantity, is admirable. On average, faculty members published 5 journal articles and one book chapter a year over the last five years.

It is noted, however, that, in common with some other Israeli universities, and universities elsewhere, the list of preferred journal outlets is produced internally and may be seen by some as a list that suits the scientific work of particular researchers and not necessarily the universal population of scientists from the same or cognate areas.

The amount of funding received for research is also impressive, as is the quality of funding sources, honors, fellowships and scholarships. Many of the faculty, both junior and senior, have been recognized for their excellence, both in teaching and in research, by Bar-Ilan University, nationally and internationally.

One challenge in the area of research for the School is the inadequacy of funding available for post-doctoral fellowships. This includes “post-docs” that permit the post-doctoral fellow to spend part of the post-doctoral period at an Israeli institution, an issue that is of particular importance to female PhD graduates whose mobility is constrained by family responsibilities.

Recommendations

Advisable changes:

That funding be secured to support two post-doctoral fellowships.

9. Infrastructure

A recurrent theme across almost all stakeholders the Committee met with during the course of its site visit was the inadequacy of the infrastructure available to deliver the School’s programs. The School needs a dedicated building that would meet its general needs (e.g., comfortable lecture theatres of adequate size and with sufficient power sources to permit the use of lap-top computers) and special needs, such as rooms for small group teaching and facilities for clinical training and supervision.

A greater investment is needed on the part of the library in a wider range of social science e-journals and e-books that are readily accessible to students via the internet.

Further, there is no elevator in the library. Consequently, access to the ground floor section of the library is not possible for faculty or students with a disability.

Recommendations

Essential changes required:

That a greater investment be made in library-held electronic and hard copy journals and books as well as electronic data bases to facilitate teaching, learning and research. The electronic materials also need to be readily accessible via the internet.

Desirable changes recommended:

The Committee regards a suitable, dedicated new building for the School to be a matter of some urgency. At the same time it realizes that the gestation period for such a large project can be lengthy. However, it would be greatly disappointed if, by the next evaluation by the CHE, the School was not “happily ensconced” in a new building that has been appropriately designed and equipped to enhance its teaching and research activities. Undue delay in this regard will be to the detriment of the School’s hard-earned and highly-regarded teaching programs and research activities.

Similarly in the case of a lift in the library to enhance access for faculty members and students with a disability.

10. Self-Evaluation Process

The self-evaluation process undertaken by the School was thorough in all respects and reflected a very considerable investment of time, energy and human resources. The self-study report provided a detailed update of the School’s and university’s response to the recommendations flowing from the previous CHE evaluation.

11. Another topic the Committee would like to address

Together with the senior faculty in several other Schools of Social Work visited by the Committee, the senior faculty of the Bar-Ilan School expressed considerable concern about the implications of the proliferation of social work programs in Israeli tertiary educational institutions.

Perhaps the major concern revolved around the resultant intensification of competition for students among the growing number of programs. This competition was seen as making it much more difficult to meet student intake targets. Further, where institutions eased admission requirements to ensure intake targets were met (something which was seen as highly undesirable), academic standards were seen as being placed at risk.

Chapter4: Summary of Recommendations and Timetable

Essential changes required:

That the School introduces a dedicated course on social work practice in diverse societies at the BA level and, indeed, at the MA level as well.

That the vacancies created by the impending retirements of senior faculty members be filled as they arise.

That retiring faculty are not replaced by part-time adjunct faculty given the already high level of casualization of the School's academic staff.

Essential changes required:

That a greater investment be made in library-held electronic and hard copy journals and books as well as electronic data bases to facilitate teaching, learning and research. The electronic materials also need to be readily accessible via the internet.

Essential changes required:

That the School ensures that the syllabus for each course specifies (1) its intended learning outcomes and (2) the relationship of these learning outcomes to the intended learning outcomes of the overall program.

That the School introduces a grading system (1) that is capable of capturing the extent which intended learning outcomes are realized and (2) which also permits clear, meaningful differentiation among students in terms of their mastery of curriculum content.

That the School clarifies who examines MA theses, the assessment criteria and grading system employed, and the scope of the theses. (Theses should not be assessed by anyone who has been involved in the supervision of the thesis.)

Advisable changes:

That Bar-Ilan University ensures that an a priori (rather than ad hoc) budget allocation for fieldwork and clinical experts is made available to the School to permit careful advance planning for the important fieldwork education program.

That the School articulates the relationship between the specializations undertaken at the BA level and those at the MA level and specify the intended learning outcomes for all specializations.

That the School ensure that the requirements of its several MA degree programs are similar in terms of years of study and that they thereby comply with the Bologna model in this respect.

That the School offer two core courses in its PhD program that will enhance students' leadership, management and policy skills –whether they secure ongoing employment in the academy or remain in the field upon completion of their studies.

That the School addresses the absence of policy practice content and insufficient exposure to community work practice in the BA individual practice specialization.

That the School reviews the matter of the intellectual rigor of some of its courses.

That the School ensures that instructors provide adequate feedback on student work submitted for assessment.

That the School ensures that final grades in all courses are based on at least two bases of assessment.

That a concerted effort be made to secure funds in order to help subvent the costs incurred by students in meeting their fieldwork requirements.

That students in programs with a thesis requirement be provided with some training in the thesis supervision process and how to optimally use it.

That funding be secured to support two post-doctoral fellowships.

That the School invest in the formal training and ongoing support of its faculty to optimize the limited resources available to supervise the theses of MA and PhD students.

That the Faculty or School introduce a *formal* mentoring program which, in the first instance at least, is focused on early career faculty members.

Desirable changes recommended:

That, in relation to adjunct faculty members, the Faculty/School put in place procedures that would enhance their security in and the predictability of their employment.

The Committee regards a suitable, dedicated new building for the School to be a matter of some urgency. At the same time it realizes that the gestation period for

such a large project can be lengthy. However, it would be greatly disappointed if, by the next evaluation by the CHE, the School was not “happily ensconced” in a new building that has been appropriately designed and equipped to enhance its teaching and research activities. Undue delay in this regard will be to the detriment of the School’s hard-earned and highly-regarded teaching programs and research activities.

Similarly in the case of a lift in the library to enhance access for faculty members and students with a disability.

That the School considers the advisability of offering specializations in its BA program, especially given the curriculum space occupied by the mandatory Jewish studies course requirements.

That consideration be given to directly tailoring perhaps two Jewish studies courses to the needs of a social work students.

Signed by:



Prof. Allan Borowski



Prof. Ram Can'an



Prof. Michàlle Mor Barak



Prof. David Biegel



Prof. Zahava Solomon



Prof. Sven Hessel

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

Appendix 2: Site Visit Schedule

Social Work –Schedule of site visit

Thursday, March 12, 2015, כ"א אדר תשע"ה

Location: Building no. 213, Room no. 320

Time	Subject	Participants
9:-09:0030	Opening session with the heads of the institution	Prof. Miriam Faust , Rector Prof. Amnon Albeck, Vice-Rector
09:30-10:15	Meeting with the Dean of Faculty of Social Sciences	Prof. Joseph Deutsch, Dean of the Social Sciences Faculty
10:15-11:00	Meeting with the head of the school of Social Work	Prof. Rachel Dekel
11:00-11:45	Meeting with senior academic staff (representatives of relevant committees)*	Prof. Liat Ayalon Prof. Nehami Baum Dr. Anat Ben-Porat Dr. Shirley Ben-Slomo Dr. Liora Findler Prof. Ricky Finzi-Dottan Dr. Sara Freedman-Goldstone Prof. Haya Itzhaky Prof. Liat Kulik Dr. Drorit Levy Dr. Rachel Lipschitz-Elhawi Prof. Jonathan Rabinowitz Prof. Orit Taubman – Ben-Ari
11:45-12:30	Meeting with adjunct academic staff (representatives of relevant committees)*	Oren Amsili Dr. Ahinoam Ehrenfreund-Hager Dr. Ofra Aran Dr. Noa Brill Ohad Green Dr. Liat Katz – Ben-Ami Yael Shoval Dr. Meyrav Yitzhack Halevi
12:30-13:15	Lunch (in the same room)	Closed-door meeting of the committee
13:15-14:00	Meeting with BA and MA students** (up to 12 students)	Shir Arviv (2 nd year) Yisca Ashwal (3 rd Year) Avital Becker (3 rd year)

		Nofar Eyal (2 nd year) Carmel Ingber (2 nd year) Peninah Lamm (3 rd year) Shani Ovadia (2 nd year) Sivan Raz (3 rd year) Liora Tair (2 nd year) Shira Tor (3 rd year)
14:00-14:45	Meeting with PhD students** and teaching assistants (up to 10 students)	Dorit Judeikin-Reuven (MA, Rehabilitation & Health , 2 nd year) Kraus Yaara (MA, Clinical Practice, 3 rd year) Lebel Riki (MA, Social planning, administration & community work, 2 nd year) Msarwa Manal (MA, Rehabilitation & Health , 2 nd year) Reshef Shani (MA, Clinical Practice, 2 nd year) Stupp Toby (MA, Social planning, administration & community work, 2 nd year) Sagit Lev (PhD) Eran Melkman (PhD) Ginna Porat-Zyman (PhD) Tehila Refaeli (PhD) Shira Sobol (PhD)
14:45-15:30	Meeting with Field Work Staff	Bilu Peri Noy Yael (Supervisor) Yael Itzhaki (Coordinator of Community Fieldwork) Dr. Makaros Ayelet (Head of Field Work Unit) Sara Revach (Supervisor)
15:30-15:45	Closed-door meeting of the committee	
15:45-16:15	Summation meeting with heads of institution, Dean and head of the school	Prof. Miriam Faust , Rector Prof. Amnon Albeck, Vice-Rector Prof. Joseph Deutsch, Dean of the Social Sciences Faculty Prof. Rachel Dekel, Head of the School of Social Work

* 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.