

COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Quality Assurance Division

National Report of

The Committee for the Evaluation of Social Work and Human Services

Study Programs

January 2016

Prepared by

Professor Allan Borowski, RMIT University, Melbourne (Committee Chair)

on behalf of

Professor David E Biegel, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland

Professor Ram A Cnaan, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

Professor Sven Hesse, Stockholm University, Stockholm

Professor Michalle Mor Barak, University of Southern California, Los Angeles

Professor Zahava Solomon, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv

Introduction

The Committee for the Evaluation of Social Work and Human Services Study Programs (the Committee) wishes to express its thanks and appreciation to the rectors, deans, faculty members, administrative staff, students and others for their investment of time, effort and resources in preparing the self-study reports, for organizing the site visits and for meeting with Committee members. The Committee is also grateful for the hard work and unflinching support provided by the CHE personnel charged with the carriage of this evaluation. The self-study reports and site visit meetings greatly facilitated the Committee's work and it hopes that both the individual reports prepared by the Committee as well as this national report will, in turn, benefit the social work and human services study programs which it evaluated.

This report is divided into 11 parts. The first part broadly outlines the higher education context in which the social work and human services education enterprise is pursued in Israel, a context that raises many challenges and offers some opportunities. The second part overviews the work of the Committee and the study programs it reviewed. It then turns to a consideration of the study programs themselves. In the fourth part the focus is upon faculty while the fifth part turns its attention to students. Teaching and learning outcomes are taken up together in the sixth part while research and infrastructure are the foci of the seventh and eighth parts respectively. This is followed by a discussion of the two Departments of Human Services that were reviewed by the Committee. The last two sections offer the Committee's recommendations for the consideration of the CHE its Planning and Budgeting Committee, the institutions and the departments/schools in relation to, first, the social work study programs and then the human services study programs.

1. Social Work and Human Services Education within the Wider Context of Contemporary Developments in Higher Education in Israel

During the course of the last two decades or so there has been a rapid increase both in the number of students pursuing higher education in Israel and in the number of higher education providers. While, for a time, this expansion was led by off-shore universities which opened campuses in Israel, the trend has now clearly shifted toward a growth in the number and size of Israeli universities (Ariel University being the most recent institution to be granted university status) and, in particular, the colleges (*michlalot*).

Of particular concern is the fact that this expansion has not been accompanied by a commensurate growth in the funds allocated by the CHE to Israel's institutions of higher education. Further, the colleges have progressively sought to offer Master's and PhD degrees and to accord greater priority to research and publication. Indeed, the Committee understands that the CHE plays a role in the promotion process of some college faculty members and increasingly requires applicants for promotion, not unlike their university-based peers, to meet research productivity criteria. And finally, across the whole higher education sector there is an increasingly heavy reliance on adjunct faculty members to deliver

curricula and a deterioration in the ratio between the number of permanent faculty members and the number of students. Given these developments, the Committee's impression is that the distinction between Israel's universities and colleges is increasingly one without a difference.

These developments serve as the context within which the social work and human services education enterprise in Israel is pursued. Social work education in Israel is "thriving" in terms of student demand and the unrelenting expansion of programs. Thus, there has been a marked growth in the number of programs--Bachelor's, Master's, social work retraining (*hasava*) and PhD programs--since the CHE's 2005-06 evaluation of the then extant social work and human services programs. Despite the proliferation of social work programs, some colleges are nevertheless seeking still further expansion through either the introduction of new programs or the "upgrading" of their approved program offerings to include Master's degrees and PhD programs. The seemingly relentless growth in the number of social work programs has resulted in an intensification of competition among the departments/schools for students, a competition which, in the Committee's estimation, has resulted in a decline in "student quality" and, in turn, academic standards. (The Committee acknowledges that most of the department/schools have sought to avoid their programs' educational quality being compromised.) Further, as noted earlier, research is highly prioritized – certainly by the universities and increasingly by the colleges. And all this is taking place within an environment of significant stress and pressure because of the often severe budgetary constraint faced by many institutions, a situation which compels some institutions to enroll ever-growing numbers of students thereby compounding what already is a very difficult situation.

2. The Work of the Committee and the Programs Reviewed

The Committee was charged with evaluating nine departments/schools of social work (the Schools of Social Work at Bar-Ilan University, Sapir College, University of Haifa, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Ashkelon College, Ariel University and Tel Aviv University and the Departments of Social Work at Ben-Gurion University and Tel-Hai Academic College) and two departments of human services (at the Max Stern Academic College of Emek Jezreel and the University of Haifa). Committee meetings and site visits were undertaken in March 2015 and 11 individual reports were submitted to the CHE over the subsequent 9 months.

The greater part of this report focuses upon social work education in Israel. A separate section addresses itself specifically to the two human services study programs reviewed by the Committee.

3. Study Programs

The study programs reviewed by the Committee included those that offer a three-year baccalaureate degree (either a BA or BSW), a Master's by coursework (two years), a Master's

with coursework plus a thesis (three years), a retraining (*hasava*) program that confers either a baccalaureate degree after two years of study or a Master's degree after three years of study, and a PhD degree (up to four years of study).

Baccalaureate Degree Programs

The baccalaureate degree programs in Israel vary. Some are generic and yet offer some field of practice specialization while others also provide for practice method specialization (e.g., policy practice at Tel Hai College). The Committee's members are mixed in their views as to the appropriateness of providing practice method specialization at the undergraduate level.

Common to all of the baccalaureate programs in social work is the absence of a *mandatory* core course on social work practice in a diverse society. While some recognition is given in all curricula to issues of diversity, the Committee believes that a dedicated course is required at the baccalaureate level (and, indeed, at the Masters level too).

While some departments/schools invested more heavily in fieldwork education (e.g., Bar Ilan University) than others, overall there appears to have been considerable improvement in the organization and delivery of field work education since the last CHE evaluation. The selection criteria for supervisors, their training, and the ongoing supervision of supervisors, the efforts to keep supervisors apprised of curriculum developments, etc. appear to be quite rigorous. Nevertheless, students reported instances, for example, of field placements that had no on-site supervisor as well as some placements that did not provide appropriate learning opportunities. In both community work and policy practice, placement opportunities seem to be limited across many programs.

One reason for the limited opportunities in both community and policy practice placements is the fact that a number of the departments/schools are in relatively close geographic proximity to one another resulting in intense competition for these types of field education places. Indeed, intense competition among these departments/schools is a problem for all types of placements. In some other countries where there is a similar problem, departments/schools have worked closely with one another to "carve up" the placement opportunities in a way which assures each institution a certain number of placements thereby substantially reducing the resources wasted in the competition to secure appropriate placements for their students. Another strategy is for the departments/schools to coordinate the scheduling of student placements with one another in order to ensure, to the extent possible, that their students are not on placement at precisely the same time thereby decreasing to some degree the extent of the "competition problem".

There are also financial dimensions to the field education programs that affect both students and the departments/schools. As far as students are concerned, the transportation costs associated with meeting fieldwork education requirements can be very burdensome. For the departments/schools, differential rates of remuneration for field educators result in both

dissatisfaction on the part of some supervisors as well as “supervisor churning” where supervisors initially recruited and trained by one department or school may move to the employ of another that offers higher remuneration. In order to resolve the issue of differential supervisor remuneration, serious consideration should be given to establishing a standard rate of pay that applies nationally and which is reflective of the qualifications, experience, and significant contribution made by supervisors to professional social work education.

Master’s Degree Programs

The Master’s degree programs by coursework commonly focus on advanced direct practice/clinical knowledge and skills. The problem of overlap between the baccalaureate social work programs and the Master’s programs that was identified in the last HEC evaluation has endured in some departments/schools. The departments/schools need to be vigilant in ensuring that there is a clear differentiation between the curriculum content of the undergraduate and graduate programs. Further, Master’s students expect both course content and pedagogy to be of a higher standard than that of the baccalaureate programs.

The Master’s’ degree with a thesis track raised two issues for the Committee. The first relates to the widespread concern about the availability of thesis advisors/supervisors. In some departments/schools some faculty members are overloaded with thesis supervision while others are either unwilling or unable to supervise. This creates a workload imbalance among faculty members. And, in some cases, where faculty members are supervising a large number of theses, their ability to provide quality supervision may be compromised.

The Committee regards the “dearth” of supervisors as a serious matter, not least because in one institution students enrolled in the Master’s program in expectation of having the option to undertake a thesis have only later found out that there is an insufficient number of faculty members available for supervision. The issue of the availability of supervisors is also one confronted by the PhD programs.

The Committee is of the view that all faculty members should be required to undertake thesis supervision (and that this role be considered in the overall distribution of workload and explicitly acknowledged in promotion processes). At the same time, the enhancement of supervision capacity will require an investment in both the formal training of novice supervisors as well as their ongoing support.

In light of the academic qualifications frameworks such as the Bologna model and those that shape higher education in countries such as the US, Canada and Australia (the Australian Qualifications Framework), some Committee members were troubled by the apparent inequity of offering one Master’s degree (by coursework) which requires two years of study while also offering another (with coursework and thesis) that requires three years.

As noted earlier in this report, there appears to be a proliferation of social work programs in Israel. Adding to the baccalaureate programs that prepare students for entry-level professional practice are the retraining programs. Many schools/departments either already offer, or are planning to introduce, a retraining program for those with a relevant baccalaureate degree. In a number of instances, new three-year retraining programs leading to a Master's degree have replaced two-year retraining programs that previously granted a baccalaureate degree. Some Committee members could not quite grasp why a retraining program may now require three years of study on the part of students who enter with a relevant baccalaureate degree when, previously, this entailed only two years of study and fieldwork practicum – as it does in North America and Oceania.

PhD Programs

Unlike some other countries, student demand for PhD programs in social work appears to be quite robust in Israel. Over the years, these programs have produced a good number of the top notch academics now found in many of Israel's department/schools of social work as well as leading clinicians, community workers, human services managers and policy practitioners.

What struck the Committee, however, was: (1) the large numbers of students pursuing a PhD, (2) the reality that those pursuing a PhD with a view to entering the academy will face very intense competition, (3) those pursuing a PhD with a view to entering the academy had little or no opportunity to teach while pursuing their studies and, in a number of cases, few opportunities or supports to publish scholarly papers, (4) the significant numbers enrolled in PhD programs who had no interest in an academic career, (5) the considerable variability in the scope and nature of coursework required of PhD students (sometimes very little) and the great variability in the depth and scope of the dissertation work, and (6) a certain dissonance between the content of the program and the knowledge and skills that employment outside of the academy would demand of the PhD graduates.

Given the cost to the state of funding PhD programs and the direct and opportunity costs incurred by PhD students, the Committee is of the view that much greater consistency across departmental/school PhD programs and stricter admission criteria are required. (But note that the pervasiveness of grade inflation referred to below presents a real challenge for student selection into graduate programs.) Thus, for example, PhD students should generally be required to: (1) undertake mandatory courses in quantitative *and* qualitative research methods and data analysis, (2) participate in a regular and ongoing structured seminar focused on such topics as dissertation proposal preparation, how to write a dissertation, writing for publication, the nature and utilization of supervision, writing grant applications, teaching skills, etc. Further mandatory content might include courses on leadership and the management of complex organizations, courses that will stand students in good stead whether they enter academia or work in the field. In sum, many of the departments/schools need to revisit the intent, structure and content of their PhD programs and create admission

criteria to fit their program's goals. And where there is insufficient supervision capacity, the numbers admitted into a PhD program should be curtailed.

A final observation about PhD programs. Some departments/schools (e.g., Hebrew University and Tel Aviv University) offer direct tracks into the PhD program while some also open their PhD programs to applicants who hold no social work qualifications whatsoever. (The rationale for the latter is unclear.) The Committee regards both the direct track and "open" pathway as problematic as neither ensures that students have the depth of practice experience in a profession for which a PhD is supposed to help prepare them for leadership positions.

4. Human Resources/Faculty

The Committee was very impressed by: (1) the commitment exhibited by the faculty members it met, across all of the departments and schools, to the professional education of social workers and (2) the very high regard in which they were held by the students with whom the Committee's members met. The Committee was especially taken by this high level of commitment given the severe resource constraints faced by many institutions and the consequent heavy faculty workloads. Indeed, were it not for the willingness of faculty members to invest time, effort and energy "above and beyond the call of duty", it is doubtful that some programs would have remained viable.

But faculty members pay a very heavy price for this commitment to their students in terms of high teaching and administrative workloads and delayed promotion, the latter due to the little remaining time consequently being available for the conduct of research. This is especially the case in the colleges. In concert with social work faculty in the universities, college faculty now aspire to be (and are expected to be) research active but are constrained, on the one hand, by high teaching loads (higher than university faculty) and, on the other, by insufficient internal financial and other human resources to support and facilitate research. This situation is particularly invidious given that college faculty members face an increasingly rising bar for promotion (more publications) while not enjoying the same levels of support as their university-based colleagues. And while the colleges provide for some reduction in workload for faculty members who are demonstrably research active, this very load often obviates the possibility of doing the research that would lead to the workload reduction needed to seriously invest in research, a situation which both frustrates and demoralizes many college faculty members.

The profile of faculty members varies considerably across the various departments and schools. In some, the faculty profile is skewed towards early career/junior faculty members (e.g., Sapir College) while in others (e.g., University of Haifa) the faculty is "mature" with several senior faculty members being on the threshold of retirement. With rare exception (e.g., the Hebrew University), junior faculty are not adequately mentored. A common theme across the site visits was the need for *formalized* mentoring arrangements that include the

training and matching of mentors and mentees and which also ensure that no junior faculty member “falls through the cracks” and fails to receive mentoring. Indeed, an important role for a mentor would be to bring clarity to bear on promotion criteria, something which junior faculty at several sites reported as being quite opaque.

As far as senior faculty are concerned, there is an almost universal practice across the various institutions of either not replacing retired senior faculty or not committing to replacing those on the threshold of retirement when they eventually retire. The implications of this situation are manifold. They include, first, increases in workload for the already overstretched remaining faculty members; second, the further deterioration of already “stretched” staff-student ratios; third, the risk of reputational damage flowing from the loss without replacement of faculty who contributed to building the national and often international standing enjoyed by the department or school; and, fourth, given the need to fill lacunae in the curriculum, the increasing reliance on adjunct faculty.

Indeed, the Committee was very concerned by the often extensive utilization of adjunct faculty. Further, it was not evident to the Committee that adjunct faculty are adequately inducted into the teaching role or, indeed, are inducted at all. Of particular concern was the fact that many adjunct faculty were neither qualified nor experienced social workers and, yet, were often engaged in teaching foundation knowledge courses at the baccalaureate level. And finally, the Committee had no sense that permanent part-time faculty members or long-serving adjunct faculty with an interest in a meaningful academic career were necessarily seen as, or “cultivated” as, potential future full-time faculty members in the institutions that they had often served well for many years.

Where faculty vacancies have, of course, arisen and been filled from time to time, the Committee was concerned about those instances in which new (typically junior) faculty members had neither social work qualifications nor any depth of professional practice experience. Given the sizable and growing number of experienced social workers in Israel with PhD qualifications, the Committee was surprised to learn that suitable candidates could sometimes not be found to fill these vacancies and, instead, candidates with PhDs from other disciplines were recruited. The Committee is of the view that it is vital, especially in smaller programs, for faculty members to be both professionally qualified and bring some depth in practice experience to their teaching and research.

Although uncommon, some social work departments/schools in Israel are headed by a senior faculty member who is not a qualified social worker, The Committee believes that academic leadership of professional social work education programs requires a dean/director who has been trained and socialized into the profession and has a substantive base in the real world of practice.

5. Students

One of the most pleasant aspects of serving on an evaluation committee for the CHE is the opportunity it affords committee members to meet with students. The Committee was very impressed by the calibre, commitment, idealism, and passion of the undergraduate and graduate social work students it had the privilege to meet across Israel. At the same time, there is considerable heterogeneity among the student body, as one would expect in a society as diverse as Israel. Indeed, the students themselves underscored the importance of a greater investment in curriculum content on social work practice in a diverse society (as well as a greater focus within curricula on some of the contemporary issues and challenges facing Israel, such as significant poverty and growing inequality).

But students are also diverse in terms of their degree of preparation for university studies. While some institutions have seemingly “solid” preparatory (*mechina*) programs (e.g., Sapir College) for educationally and socially disadvantaged students, others, with less developed or no programs, find themselves having to invest heavily in supporting disadvantaged students nevertheless admitted for study. The Committee’s observation was that where educationally disadvantaged students are admitted into social work programs without adequate preparation for tertiary studies, the demands on faculty members can be substantial, especially where they have neither the skill nor additional resources to appropriately serve these students.

It was the Committee’s strong sense that there is also another factor at play which impinges on the quality of the student body. This is the sheer number of social work programs in Israel and the competition among them to attract students into their programs. The Committee believes that the increase in the number of programs has meant that departments/schools have had to lower their entry standards and admit “weaker” students than in the past in order to meet their enrolment quotas. The Committee believes this has had an adverse effect on the quality of the education provided although it also acknowledges that most of the department/schools have sought to avoid their programs’ educational quality being compromised.

To the extent that there is an element of homogeneity among the student body it is among the graduate students. Many of the students enrolled in the graduate degree programs (and probably a significant proportion of the undergraduates as well) are employed either full- or part-time and often also have major family responsibilities. This presents the departments and schools with challenges as far as the “efficient” delivery of courses is concerned (typically all required graduate classes are held on one long day per week) and can affect the timeliness with which graduate students complete their programs of study.

6. Teaching and Learning Outcomes

Another factor that has a bearing on the quality of education is the large numbers of students that are admitted for study. Presumably, larger enrollments generate greater funds for the resource-constrained departments/schools. However, as noted above, the “cocktail” of

lowered admission standards, burgeoning student numbers and deteriorating faculty-student ratios has placed the maintenance of educational standards at risk.

Indeed, the Committee was taken aback by some of the assessment practices (online multiple choice tests) employed by some faculty members in some institutions as the primary (and sometimes sole) means of assessing the knowledge and skill acquisition of students in large classes. Students reported that this way of assessing their mastery of the subject area was very limited, resulted in little feedback (if any) and provided no opportunity for students to demonstrate the depth of their engagement with the course content. While understanding the faculty members' utilization of this mode of assessment as a "survival" strategy, the Committee nevertheless regards this practice as quite unsatisfactory.

Curiously, in spite of all the factors that point to educational standards necessarily being at least somewhat compromised, across all the programs of all departments/schools student grades are consistently well above average. The grades assigned to graduate theses are also high – perhaps not unexpected since a common practice is for the thesis supervisor to also serve as a thesis examiner. The Committee believes that extensive grade inflation is at play in schools/departments of social work. (It acknowledges that this appears to be a "cultural" phenomenon across all programs in all Israeli universities and colleges. It is also a common phenomenon in some other countries.) Nevertheless, grade inflation suggests that the investment in assessing students' knowledge and skills (even when it entails using such "limited" tools as multiple choice tests) is substantially wasted as it does not yield student grades that clearly distinguish among students in terms of their level of performance.

At the same time, all departments/programs, to varying degrees, have recently introduced statements of intended learning outcomes (ILOs) into their study programs and, again variably, such statements now also appear in individual course outlines. The clear intention is that ILOs be specified for all programs of study and the individual courses that they are comprised of. The specification of ILOs can serve as explicit benchmarks against which to assess students and, where appropriate assessment tools are used, they may also serve to ameliorate both declines in quality and grade inflation.

7. Research

A number of the university-based departments/schools of social work enjoy enviable national and international reputations for the scholarly and research contributions of their faculty. As far as the colleges are concerned, they, as noted previously, are increasingly emphasizing the importance of research but are constrained by their workload formula (heavier teaching loads than university faculty members) and a dearth of internal human and financial resources to support research.

The aspirations of college faculty members and the expectation of college management and, seemingly, the CHE as well, for colleges to assume a much higher profile as far as research is

concerned, begs the question of what the CHE believes should be the difference between the universities and the colleges. If it is intended that Israel move from a “pluralist” higher education system (as also found in the United States) towards a “unitary” one (as in Australia) where there is no real distinction between universities and the colleges, then as a matter of equity the colleges, including their departments/schools of social work, need to be much more adequately resourced to carry out a key expected function, namely, research.

8. Infrastructure

The adequacy of the infrastructure available to the universities and colleges to deliver their various programs of study in social work is highly variable. For example, Tel Aviv University’s Bob Shappell School of Social Work and Ben-Gurion University’s Spitzer Department of Social Work appear to be well catered for in this regard and the same is true of Tel Hai College where a substantial investment in buildings and other infrastructure is in train. In the case of both Bar Ilan University and Ariel University, however, adequate and fully-equipped large teaching spaces and small skills laboratories as well as faculty offices are seriously lacking. (The school of social work at Bar Ilan University is in urgent need of its own building.) Ariel University also requires a greater investment in library resources.

9. Departments of Human Services:

Max Stern College of Emek Jezreel and the University of Haifa

The Committee was also charged with the task of evaluating the Departments of Human Services at the Max Stern Academic College of Emek Jezreel and the University of Haifa. The Committee was positively impressed by the dedication of the faculty members serving in these Departments, their levels of academic expertise and their research and scholarship productivity. From the student surveys as well as meetings with students, it is clear that many students are attracted to these departments. However, there is lack of clarity and focus in the mission and goals of these departments that permeates their educational and research programs and animates students’ dissatisfaction and their lack of ability to explain their field of study to employers.

Some of the confusion stems from similarity in terms used to describe different concepts and domains of study. For example, the similarity in terms in Hebrew for human services (*sherutei enosh*) and for human resource management (HRM) (*mashabei enosh*) was cited by students as a source of confusion. Similarly, 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 Committee recommends that the CHE establish a multidisciplinary committee, reflective of the multidisciplinary nature of these Departments, to engage in a process that would provide greater clarity and specificity to their mission and would enable them to communicate this focus more succinctly to students and employers. Once the mission and message are more focused, the course of studies needs to be designed so that it is 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. Alternatively, if the focus shifts 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/college might want to check for overlap with any courses on HRM that might be offered in other programs such as in the School of Business. Such a review would help the academic institutions eliminate costly redundancies while taking advantage of relevant faculty expertise in other departments.

10. Recommendations Concerning the Social Work Study Programs

Recommendations to the CHE

1. The Committee recommends that the CHE review the role that it expects the colleges to play vis-à-vis the universities in the provision of higher education and the pursuit of research in Israel (a pluralist versus a unitary system of higher education).
2. Given the Committee’s concerns about the threats to the quality of higher education in Israel as outlined earlier in this report, the Committee recommends that the CHE consider limiting the further expansion of social work education program offerings and support the consolidation of existing ones. It further recommends that any future proposals for expansion take cognizance of the projected labour force demands for social workers in Israel.
3. The Committee recommends that the CHE, if it has not already done so, consider adopting a national framework, such as the Bologna model or the Australian Qualifications Framework, to ensure comparability in the nomenclature, standards and quality of higher education qualifications.
4. The Committee recommends that the CHE institute an inquiry into the causes, consequences and solutions to the phenomenon of grade inflation.
5. The Committee recommends that the CHE consider the adoption of a national policy on transition-to-tertiary education programs for students from socially and educationally disadvantaged backgrounds.

Recommendations to the Planning and Budgeting Committee of the CHE

6. The Committee recommends that, if the CHE expects the faculty of the colleges to actively engage in research, then, in the case of social work (but, in reality, across the whole sector) it should make the requisite budget allocations.

7. The Committee recommends that the CHE increase the per capita allocation it makes to the universities and colleges for social work students to a level reflective of the real costs involved. The higher costs of social work education relative to the social sciences generally are due to such factors as the high costs of fieldwork education and the need for small classes (especially in the teaching of practice skills) at both the baccalaureate and Master's levels.

8. Given that most graduate social work students are employed and are also parents with child care responsibilities, the Committee recommends far less stringency in relation to the time lines required to complete Master's degree studies whether by coursework or (especially) by thesis.

9. In order to obviate competition between the social work programs for field education supervisors and consequent "supervisor churning", the Committee recommends that remuneration for supervisors should be set nationally at a level reflective of the level of supervisors' professional qualifications and years of practice experience by an *independent* remuneration tribunal/committee comprised of representatives of the CHE, the departments/schools of social work and the Social Workers' Union.

10. Given that the range of professional social work qualifying degrees (for beginning-level practice and licensing) is now so great in terms of degree level (baccalaureate, *hasava* Masters) and content (generic, field of practice specialization, practice method specialization, etc.) the Committee recommends that a national social work education accrediting body be established. Like accrediting bodies elsewhere, its role would be to specify entry-level practice or competency standards and prescribe the requisite curriculum content. (See, for example, the *Education Policy and Accreditation Standards* of the US Council on Social Work Education and the *Social Work Education and Accreditation Standards* (2012) and *Practice Standards* (2013) of the Australian Association of Social Workers.) Such an accrediting body could also assume a role in quality assurance through specifying, for example, the qualifications required of field educators and adjunct faculty, the minimum number of days to be spent by students in field work education, the balance between regular faculty and adjunct faculty, etc.

11. In view of the differential "endowment" of various institutions in terms of their educational infrastructure (buildings, classroom, skills laboratories, faculty offices, library facilities, etc.) observed by the Committee, it recommends that an infrastructure audit be undertaken and budget allocations made to those institutions whose infrastructure is deficient.

Recommendations to Institutions

12. With a view to enhancing the quality of the education provided, the Committee recommends that the number of faculty members holding tenurable and tenured appointments be increased to address deteriorating staff-student ratios. At the same time, the use of adjunct faculty should be curtailed.

13. The Committee recommends that all adjunct faculty members be appropriately inducted into the college/university, including some formal training in teaching at the tertiary education level. (Adjunct faculty should be remunerated for the time spent participating in the induction program.)

14. The Committee recommends that all institutions establish a *formal* mentoring program for early career faculty members (tenurable and tenured) and that training for both mentors and mentees constitute an integral part of such a program.

15. In view of the shortage of thesis supervisors, the Committee recommends that all institutions (1) tailor the number of students admitted to the number of faculty members available to supervise theses and dissertations and (2) establish *formal* training programs in thesis supervision and provide ongoing support for faculty members until they have successfully completed supervising several theses/dissertations. At the same time, a thesis/dissertation supervision program should also cater to the needs of students undertaking a thesis by providing them with formal opportunities to understand the nature of the supervision process and the supervisor-supervisee relationship.

16. The Committee recommends that the institutions, especially the colleges, substantially increase intramural funding for faculty research and, where one does not exist, that they establish a research office/authority to support faculty efforts to secure research funding and conduct research.

17. The Committee recommends that those individuals who are appointed as directors/deans of departments/schools of social work should be qualified and experienced social workers.

Recommendations to Departments/Schools

18. The Committee recommends that mandatory courses on social work practice in diverse societies be introduced as core curriculum content in both baccalaureate and Master's programs.

19. The Committee recommends that the departments/schools continually monitor their baccalaureate and Masters degrees to ensure that they are distinct programs.

20. The Committee recommends that doctoral programs be reviewed with a view to addressing any dissonance between the structure and content of the program and the planned career paths of students. Thus, the Committee recommends that all doctoral programs ensure that they provide sufficient structured course content to prepare students

for a career as versatile (quantitative and qualitative) applied social researchers, teachers in tertiary institutions and leaders of the profession in policy, practice and the management of human services organizations (including the management of colleges and universities).

21. The Committee recommends that direct track PhD programs be abandoned and that PhD programs cater to social work qualified and experienced students.

**11. Recommendations Concerning the Human Services Study Programs
Departments of Human Services at
Max Stern College of Emek Jezreel and the University of Haifa**

Recommendation to the CHE

1. The Committee recommends that the CHE assemble a group of scholars and practitioners (from the Departments for Human Services as well as from allied disciplines such as sociology, psychology, business administration, social work) to assist in generating clear and focused mission and goals statements for these departments. The Committee notes that similar concerns regarding lack of clarity with respect to the focus of the human services study programs were raised by the previous CHE evaluation committee.

2. The Committee recommends that no new human services departments and study programs be established until greater clarity is achieved regarding mission and goals.

3. As in the case of the social work study programs, the Committee recommends that the CHE institute an inquiry into the causes, consequences and solutions to the phenomenon of grade inflation in Departments of Human Services.

4. Prior to approving additional advanced degrees within the Departments and after providing more clarity of both mission and goals, the Committee recommends that more faculty be recruited so that they can adequately supervise the independent work required at the Masters and PhD levels.

5. The Committee recommends that, in the future, a separate evaluation review committee should be established for the Departments of Human Services that would include a multidisciplinary team reflective of the multidisciplinary nature of these departments.

Recommendations to the Planning and Budgeting Committee of the CHE

6. Once the mission and goals have been clarified, the Committee recommends that an investment be made in increasing the number of core faculty, particularly senior faculty, so that these Departments would be capable of mentoring and supervising students for advanced degrees.

7. The Committee recommends that sufficient resources be allocated to ensure that the Departments have adequate space available to accommodate students' learning needs and to reduce class size to accommodate more productive discussions.

Recommendations to Institutions

8. The Committee recommends that universities and colleges examine potential overlaps with other programs and the possibility of capitalizing on the relevant expertise that exists in other departments or faculties to enhance the learning experiences of students in the Departments of Human Services.

Recommendations to Departments

9. The Committee recommends that the link between the mission and the objectives of the Departments of Human Services be made more succinct. Once the mission statement and goals of the Departments have been made clearer, measurable intended learning outcomes need to be redefined accordingly.

10. The Committee recommends that the Departments provide a clearer focus to their study programs that would include more knowledge and skills related to the real world of employment and be more congruent with student expectations such as management, finance, and human resource management.

11. The Committee recommends that the focus of the Departments be more clearly communicated to prospective applicants to avoid the confusion and misconceptions related to the similarity of the terms "human services" and "human resources."

12. The Committee recommends that the Departments expand the field experience opportunities to also include organizations in the business sector so more students who wish to take advantage of these learning experiences can do so.

13. The Committee recommends that additional courses be offered that are oriented toward skills that would be needed in the job market such as more content related to management, economics, budgeting, finance, and HRM.