



**Social Work 9802, (570/571)
Advanced Evaluation in Social Work Practice
Winter 2025-2026**

Course Coordinator: Carrie Smith, Associate Professor

Instructor Information:

Carrie Smith, Associate Professor
Email: csmit486@uwo.ca

Office Hours: Thursdays, 1:30 pm to 2:30 pm or by appointment

Ruth Wilson, Assistant Professor
Email: rwils57@uwo.ca

Office Hours: Thursdays, 11:30 am to 12:30 pm or by appointment

Course and Faculty Contact:

For Course Information (Day, Time and Location), please go to student.uwo.ca, login, select academics; course registration; by class – your schedule should appear. For Faculty Contact information please see the class OWL.

Calendar Description:

This course provides opportunities to apply advanced research methods to evaluate social work practice.

Antirequisites: None

Prerequisites: Registration in the Master of Social Work program or a Letter of Permission from the School of Social Work

Unless you have either the requisites for this course or written special permission from your Dean to enroll in it, you may be removed from this course and it will be deleted from your record. This decision may not be appealed. You will receive no adjustment to your fees in the event that you are dropped from a course for failing to have the necessary prerequisites.

Statement of Commitment:

At King's University College, we learn and work on land that is part of the Dish with One Spoon Treaty from the original inhabitants of this land, the Anishinaabeg, Haudenosaunee, Lenapeewak, and Attawandaron peoples; all of whom have longstanding relationships to the land of Southwestern Ontario and the City of London. As an uninvited guests, we are grateful to inhabit this land, and hope

to maintain the spirit of the Dish with One Spoon Treaty to work collaboratively with the original inhabitants to protect it.

As a mixed-race Filipina, mother, settler, social worker and academic, I (Ruth) am aware of and committed to addressing the historical and continuing harm caused by my community and my profession against Indigenous people. As a white, mother, settler with Scottish ancestry, social worker and academic, I (Carrie) am also committed to addressing the historical and continuing harm caused by my community and profession against Indigenous people. We are striving to do better both professionally and personally, and to finding ways to put into action the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015) recommendations. In our teaching, we strive to listen intently, to learn, and to take action towards decolonizing and Indigenizing research and practice; this includes identifying and challenging the specific ways that colonization continues to create harmful practices and policies within social work. We are hopeful that our collaborative learning experience in this course will be a small but important part of the ongoing and larger conversation around how our work - as social workers, educators, learners – can lead us to our mutual liberation.

Purpose:

Social workers have an ethical and professional responsibility to provide excellence within the social work profession and the current political and fiscal climate demands that agencies and practitioners be able to employ outcome metrics to demonstrate that their interventions are evidence-informed and effective. This course provides students with an understanding of evidence-based/informed interventions and how to incorporate appropriate methods of scientific inquiry to evaluate social work practice.

Topics include evaluation of direct practice, planning evaluations, ethics and participatory action research, decolonizing and indigenizing evaluation, measurement methods and tools, quantitative and qualitative approaches to evaluation and applications of these methods to program evaluation and the development of evidence-informed practice.

This course is part of the core curriculum for the MSW program.

Course Objectives:

At the conclusion of this course students will be able to:

1. Situate evaluation processes in the broader non-profit industrial complex & neo-liberal, neo-colonial welfare state.
2. Identify different types of evaluation (process evaluations, outcome evaluations, single-case designs).
3. Identify the appropriate uses of different types of program evaluation approaches.
4. Explore critical approaches to evaluation including participatory, decolonizing and Indigenizing evaluation.
5. Outline the key steps in planning an evaluation study.
6. Demonstrate social work professional values and ethical issues that are pertinent to conducting and monitoring a program evaluation.
7. Identify the process of engaging significant stakeholders in the process of evaluation.
8. Understand how the agency and social context impacts both the process and outcome of evaluations.
9. Understand different measurement tools.
10. Interpret both qualitative and quantitative data collected from practice evaluation.
11. Create a program logic model and evaluation plan.

12. Use evaluation evidence to inform practice.
13. Integrate practice with evaluation to develop strong programs.

Required Textbook:

Rubin, A. (2020). *Program evaluation: Pragmatic methods for social work and human service agencies*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/9781108870016

You can purchase a paperback copy of this textbook for \$67.95 or an electronic copy for \$62.95 from the bookstore at Western. Students are welcome to search for and purchase second-hand versions of this text. Earlier editions are not available.

Class-specific policy on AI (e.g. Chat GPT):

King's is committed to fostering a culture of professionalism, honesty, and academic integrity, and all members of our community—faculty, staff, and students—have a role to play in promoting an ethical learning environment. Furthermore, through the work they submit for academic evaluation, students develop important habits of critical thinking, independent inquiry, and creativity. Thus, it is expected that students will submit work that is truly their own, completed without external assistance (human or artificial) except as explicitly permitted by the course instructor.

Within this course AI tools [such as Chat GPT] are permitted exclusively for: information-gathering and preliminary research purposes. All students in this course are required to include an AI disclosure statement on the title page of their assignments. If you did not engage with AI tools to create your assignment, your statement will indicate that the assignment was generated entirely by human intelligence. If AI tools are used, you must acknowledge this use and state how the tool was used.

Please be advised that generative AI tools are trained on vast, opaque datasets that reflect dominant narratives, including those shaped by colonial, Eurocentric, and racist worldviews. As a result, these tools can reproduce and reinforce harmful stereotypes, erase Indigenous and racialized ways of knowing, and privilege Euro-Western epistemologies. Further, while AI can support some aspects of research, extensive and habitual engagements with AI can impede your critical thinking and hinder your capacity to ethically assess information and ideas. Use these tools with caution and critically evaluate their assistance and influence over your work.

Recording and Electronic Devices:

When there are discussions about cases in which either the instructor or other students have been involved, all case material should respect client confidentiality. Audio, video, electronic, or handwritten recording of this case material, and of colleagues' personal clinical experiences will not be permitted. Students will be requested to refrain from using phones and computers for purposes other than to facilitate the class learning process.

In this era of generative AI, it is important to protect the identities, voices, and stories shared within our classroom. To uphold the privacy and dignity of everyone involved, students who have obtained permission to record lectures and class discussion must adhere to the following additional guidelines:

- Do not manipulate or alter recordings in any way
- Do not upload recordings to any open-source AI platforms or software
- Store recordings securely, using a password-protected drive or folder
- Delete all recordings promptly at the end of the course

Assignments and Evaluation Criteria:

Universal Design Evaluation Approach:

Adopting a universal design approach for this course, students will be asked to design a program logic model (25%), complete a program evaluation plan (45%), and choose one of three assignments (30%) to demonstrate mastery of the course objectives.

1. Program Description and Program Logic Model:

Describe a program that addresses a social issue of your choice using a program logic model. Please submit your assignment through OWL Brightspace. Please see detailed description and rubric posted on OWL Brightspace.

Due: February 12th, 2026

Mark: 25%

2. Evaluation Plan:

Produce a plan for an outcome or process evaluation. Please submit your assignment through OWL Brightspace. Please see detailed description and rubric posted on OWL Brightspace.

Due: April 9, 2026

Mark: 45%

3. Choices for Evaluation:

Please select one of the three forms of evaluation from the list below and inform your instructor in class on **January 15th, 2026**.

A) Single-Case Evaluation Paper & Presentation

Students may choose to complete a mock single-case evaluation. The single-case could be a person, family, or group. Students will be asked to complete the mock evaluation, prepare a 4-page paper describing the process and the results, and present their findings to the class. The presentation should take 20 minutes, with time after for questions (10 minutes). Please submit your presentation and paper through OWL Brightspace. Please see detailed description and rubric on OWL.

Due: March 26, 2026

Mark: 30%

B) Case Example Presentation (Groups of 3 or 4)

The purpose of this assignment is to present a published program evaluation and facilitate a collective assessment of the approach, design, ethics and recommendations. To minimize duplication, each group will sign up to present a case example that represents one of the following approaches/designs:

- Week 8: Traditional Quantitative Design (Formative or Process)
- Week 8: Traditional Qualitative Design or Mixed Methods (Formative or Process)
- Week 9: Outcome or Impact Evaluation
- Week 10: Indigenous evaluation
- Week 11: Participatory evaluation
- Week 11: Developmental evaluation

Please see detailed description and rubric posted on OWL Brightspace.

Due: **TBD**

Mark: 30%

C) Take Home Final Exam

Students may choose to write a final take-home examination. The examination will include five questions, of which students will be asked to choose three to respond to in essay or paragraph form. Students will have access to their resources from the course for the exam. The examination questions will be distributed on April 2nd, 2026, and due on April 9th, 2026. Please submit your exam on OWL Brightspace.

Due: **April 9th, 2026**

Mark: 30%

COURSE SCHEDULE:

WEEK 1 – January 8

Topic: Setting the Stage: The Politics of Evaluation

Readings:

Daller-Larsen, P. (2024) The evaluation society and its dangers. In Newcomer, K. E., & Mumford, S. W. (Eds.). *Research Handbook on Program Evaluation* (First edition.). Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

McBride, D., Casillas, W. & LoPiccolo, J. (2020). Inciting social change through evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 166, 119-127. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.20405>

Recommended Readings:

Rubin, A. (2020). Chapter 1: Introduction and Overview (pp.3-22).

WEEK 2 – January 15

Topic: Single-Case Designs

Readings:

Rubin, A. (2020). Chapter 8: Single-Case Designs for Evaluating Programs and Practice (pp.137-152)

Csiernik, R., & Birnbaum, R. (2017). Case Study 13: The Power of One: Single-Case Study Design. In [*Practising social work research: case studies for learning \(Second edition\)*](#). University of Toronto Press.

WEEK 3 – January 22

Topic: Theory of Change & Logic Models

Readings:

Gugerty, M. K., & Rangarajan, A. (2023). Theory of Change and Logic Models: Foundation for the Evaluation of Social Programs. In *The Oxford Handbook of Program Design and Implementation Evaluation*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190059668.013.5>

W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2004). *Logic model development guide*. W.K. Kellogg Foundation.
https://www.academia.edu/21938114/W_K_Kellogg_Foundation_Logic_Model_Development_Guide *Please read chapters 1 (pp.1-14) and 2 (pp. 15-25).

WEEK 4 – January 29

Topic: Program Logic Model Development

Readings:

W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2004). *Logic model development guide*. W.K. Kellogg Foundation.
https://www.academia.edu/21938114/W_K_Kellogg_Foundation_Logic_Model_Development_Guide
*Please read chapter 4 (pp.35-48).

Luck, K.E., Doucet, S., & Luke, A. (2020). The development of a logic model to guide the planning and evaluation of a navigation center for children and youth with complex care needs. *Children and Youth Services*, 41(4), 327-341.

WEEK 5 – February 5

Topic: The Evaluation Process & Framework

Reading:

Grinnell, R.M., Gabor, P.A. & Unrau, Y.A. (2019). Chapter 3: The evaluation process. In *Program evaluation for social workers: Foundations of evidence-based programs (8th Ed)*. (pp.39-51). Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-0916510.

Markiewicz, A., & Patrick, I. (2016). The evaluation plan. In *Developing Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks* (pp. 148-180). SAGE Publications, Inc, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071878774>

WEEK 6 – February 12

Topic: Evaluation Ethics & Working with Stakeholders

Schnarch, B. (2004). Ownership, control, access and possession (OCAP) or self-determination applied to research. A critical analysis of contemporary First Nations research and some options for First Nations communities. *Journal of Aboriginal Health*, 1(1), 80-95.

Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2019). Chapter 7: Working with Stakeholders. In *Program evaluation theory and practice : a comprehensive guide (Second edition.)*. The Guilford Press.

****Program Logic Models Due****

WEEK 7 – February 19th: WINTER READING WEEK (NO CLASS)

WEEK 8 – February 26

Topic: Quantitative and Qualitative Methods for Formative and Process Evaluations

Readings:

Rubin, A. (2020). Chapter 4: Survey Methods for Program Planning and Monitoring (pp.63-83)

FRIENDS National Resource Center for Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention. (2009). [Using qualitative data in program evaluation: Telling the story of a prevention program](#). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Office on Child Abuse and Neglect.

Recommended Reading:

Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2019). Chapter 9: Evaluation Designs. In [Program evaluation theory and practice : a comprehensive guide \(Second edition.\)](#). The Guilford Press.

****Case Example Presentations****

WEEK 9 – March 5th

Topic: Outcome and Process Evaluations

Readings:

Rubin, A. (2020). Chapter 5: Selecting and Measuring Outcome Objectives (pp.87-108)

Rubin, A. (2020). Chapter 6: Inference and Logic in Pragmatic Outcome Evaluation: Don't Let the Perfect Become the Enemy of the Good (pp.109-136).

****Case Example Presentations****

WEEK 10 – March 12th

Topic: Decolonizing & Indigenizing Evaluation

Readings:

Eakins, D., Gaffney, A., Marum, C., Wangmo, T., Parker, M. Magarati, M. (Feb. 2023). Indigenous Evaluation Toolkit for Tribal Public Health Programs: An Actionable Guide for Organizations Serving American Indian/Alaska Native Communities through Opioid Prevention Programming.

<https://www.indigenoussphi.org/tribal-opioid-use-disorders-prevention/indigenous-evaluation-toolkit>

Wehipeihana, N. (2019). Increasing cultural competence in support of indigenous-led evaluation: A necessary step toward indigenous-led evaluation. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 34(2), 368-384.

****Case Example Presentations****

WEEK 11 – March 19th

Topic: Participatory and Developmental Evaluation

Readings:

Crupi, K., & Godden, N. J. (2024). Feminist Evaluation Using Feminist Participatory Action Research: Guiding Principles and Practices. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 45(1), 51-67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10982140221148433>

Patton, M.Q. (2016). Chapter 1: State of the Art and Practice of Developmental Evaluation. In (M. Q. Patton, K. McKegg, & N. Wehipeihana, Eds.) [*Developmental evaluation exemplars: principles in practice*](#). New York: The Guilford Press.

****Case Example Presentations****

WEEK 12 – March 26th

Topic: Evaluating Outcomes

Reading:

Salazar, A.M., Barkan, S.E., Rankin, L.F., Woo, C.B. Rozekova, I., Fowler, N.E., Haggerty, K.P., Shogren, D., & Salzer, A. (2021). Evaluation of a brief foster parent/case worker training

to support relationship building skills and acceptance of LGBTQ+ Youth in Care. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2021.2011531>

****Single-Case Evaluation Presentations****

WEEK 13 – April 2nd

Topic: Analyzing, Presenting and Making Decisions With Data

Reading:

Rubin, A. (2020). Chapter 10: Analyzing and Presenting Data from Formative and Process Evaluations (pp. 175-185).

Calderwood K.A. (2012) Teaching inferential statistics to social work students: A decision-making flow chart. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 32(2), 133-147. DOI: 10.1080/08841233.2012.670065

Recommended Readings:

Rubin, A. (2020). Chapter 12: Writing and Disseminating Evaluation Reports (pp.210-227).

WEEK 14 – April 9th

Topic: Review and Wrap-up

****EVALUATION PLANS DUE****

Recommended Readings:

- Azzam, R., & Christie, C. (2007). Using public databases to study relative program impact. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 22(2), 57-68.
- Baker, L.R., Stephens, F., & Hitchcock, L. (2010). Social work practitioners and practice evaluation: How are we doing? *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 20, 963-973.
- Carman, J., (2007). Evaluation practice among community-based organizations: Research into reality, *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(1), 60-75.
- Cooper, S. (2018). The politics of evaluation. In *Participatory Evaluation in Youth and Community Work* (1st ed., Vol. 1, pp. 27–36). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315645247-4>
- Crooks, Claire, "The Healthy Relationships Plus Program: National Implementation Summary" (2017). Healthy Relationships Plus Program Implementation Study. 1.
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/csmh-healthyrelations/1>
- Davis, T.D., Dennis, C.B., & Culbertson, S.E. (2015). Practice evaluation strategies among clinical social workers: New directions in practice research. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 25, 654-669.
- Dighe, S., & Matthias, C. (2023). Deconstructing the Imperial Episteme: Decolonizing Knowledge Production in Program Evaluation. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, 19(44), 117-130.
- Eakins, D., Gaffney, A., Marum, C., Wangmo, T., Parker, M. Magarati, M. (Feb. 2023). Indigenous Evaluation Toolkit for Tribal Public Health Programs: An Actionable Guide for Organizations Serving American Indian/Alaska Native Communities through Opioid Prevention Programming.
<https://www.indigenousphi.org/tribal-opioid-use-disorders-prevention/indigenous-evaluation-toolkit>
- Giannone, D. (2016). Neoliberalization by Evaluation: Explaining the Making of Neoliberal Evaluative State. *Partecipazione e Conflitto*, 9(2), 495–516.
<https://doi.org/10.1285/i20356609v9i2p495>
- Graham (2018). [Formative Evaluation Toolkit: A Step-by-Step Guide and Resources for Evaluating Program Implementation and Early Outcomes](#). Administration for Children and Families. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Grinnell, R.M., Gabor, P.A. & Unrau, Y.A. (2019). *Program evaluation for social workers: Foundations of evidence-based programs (8th Ed)*. Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-0916510.

- Hamme Peterson, C., Schmid, K. & Kososki, R. (2020). A national survey of counselors' use of five types of program evaluation. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation*, 11(2), 71-87. doi: 10.1080/21501378.2019.1678017
- Hogard, E. (2007). Using consultative methods to investigate professional-client interaction as an aspect of process evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(3), 304-317. doi:10.1177/1098214007304741
- Kratochwill, T. R., Hitchcock, J., Horner, R. H., Levin, J. R., Odom, S. L., Rindskopf, D. M & Shadish, W. R. (2010). Single-case designs technical documentation. What Works Clearinghouse website: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED510743.pdf>
- Markiewicz, A., & Patrick, I. (2016). Introduction to developing monitoring and evaluation frameworks. In *Developing Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks* (pp. 1-21). SAGE Publications, Inc, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071878774>
- Mayne, J. (2004). Reporting on outcomes: Setting performance expectations and telling performance stories, *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 19(1), 31-60.
- McMurtry, S., & Hudson, W.W. (2000) The Client Satisfaction Inventory: Results of an initial validation study. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 10, 644- 663.
- Perneger, T.V. (2004). Why we need ethical oversight of quality improvement projects. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 16(5), 343-344.
- Poon, B., Wing-sea Leung, J., Louie, A., & Vergel de Dios, C. (2013). The key functions of collaborative logic modeling: Insights from the British Columbia early childhood dental programs. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 27(2), 87–102.
- Rey, L., Brouselle, A., & Dedobbeleer, N. (2012). Logic Analysis: Testing program theory to better evaluate complex interventions. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 26(3), 61-89.
- Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., Padgett, D.K., Logan, T.K. (2006). *Program Evaluation: An Introduction* (4th Ed). Belmont, California: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Savaya, R., & Waysman, M. (2008). The logic model: A tool for incorporating theory in development and evaluation of programs. *Administration in Social Work*, 29(2), 85-103.
- Sharp, A., & Eddy, C. (2001). Softly, softly catch the monkey: Innovative approaches to measure socially sensitive and complex issues in evaluation research. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 16(2), 87-99.
- Sieppert, J.D. (2005). Evaluation in Canada's social services: Progress, rifts, and challenges. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 20(3), 101-121.
- Taylor-Ritzler, T., Suarez-Balcazar, Y., Garcia-Iriarte, E., Henry, D.B. & Balcazar, F.E. (2013). Understanding and measuring evaluation capacity: A model and instrument validation study. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 34(2), 190-206.

- Taut, S., & Alkin, M. (2003). Program staff perceptions of barriers to evaluation implementation. *American Journal of Evaluation, 24*(2), 213-226.
- Trochim, W., Marcus, S.E., Masse, L.C., Moser, R.P., & Weld, P.C. (2008). The evaluation of large research initiatives: A participatory integrative mixed-methods approach. *American Journal of Evaluation, 29*(1), 8-28.
- Trocmé, N., MacLaurin, B., Fallon, B., Shlonsky, A., Mulcahy, M., Esposito, T. (2009). National Child Welfare Outcomes Indicator Matrix (NOM). Montreal, QC: McGill University: Centre for Research on Children and Families.
- Tucker, J. & Roth, D. (2006). Extending the evidence hierarchy to enhance evidence based practice for substance use disorders. *Addiction, 101*(7), 918-932.
- Wade, K., & Neuman, K. (2007). Practice-Based Research: Changing the professional culture and language of social work. *Social Work in Health Care, 44*(4), 49 – 64.
- Wholey, J.S., Hatry, H.P., & Newcomer, K.E. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wodarski, J.S. (2012). *Research methods for evidence-based practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- World Health Organization. (2003). *Quality improvement for mental health* WHO. Retrieved from: http://www.who.int/mental_health/resources/en/Quality.pdf

School of Social Work Policies 2025 - 2026

School of Social Work Attendance Policy

The Bachelor and Master of Social Work programs are intensive professional preparation programs that emphasize both academic and professional integrity. Regular attendance is not only essential for student success but is also a requirement set by the Canadian Association of Social Work Education (CASWE) for program accreditation and by the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (OCSWSSW) as part of professional expectations. A key aspect of this integrity is active engagement in all classes, integration seminars, and practicum activities. We recognize that students may encounter challenges that affect their ability to attend, and we are committed to working collaboratively to support student success while upholding professional expectations.

Attendance Expectations

1. Regular attendance is expected in all BSW and MSW professional Social Work courses. Each class provides essential learning experiences that cannot always be replicated outside the classroom. Engaging fully in coursework supports both individual learning and the integrity of the social work profession.
2. No more than two unapproved absences per class, per semester (approximately 20% of any one class)
3. If a student is facing barriers to attendance, we encourage early communication with instructors and the School of Social Work support staff to explore potential solutions.
4. If a student is experiencing ongoing difficulties attending class, they will be required to meet with the Coordinator of Academics and Development to discuss available supports and strategies (Please see Student in Difficulty Policy).
5. Instructors require regular attendance as part of course participation. In cases where attendance is inconsistent, students may be asked to engage in additional learning activities to ensure they meet course requirements. Instructors have the discretion to determine if and how alternative learning activities may substitute for missed coursework.
6. Absenteeism (more than two unapproved absences) may result in failure of the course and provides grounds for requiring a social work student to withdraw from the program. Please note: regularly arriving late and/or leaving early will be considered absenteeism, unless an accommodation is in place.

Absences from Practicum: Students should refer to the relevant Professional Practicum Education Policies and Guidelines Manual for policies about attendance at placement.

Absences Due to Illness, Injury, Bereavement, or Other Compassionate Circumstances

We understand that unexpected situations may arise. If you are absent due to illness, injury, bereavement, religious observance, or other compassionate circumstances, you will not be penalized. However, you remain responsible for any missed coursework and should communicate with your instructor as soon as possible to discuss how to stay on track.

Student Responsibilities:

- **If you miss a single class (or more than one class in a single week)**, inform your instructor(s) at the earliest opportunity. You will not be penalized, but you are responsible for making up any missed content.
- **If you are going to miss an assignment deadline, test, or exam**, contact the **Coordinator of Academics and Development** and provide documentation to support the absence. The Coordinator will work with you and your instructors to arrange accommodations.
- **Upon your return**, speak with your instructor(s) to clarify expectations for catching up on missed coursework.

Instructor Responsibilities:

- Students will not be penalized for absences due to illness, bereavement, religious observance, or other compassionate reasons.
- Instructors will provide reasonable alternatives to help students meet academic requirements while maintaining fairness and consistency across the course.

For more details, refer to Western University's **Absence Due to Illness Policy**: [Western University Absence Policy](#).

Absences for Religious Observance

King's University College and Western University are committed to valuing religious diversity. Students observing religious holidays that require absence should provide written notice to their instructor and the Coordinator of Academics and Development at least two weeks in advance.

Instructors will ensure students are provided with fair and reasonable alternatives to meet academic expectations.

For a list of approved religious observance dates, visit: [Accommodation for Religious Observance](#).

Unapproved Absences

Absences that are not related to illness, injury, bereavement, compassionate grounds, or religious observance are considered unapproved. Students may have up to two unapproved absences per course without penalty.

Process for Unapproved Absences

- **Single unapproved absence:** If you miss a class, notify your instructor as soon as possible. While you will not be penalized, you are responsible for catching up on missed content.
- **Three or more unapproved absences:** Missing three classes in a single course (30% of a course) will trigger the **Student in Difficulty Policy**. You will be required to meet with the Coordinator of Academics and Development to discuss your absences and explore available supports to help you succeed.
 - If you miss more than 30% of a course, you may be placed on academic probation and could face further actions under University Senate Regulations, which may include failing the course or being required to withdraw from the program.

If you are unsure whether an absence qualifies as approved or unapproved, we encourage you to reach out to your instructors or the Coordinator of Academics and Development for clarification.

Make-Up Work

If a student misses classes, instructors may assign make-up work to ensure that learning outcomes are met. While this work may not always be identical to what was completed in class, it is designed to provide meaningful learning opportunities.

Supporting Student Success

We recognize that students may face challenges in balancing their academic and personal responsibilities. Our goal is to work together to find solutions that support your learning and overall well-being while maintaining the integrity of the social work profession. If you are struggling with attendance or other academic concerns, please reach out to your instructors or the Coordinator of Academics and Development for support.

For additional guidance or clarification, please contact the School of Social Work.

School Council 03/25

Grade Adjustment for Late Assignments

Students should negotiate any extension requests (whether an accommodation is applicable or not) in writing with the Instructor prior to the assigned due date.

Failure to meet deadlines without prior permission of the Instructor will result in a reduction of marks. **Marks for papers/assignments received after the due date will be reduced by 2% per day** (including weekends) to a maximum of 5 days, after which time the assignment will not be accepted. Should the Student be granted an extension (based on a negotiated accommodation or extension request), they are expected to submit their paper/assignment by the negotiated due date, and are not subject to the provisions outlined in the Grade Adjustment

for Late Assignments policy. The Instructor has the authority to refuse to grade a paper/assignment submitted past the negotiated due date (for which the Student has not negotiated a new due date based on extenuating circumstances).

School Council 04/18

CODES OF CONDUCT

MSW students are expected to comply with the Code of Ethics set out by the Canadian Association of Social Workers (CASW) and the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (OCSWSSW) both in the academic environment and practicum settings. Students must also adhere to the university codes of conduct:

[Code of Ethics of the Canadian Association of Social Workers](#)

[OCSWSSW Code of Ethics](#)

[Western Code of Student Conduct](#)

[King's Code of Student Conduct](#)

[King's Harassment and Discrimination Policy](#)

Review for Professional Conduct in the School of Social Work

Preamble:

The Educational Policies and Accreditation Standards for Canadian Social Work Education approved by the Canadian Association for Social Work Education (CASWE) Board of Directors (2021) stipulates that Schools of Social Work have policies relevant to the unique professional and educational requirements of professional social work programs to augment those policies of the broader university (section 1.3). In particular, 1.3.2 references the need for policies and procedures related to student codes of conduct. Also, section 3.3 outlines core learning objectives for students, which include the need to develop an appropriate professional identity and develop appropriate values and ethics in professional practice.

1. General standards of student conduct are defined by the King's University College Code of Student Conduct. The following policy pertains to professional conduct and applies to any social work course or related learning environment including Practicum. It is an attempt to balance the commitment of the School of Social Work to support and assist students in becoming professional social workers, with the need to protect the safety and well-being of all students, staff, professional officers, and faculty as well as vulnerable individuals, families, groups and communities. Thus, the School of Social Work holds an expectation that its students will adhere

to recognized ethical obligations and professional standards such as the Social Work Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice adopted by the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers, and that the School has an obligation to take action when a student acts in an unethical or unprofessional manner. The purpose of this policy is to provide examples of conduct that may require a review and to provide guidelines for a process of review. The School of Social Work will undertake to resolve any concerns in a fair, timely, reasonable and effective manner.

2. The major values and principles as included in the Social Work Code of Ethics that guide professional social work practice are:

- Empathy and concern for clients
- Respect for individual worth and dignity
- Human capacity for growth and change
- Self-determination
- Honesty and integrity
- Confidentiality
- Social and individual responsibility
- Social justice, human rights and equality

3. It is important that students review and become familiar with the Canadian Association of Social Workers' Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Ethical Practice; the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers' Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice; and relevant School, College, University and in the case of Practicum, agency policies, regulations and procedures, including:

- King's University College Code of Student Conduct
- King's University College Harassment and Discrimination Policy
- The School of Social Work Field Education Policies and Guidelines Manual
- The School of Social Work Policy on Extension of Placement
- Western University Academic Policies/Regulations
- Western University Senate Policy on Off-Campus Placements
- Western University Guide for Students in Professional Program Placements, Clinics, Practica

4. Limits of Confidentiality:

The School of Social Work recognizes that the safety and confidentiality of students, clients, or others who have been subject to unprofessional conduct under this Policy must be an important priority. The School of Social Work must balance the need for confidentiality against its duty to protect present and future students or persons who might otherwise be placed in jeopardy by a student who is acting in an unprofessional or unethical manner under this Policy. Information disclosed during meetings with instructors, program coordinators, the Field Education Team, or the Director will not be kept confidential if the information raises concerns about the student's

capability of assuming the professional responsibilities of social work practice. Instructors and/or program coordinators and/or the Director will share pertinent information with each other in a respectful and professional manner, for the purpose of identifying student issues and enhancing problem solving about the concerns. The School of Social Work reserves the right to share information with the University or third parties as required by law and University regulations.

5. Behaviour That May Result in a Review

Student reviews can occur under any of the following circumstances:

5.1 Serious or persistent behaviour that would constitute a breach of the professional codes of ethical conduct and standards of practice mentioned above, were the student a practicing social worker.

5.2 Behaviour that causes individuals in the School of Social Work to have a serious or persistent concern about the harmful effect of the student's behaviour on the learning environment that would constitute a breach of the Harassment and Discrimination Policy and the Code of Student Conduct at King's University College. Reasons for the serious or persistent concern may include but are not limited to the following: speech or behaviour that contravenes the Ontario Human Rights Code (e.g. discrimination or harassment because of race, creed, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, sex, sexual orientation, age, record of offences, marital status, same sex partnership status, family status or disability); sexual harassment, including unwelcome conduct or gestures; any threat or attempt to physically harm another person; and intimidation or threats to harm another person in non-physical ways.

5.3 Behaviour that results in offenses involving property, including misappropriation, damage, unauthorized possession, defacement and/or destruction of premises or property of the College or the property of others.

5.4 Behaviour that results in illegal use, possession, or distribution of a controlled or restricted substance, or possession, use, or storing of dangerous objects (including unlicensed firearms).

In situations where the jurisdiction is unclear, the Dean of Students and/or the Vice-Principal and Academic Dean may be involved.

6. Three Stages of Review:

Three stages of review can occur in the School of Social Work regarding behaviour that is not consistent with the recognized ethics and standards of the profession of the social work. The stage of review is dependent upon the seriousness of the allegation of the breach of this Policy. The overall commitment of the School of Social Work is to resolve any concern related to professional conduct of a student, at Stage One or Stage Two through a mediation approach

with the student.

6.1 Stage One:

6.1.1 A Stage One review involves a classroom instructor and a student. When a classroom instructor has concerns about a student's behaviour as it relates to professional conduct, the instructor will:

- Discuss the concerns directly with the student and seek to work with the student to resolve the concern within a defined time frame;
- Document dates and contents of meetings with the student.

6.1.2 If the problem arises in the practicum, the Field Instructor will discuss the concerns directly with the student and Faculty Consultant, and follow the procedure outlined in the School's Field Education Policies and Guidelines Manual.

If the concerns are not resolved at Stage One, the individuals involved will proceed to Stage Two.

6.2 Stage Two:

6.2.1 If the concern is expressed by a classroom instructor and cannot be resolved at Stage One, a Stage Two review involves the instructor, the student and the Social Work Programs Liaison. Students may elect to have someone accompany them to the meeting, but must inform the instructor and Programs Liaison of the identity of the individual accompanying the student in advance of the meeting. If students elect to have someone accompany them, that individual should be referred to the Western University Office of the Ombudsperson document "[Support Person: Students Helping Students](#)".

6.2.3 Stage Two Review will include:

- Determination of the nature and specifics of the concern
- Development of a written plan (including time lines and specific actions) to address the concern. A copy of the written plan will be signed by and provided to all parties personally or by registered mail within ten (10) business days.
- A follow up meeting with all parties to determine if the concern has been resolved. If it is determined that further intervention is required a Stage Three Review will be conducted.

6.3 Stage Three:

6.3.1 Generally a Stage Three review is conducted when issues are considered by the School of Social Work to be of such a serious nature that formal intervention is required. A Stage Three review is most often conducted when concerns have not been resolved in Stages One and Two.

A Stage Three review always occurs when a student is being considered for withdrawal or discontinuance in the program or if a recommendation for suspension or expulsion from the University is being considered. Any decision is based on a simple majority vote of the Review Committee at Stage Three.

6.3.2 The Review Committee is comprised of the Director (chair), the Graduate Program Coordinator, and Coordinator of Field Education, or designate.

6.3.3 When a Stage Three review is called for and the Director determines that there are sufficient grounds to continue, he/she may temporarily withdraw the student from courses, as warranted. Within two weeks of being advised, the Director will convene an in-camera meeting of a review committee. The student has the right to express to the Director any perceived conflict of interest with any member of the review committee. Any individual who has participated in the Stage One and Two reviews will not be a voting member of the Stage Three review committee. The student (and an accompanying person if the student wishes) will be invited to attend the review committee meeting. The following individuals may also be invited to attend the meeting: the Social Work Programs Liaison, and any other persons deemed appropriate by the Director to gather further information, determine the nature of the problem and identify alternatives for resolution. Members of the review committee will be informed ahead of time of the identity of a person accompanying the student.

6.3.4 The student will be notified in writing of the specific concerns and meeting date with sufficient time to prepare for and attend the meeting. Should the student choose not to attend the review, the Committee will determine a decision in the student's absence.

6.3.5 The review committee will review any available information (facts) related to the concern(s), review any actions taken to date, hear the student's position related to the concern(s), permit the student to ask questions, and seek clarifications. Hearsay evidence (information) is to be avoided if at all possible. The review committee will control information flow and limit questions to issues of relevance. At the conclusion of the meeting, the review committee will determine a decision based on all information gathered. The Director of the School of Social Work will inform the student of the decision in writing within ten (10) days of the review committee's decision.

6.3.6 When the concern does not arise in the practicum, any faculty member of the School, or the Programs Liaison may advise the Director in writing of an alleged incident or series of incidents. Any incident related to a course or instructional activity will be reported to the Vice Principal and Academic Dean. Any incident that comes under the jurisdiction of the Code of Student Conduct will be reported to the Dean of Students immediately.

6.4 The review committee's decision may include one or more of the following:

6.4.1 Continue student in the program with no conditions;

6.4.2 Establish formal conditions for student's continuance in the program – (e.g., setting goals, actions, timelines, monitoring, mentoring and support, placing the student on probation for a period of time and monitoring the student during the probationary period, referring the student to counselling, requiring the student to temporarily withdraw from the program);

6.4.3 Consult with and/or refer to the King's University College Harassment Advisor (if a referral is made, the student must be notified).

6.4.4 Recommend withdrawal of student from the program and/or University

On rare occasions, it may be recommended that the student no longer continue in the social work program, be suspended, or be withdrawn from the University. The student will be counselled to voluntarily withdraw. If that does not occur, the student will be reported by the Director to the Vice Principal and Academic Dean, with a recommendation for suspension or withdrawal. Under the jurisdiction of the Student Code of Conduct, the student will be reported to the Dean of Students. The student will be provided with specific reasons for the recommendation. Any readmission will be subject to the regulations pertaining to "unsatisfactory performance" outlined by the Western Academic Calendar.

6.5 In any Stage Three review, there must be clear, concise documentation of concerns as well as verification that these concerns have been discussed with the student, and that attempts have been made to address the concerns where appropriate. Retention of information on the student's academic record will comply with the regulations outlined under "Offence Record" and "Release of Information Concerning Scholastic Offences" in the Western Academic Calendar.

7. Retention and Disposition of Documentation

Any documentation pertaining to any of the Stages of Review will be kept in the student's academic file, which is located in a locked cabinet in the office of the Social Work Programs Liaison. Documentation will be kept until such time as the student graduates from the social work program. If the student is asked to withdraw from or discontinue in the program, or is suspended or expelled from the University, the documentation will be retained in the file in perpetuity.

8. Access to Student File

Only those parties who are involved in the review process, the current Director of the School of Social Work, the Coordinator of Field Education and the Programs Liaison shall have access to the files.

9. Appeals

Any decision made by the Stage Three review committee or the Director can be appealed to the Vice Principal and Academic Dean, King's University College and the King's University College Discipline Committee.

Practicum Committee 10/06
Faculty Committee 10/06
School Council 10/06
Revised School Council 10/19

School of Social Work Course Policy

Students are expected to complete all required evaluation components, by the dates indicated in the course syllabus, successfully pass this course and progress in the program. Students must achieve a cumulative average of 60%+ on all individual assignments, before late penalties, to pass the course and meet progression requirements. A student who fails to submit all the required assignments (including tests and exams if applicable), by the agreed upon timeline, will not meet progression requirements of the program. In courses where group work and individual assignments are part of the evaluation components, students must earn a passing mark on their individual work (case write-ups, essays, reports, and/or class contribution) to pass the course and meet progression. If you receive a failing mark on your individual work and a passing grade on the group presentation/report, you will not meet progression requirements.

Students with course conflicts and approved inter-university athletic conflicts, or students unable to hand in a summary or participate in the report based on medical or compassionate grounds, may appeal for an extension, or for concessions to the above policy. Requests for accommodations based on medical or compassionate grounds must always be accompanied by appropriate documentation – either with the request, or as soon as possible after the fact and be made through the Social Work Programs Liaison and/or the student's Accessibility Counselor. Students who have any problems that may hinder their academic performance are encouraged to discuss these issues with their professor and/or the Social Work Programs Liaison before the assignments are due.

School Council January 2024



General Course Policies 2025–2026

1. Academic Accommodations, Consideration for Absences

Academic Accommodation (Accessibility)

Accessibility Services works to ensure that academic programs are accessible to all students, and supports students who may have a condition related to, but not limited to, vision, hearing, mobility, different ways of learning, mental health, chronic illnesses, chronic pain, autism spectrum disorder, ADD/ADHD, and temporary conditions (beyond short-term academic consideration). Accessibility Services provides recommendations for accommodation based on medical documentation or psychological and cognitive assessment. The accommodation policy can be found here [Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities](#). Information on Accessibility Services at King's can be found [here](#).

Academic Consideration for Student Absence

If a student is unable to meet a course requirement due to substantial but temporary extenuating circumstances (medical or compassionate), they should follow the procedures below.

In some cases, where instructors have built flexibility into their assessments, this flexibility will already address consideration needs.

Requests for academic consideration should be directed to the Academic Advising Office of your faculty/college of registration. Requests must be made as soon as possible and no later than 48 hours after the missed assessment.

As a rule, documentation is required for academic consideration. For academic consideration requests on medical grounds, the Student Medical Certificate is available at https://www.kings.uwo.ca/kings/assets/File/currentStudents/courses_enrollment/exams_and_tests/SMC-Feb-2025.pdf.

Students are permitted one academic consideration request without supporting documentation per term per course.

Instructors may designate one assessment per half-course weight as requiring formal supporting documentation. Please refer to the course outline for each course.

For further information, please see:

https://uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/academic_consideration_Sep24.pdf

Absences from Final Examinations

If you miss the Final Exam, contact the Academic Advising Office of your faculty/college of registration as soon as you are able to do so. They will assess your eligibility to write the Special Examination (the name given by the University to a makeup Final Exam).

You may also be eligible to write the Special Exam if you are in a “Multiple Exam Situation” (e.g., more than 2 exams in 23-hour period, or more than 3 exams in a 47-hour period).

If a student fails to write a scheduled Special Examination, the date of the next Special Examination (if granted) normally will be the scheduled date for the final exam the next time this course is offered. The maximum course load for that term will be reduced by the credit of the course(s) for which the final examination has been deferred. See the Academic Calendar for details (under [Special Examinations](#)).

Religious Accommodation

Students should consult the University's list of recognized religious holidays, and should give notice in writing to the instructor and Academic Advising Office if a course requirement will be affected by a religious holiday/observance. Notice must be given as early as possible, and no later than two weeks prior to an examination, and one week prior to a midterm test date. It is the responsibility of such students to inform themselves concerning the work done in classes from which they are absent and to take appropriate action.

2. Support Services

Accessibility, Counselling and Student Development at King's University College:

<https://www.kings.uwo.ca/current-students/student-services/>

Students experiencing emotional or mental health distress can access services at King's University College: <http://www.kings.uwo.ca/current-students/campus-services/student-support-services/personal-counselling/>

Good2talk is a good online and phone 24/7 resource for students and is available in English, Mandarin, and French: <https://good2talk.ca>, 1-866-925-5454

MentalHealth@Western provides a complete list of options about how to obtain help:

https://www.uwo.ca/health/mental_wellbeing/

Academic Support Services at King's University College:

<https://www.kings.uwo.ca/current-students/academic-resources/>

GBSV Support:

King's is committed to reducing incidents of gender-based and sexual violence and providing compassionate support to anyone who has gone through these traumatic events. If you have experienced sexual or gender-based violence (either recently or in the past), you will find

information about support services for survivors, including emergency contacts at:
<https://www.kings.uwo.ca/about-kings/safe-campus/gender-and-sexual-violence/>

You can reach someone supports at Kings by emailing Care@kings.uwo.ca or calling 519-930-4640 to reach a social worker who can offer help.

You can also reach Western's Gender-Based Violence & Survivor Support Case Manager by [email](#) or by calling 519-661-3568.

Further supports can be found on this website: <https://www.kings.uwo.ca/about-kings/safe-campus/gender-and-sexual-violence/>

See also https://www.uwo.ca/health/student_support/survivor_support/get-help.html

University Students' Council offers many valuable support services for students, including the health insurance plan: <http://westernusc.ca/services/>

3. Statement on Use of Electronic Devices

Use of Electronic Devices: Unless explicitly stated otherwise, you are not allowed to have a cell phone, or any other electronic device, with you during tests or examinations. Unauthorized possession of such a device during a test or examination constitutes an academic offence.

Use of Laptops, Tablets, and Smartphones in the Classroom: King's University College at Western University acknowledges the integration of new technologies and learning methods into the curriculum. The use of electronic devices such as laptop computers, tablets, or smartphones can contribute to student engagement and effective learning. At the same time, King's recognizes that instructors and students share jointly the responsibility to establish and maintain a respectful classroom environment conducive to learning.

The use of electronic devices by students during lectures, seminars, labs, etc., shall be for matters related to the course at hand only. Students found to be using electronic devices for purposes not directly related to the class may be subject to sanctions under the Student Code of Conduct; see <https://www.kings.uwo.ca/current-students/student-affairs/code-of-student-conduct1/>

Inappropriate use of electronics (e.g., laptops, tablets, smartphones) during lectures, seminars, labs, etc., creates a significant disruption. As a consequence, instructors may choose to limit the use of electronic devices in these settings. In addition, in order to provide a safe classroom environment, students attending in-person class sessions are strongly advised to operate laptops with batteries rather than power cords.

4. Statement on Academic Offences

King's is committed to academic integrity. Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, is posted at http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_undergrad.pdf

It is expected that students will submit work that is truly their own, completed without external assistance (human or artificial) except as explicitly permitted by the course instructor. Check with your instructor on what tools, including generative AI (ChatGPT, translation tools, grammar-checking tools) are permitted in the course. Because a tool is permitted in one course, that does not mean it is permitted in other courses.

All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system; see <https://elearningtoolkit.uwo.ca/tools/Originality Reports - TurnItIn.html>.

Computer-marked multiple-choice tests and/or exams may be subject to submission for similarity review by software that will check for unusual coincidences in answer patterns that may indicate cheating.

5. Copyright of Course Material

Lectures and course materials, including PowerPoint presentations, tests, outlines, and similar materials are protected by copyright. Faculty members are the exclusive owner of copyright in those materials they create. Students may take notes and make copies for their own use. Students may not allow others to reproduce or distribute lecture notes and course materials publicly (whether or not a fee is charged) without the express written consent of a faculty member. Unauthorized sharing of class content is subject to academic discipline.

Similarly, students own copyright in their own original papers and exam essays. If a faculty member wishes to post a student's answers or papers on the course website, they should ask for the student's written permission.

6. Use of Recordings

Participants in this course are not permitted to record the sessions, except where recording is an approved accommodation and/or the participant has the prior written permission of the instructor. Unauthorized recording and/or sharing of class content is subject to academic discipline.

7. Policy on Attendance

Any student who, in the opinion of the instructor, is absent too frequently from class or laboratory periods in any course, will be reported to the Dean of the Faculty offering the course, after due warning has been given. On the recommendation of the department concerned, and with the permission of the Dean of that Faculty, the student will be debarred from taking the regular examination in the course.