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Framework for Accreditation

The Commission on Accreditation (COA) of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) is recognized by the Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) to accredit baccalaureate and master’s degree programs in the United States and its territories.

The professional judgments of the COA are based on the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) developed by the Commission on Educational Policy (COEP) and the Commission on Accreditation (COA).
Framework for Accreditation

Accreditation is a system for recognizing educational institutions and professional programs affiliated with those institutions as having a level of performance, integrity, and quality that entitles them to the confidence of the educational community and the public they serve.

The purposes of accreditation are:

• quality assurance;
• academic improvement; and
• public accountability
Framework for Accreditation

EPAS Development Process

• COA and COEP are responsible for revising the EPAS at periodic intervals not to exceed 7 years

• Requirement by CHEA (CSWE’s recognizer)

• 2015 EPAS involved a 5-year process with 3 drafts issued for public review and comment

• Next set of EPAS will be released in 2022
  o Current progress: environmental scan, drafting, and feedback from programs, members, and the public
Approval to Start the Process

IMPORTANT STEP: Approvals Required in Advance of Application Submission to CSWE’s Accreditation Department

State higher education and regional accreditation approvals must be obtained prior to submitting application. Such approvals, along with internal program, institutional, or board approvals, can take anywhere from 6-months to 1-year or more dependent upon each process and the materials required for approval. Plan accordingly as the Accreditation Department cannot moved forward the application without documented approvals at the state- and regional-levels.
Starting the Process

• Submit *Letter of Institutional Intent, Candidacy Eligibility Fee, and Candidacy Eligibility Application* form with supporting materials.

• Approved by director of the Department of Social Work Accreditation (DOSWA) and assigned to accreditation specialist.

• *Draft Benchmark I* document submitted to accreditation specialist.

• Specialist reviews and identifies any areas for further revision that program must make prior to approval. Specialist and program go back-and-forth until specialist approves document, placing program on agenda.

• The date of *Draft Benchmark I* approval determines the program’s agenda date (February, June, or October).

• Approval of *Draft Benchmark I* formally places program on agenda for first commissioner visit.

• Review Candidacy Timetables for submission dates and guidelines.
Candidacy Eligibility Application

• Six Eligibility Standards (Two more will be at Initial Accreditation Stage)
  • Provide response plus supplemental documentation for each standard
• Signed by both social work program director and president/chancellor/designee

• **Eligibility Standard 1**
  • The review of the social work program by the Commission on Accreditation (COA) is authorized by the chief executive officer of the institution.

• **Eligibility Standard 2**
  • The program is located in an educational institution recognized by a regional accrediting body approved by the Commission on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).

• **Eligibility Standard 3**
  • The institution must be legally organized and authorized to operate as a postsecondary educational institution under the laws of the relevant state. The program has been approved by the appropriate higher education authority.
Candidacy Eligibility Application (continued)

• **Eligibility Standard 4**
  • The institution has a written affirmative action policy, plan or program, and procedures, and a policy against discrimination based on race, color, religion, creed, gender, ethnic or national origin, disability, or age and documented ADA compliance.

• **Eligibility Standard 5**
  • Identify program director with demonstrated leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in the field of social work.
  • Director must possess a master’s social work degree from a CSWE-accredited program.
  • It is preferred, but not required that director also possess a doctoral degree.

• **Eligibility Standard 6**
  • The institution documents sufficient and firm institutional supports to create, build, and maintain the social work program. Include faculty, staff, budget, and other resources necessary to build and maintain the program.
Letter of Institutional Intent

• Narrative that provides clear, complete, and sufficient information regarding the program and institution’s intent to start a social work program, which includes the following:
  • A discussion of the institution’s mission and the relationship of the social work program to that mission.
  • An analysis of the relationship of the proposed program to the institution’s strategic or long-range plan.
  • A discussion of the costs (including a projected budget) of the program and the benefits or advantages that the institution expects to receive relative to these costs.
  • Preliminary ideas about the mission and goals of the social work program.
  • A summary of the program’s initial development activities.
Program Structure for Master’s Programs

• Master’s programs should be designed to be completed by full-time students in 2 years. It is permissible for individual students to take longer than 2 years, as long as the program is structured to be completed in 2 years.

• May elect to develop a part-time program, which should be designed to be completed within 4 years. It is permissible for individual students to take longer than 4 years, as long as the program is structured to be completed within 4 years.
Length of Candidacy Process

• Completing the Candidacy process is a 3-1/2-year incremental process that concludes with Initial Accreditation (full accreditation)

• The Candidacy process is focused on the Benchmark Model of Program Development which leads to Initial Accreditation, which is granted for four years

• You will remain on the same EPAS for duration of Candidacy process (including progress reports if you receive Initial with a PR)

• Four years after Initial Accreditation, a program is reviewed for reaccreditation (referred to as Reaffirmation)

• After the first reaffirmation, programs will be reviewed every eight years
Stages of Program Development

• By the time a program is reviewed by the COA for Initial Accreditation, the self-study will be completed; at least one class graduated; and assessment data collected from program graduates.
• Only students admitted during the academic year in which the program is granted Candidacy will be recognized as having graduated from an accredited program.
• Faculty Requirements
  • 2 full-time for baccalaureate
  • Master’s-3 at BM I; 5 at BM II; 6 at BM III.
  • Faculty must be appointed full-time to social work
Reporting on Faculty

Include all full- and part-time faculty
Include a faculty data form for each faculty member
Add up percentage of time assigned column and use that sum for the ratio
For cross-listed or part-time faculty, in the percent assigned column, use the percent of a full-time (teaching-only) workload they teach
  • E.g.: If 10 courses per year is full-time, each course counts as .1FTE
  • If you have both BSW & MSW programs, divide the FTE between the two columns, being sure not to double-count time (Both columns combined should add up to 1 FTE)
COA Agenda

• Once your program is on the February, June or October agenda, the program remains on that agenda throughout the Candidacy process and into the Reaffirmation process.

• If your program is deferred by the COA at any point in the process due to concerns or insufficient information, you will remain on your original agenda date as long as concerns are addressed sufficiently and promptly.

• Your program is also permitted to request additional time at any point in the process, moving it to a later agenda.
  • If your program requests additional time at any point in the process, that will permanently move it to a later agenda.
Program Options

• Programs must specify their program options while in Pre-Candidacy
  • Program options are all locations and delivery methods
  • Once Candidacy has been granted at the end of the year of Pre-Candidacy, programs cannot add new program options
  • Once Initial Accreditation is granted, programs can add program options through substantive change process

• Narrative response for each standard must address all program options
  • With a statement that the narrative applies to all program options; or
  • With a description of how each program options complies with the standard

• All program options are accredited as part of one single program
  • If one program option is out-of-compliance, that affects the compliance of the entire program
Making Changes While in Candidacy

• Permitted to make changes and updates to policies, procedures, and curriculum at any point in the Candidacy process, as long as they remain compliant with the standards.

• Expected to continuously update evolving standards, such as faculty, budget, etc.

• All standards are reviewed at the Initial Accreditation stage, so you should be mindful of how program changes impact standards that have already been approved.

• Provide personnel updates to accreditation specialist as they occur.
  • Primary Contact, Program Director, Field Director, and President are kept on file with CSWE.
Role of Accreditation Specialist

- Until a specialist is assigned, the program works with Accreditation Director.
- Once a program submits its application to the director, it will be assigned an accreditation specialist.
- Specialists provide customized consultations via phone, video, in-person, at APM, at BPD, etc.
- If an institution has both baccalaureate and master’s programs, they will both be assigned to the same specialist.
- Specialists are responsible for writing all letters to programs, working directly with a group of commissioners.
- Specialists are not decision-makers, but are responsible for disseminating COA decisions and interpretations to programs and are your best resource for interpretation of standards throughout the accreditation process.

When it doubt, ask your specialist!
Candidacy Timetables

- The timetables are organized around COA meeting dates (February, June, October).
- Chronological list of Candidacy materials and actions,
- The deadline for each item
- To whom materials should be submitted
- Your program is not placed on a COA agenda (scheduled for review at the February, June or October COA meeting), until the program’s Benchmark I document has been approved by the program’s accreditation specialist
- Once the document is approved, a commissioner visitor will be assigned
# Major Candidacy Due Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidacy Eligibility Documents</th>
<th>Draft Benchmark I (BM 1) to CSWE</th>
<th>Commissioner Site Visit Dates (3 are scheduled)</th>
<th>Commission on Accreditation (COA) Review Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Jan 31, 2020**               | Due to CSWE specialist no later than Feb 28, 2020 | • Visit 1: Sept 1-Nov 15, 2020  
• Visit 2: Sept 1-Nov 15, 2021  
• Visit 3: Sept 1-Nov 15, 2022 | • Candidacy Status Review-Feb 2021  
• 2nd Yr Candidacy Review-Feb 2022  
• Initial Accreditation-Feb 2023 |
| **Accreditation will apply to students beginning Fall 2020 and beyond.** | Approval by CSWE specialist by May 1, 2020 | E-mail final copy of BM1 to commissioner one month prior to CV visit. | |
| **Mar 31, 2020**               | Due to CSWE specialist no later than April 30, 2020 | • Visit 1: Dec 1, 2020-Feb 28, 2021  
• Visit 2: Dec 1, 2021-Feb 29, 2022  
• Visit 3: Dec 1, 2022-Feb 28, 2023 | • Candidacy Status Review-June 2021  
• 2nd Yr Candidacy Review-June 2022  
• Initial Accreditation-June 2023 |
| **Accreditation will apply to students beginning Fall 2020 and beyond.** | Approval by CSWE specialist by July 1, 2020 | E-mail final copy of BM1 to commissioner one month prior to CV visit. | |
| **May 31, 2020**               | Due to CSWE specialist no later than July 31, 2020 | • Visit 1: March 1-May 31, 2021  
• Visit 2: March 1-May 31, 2022  
• Visit 3: March 1-May 31, 2023 | • Candidacy Status Review-Oct 2021  
• 2nd Yr Candidacy Review-Oct 2022  
• Initial Accreditation-Oct 2023 |
| **Accreditation will apply to students beginning Fall 2021 and beyond.** | Approval by CSWE specialist by October 1, 2020 | E-mail final copy of BM1 to commissioner one month prior to CV visit. | |
Benchmark Model

- Three Benchmarks in the Candidacy process
- Incorporates all standards in the EPAS, but divided into thirds (1/3 at Compliance in BMI; 1/3 in BMII; 1/3 in BMIII)
- Later standards build on earlier standards, with multiple touchpoints for feedback and consultation in the process
- Important to have draft standards as final as possible at each stage to ensure the best quality of feedback from commissioner visitors and specialist
Benchmark Model (continued)

• Draft Benchmark I → review and consultation by specialist of all Benchmark I standards

• Benchmark I → full review of BMI standards for compliance by Commissioner visitor and consultation on all BMII standards in draft by commissioner visitor → Grant Candidacy

• Benchmark II → full review of BMII standards for compliance by Commissioner visitor and consultation on all BMIII standards in draft by commissioner visitor → Grant 2nd Year of Candidacy

• Benchmark II → full review of BMIII standards for compliance by commissioner visitor → Grant Initial Accreditation
Structure of Benchmark Documents

**Volume I**
- Standards for Compliance
- Standards for Draft – The commissioner consults with the program on how to develop this section for the next Benchmark document.
- Any tables, forms, supplemental documents, etc., should be incorporated into narrative

**Volume II**
- Draft syllabi for Benchmark
- Final/ revised syllabi for Benchmark II and Initial Accreditation Self-Study

**Volume III**
- Draft Student Handbook for Benchmark I
- Final Student Handbook and Draft Field Manual for Benchmark II
- Final Student Handbook and Final Field Manual for Initial Accreditation Self-Study
Document Submission

- Submit three volumes, plus *Benchmark I Review Brief, Benchmark II Review Brief*, or *Initial Accreditation Review Brief* as separate document
- Submit all documents electronically using formatting guidelines from CSWE’s website
- Email all documents to accreditation specialist
- Mail two USB copies of *Benchmark I, Benchmark II, and Initial Accreditation Self-Study* to accreditation specialist for research & archival purposes
- 2015 Educational Policies and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) describes four features of an integrated curriculum design:
  - AS1: Mission and Goals
  - AS2: Explicit Curriculum
  - AS3: Implicit Curriculum
  - AS4: Assessment
Effective June 10, 2019: The COA is paperless! Zero physical copies of accreditation documents are required. E-copies only will be accepted per the policy 1.2.11 Document Formatting & Submission in the EPAS Handbook.
Commission on Accreditation (COA)

- Commissioners are appointed for up to two consecutive three-year terms
- A diverse group of Commissioners is selected to represent a range of program levels, sizes, and structures
- Names and credentials of all commissioners are listed on our website
- Minimum of 5 years of teaching experience
- Experienced site visitors prior to serving on COA
- Faculty members at CSWE-accredited social work programs
- Current CSWE members
Role of Commission on Accreditation (COA)

• COA (Commission on Accreditation) and COEP (Commission on Educational Policy) develop a new EPAS every eight years with feedback from program members and constituents.
• COA has sole responsibility for determining whether a program complies with accreditation standards.
• Commissioner visitors will never serve as readers for the programs they previously visited as commissioner visitors.
• Commissioners treat benchmark materials as confidential in their discussions and decision-making.
Role of Commissioner Visitor

• Commissioners are responsible for visiting programs in Candidacy and serve as consultations to programs during those visits
• Each program receives a total of three different Commissioner visitors (one per year)
• The Commissioner visitor will review the compliance standards and identify any concerns in the Commissioner visit report
• The Commissioner visitor will review draft standards and provide consultation and feedback for further improvement
• The visitor identified concerns, but does not make a decision
  • The decision is only made by the readers, who review the full document, Commissioner visit report, and program response
Arranging Commissioner Visit

• Sheila Bell (Site Visit Coordinator) will notify you of assigned Commissioner visitor
• Once you receive visitor’s name, establish communication right away to agree upon a date
• Work with the visitor to schedule meetings with:
  • President, Chancellor, or Designee
  • Faculty
  • Students
  • Field instructors, field personnel, any other constituent groups
  • Closing interview with program director and anyone director chooses to invite
• Individuals can only meet with the visitor with the program director’s permission
• Program should pre-pay flight and hotel
• Program should reimburse group transportation to/from Commissioner visitor’s hotel, travel
day meals, appropriate incidentals
• Arrange ground transportation from hotel
  • Faculty pick-up is preferred, but ask visitor if they have other preferences
Arranging Commissioner Visit

- Commissioner visitor reviews first half of standards on review brief for compliance
- Commissioner visitor reviews second half of standards on review brief for recommendations for further review
  - Come prepared with questions and consultative topics to receive guidance and support on your draft standards, which will be reviewed for compliance in the coming year
- Commissioner visitor completes report using the review brief
  - Benchmark I Review Brief; Benchmark II Review Brief; or Initial Accreditation Review Brief
- Commissioner identifies concerns, but does not determine compliance
- Compliance is determined by the two Commissioner readers who review all materials
CSWE Accreditation Web Resources

• Accreditation Process
  • [https://www.cswe.org/Accreditations/Accreditation-Process](https://www.cswe.org/Accreditations/Accreditation-Process) (select Candidacy)
    • Preparation → formatting guidelines, Benchmark Grids, preparatory resources
    • Benchmark I/II/Initial → all required forms submitted at each stage
    • Timetables → timetables for the Candidacy process
    • Resources → sample format for curriculum matrices and assessment plan

• EPAS Handbook

• Candidacy Workshop (additional fee)
  • [https://cswe.org/Accreditations/Training.aspx](https://cswe.org/Accreditations/Training.aspx)
Statement for Programs in Candidacy to Post on their Web Sites

• [Program] has achieved Candidacy for Accreditation by the Council on Social Work Education’s Commission on Accreditation.

• Candidacy for a baccalaureate or master’s social work program by the Council on Social Work Education’s Commission on Accreditation indicates that it has made progress toward meeting criteria for the assessment of program quality evaluated through a peer review process. A program that has attained Candidacy has demonstrated a commitment to meeting the compliance standards set by the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards, but has not yet demonstrated full compliance.

• Students who enter programs that attain Candidacy in or before the academic year in which they begin their program of study will be retroactively recognized as having graduated from a CSWE-accredited program once the program attains Initial Accreditation. Candidacy is typically a three-year process and attaining Candidacy does not guarantee that a program will eventually attain Initial Accreditation. Candidacy applies to all program sites and program delivery methods of an accredited program. Accreditation provides reasonable assurance about the quality of the program and the competence of students graduating from the program.

• For more information about social work accreditation, you may contact Accreditation.
Statement for Programs in Pre-Candidacy to Post on their Web Sites

• [Program] is currently in Pre-Candidacy for Accreditation by the Council on Social Work Education’s Commission on Accreditation.

• Pre-Candidacy for a baccalaureate or master’s social work program by the Council on Social Work Education’s Commission on Accreditation indicates that it has submitted an application to be reviewed for Candidacy. A program that has attained Pre-Candidacy has not yet been reviewed by the Commission on Accreditation or been verified to be in compliance with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards. The Council on Social Work Education does not publicly disclose whether programs have currently attained Pre-Candidacy Status until they are granted Candidacy.

• Students who enter the program while it is still in Pre-Candidacy will not be recognized as attending a program in Candidacy unless the program attains Candidacy in the academic year in which those students enter. The Candidacy Process is typically a three-year process and there is no guarantee that a program in Pre-Candidacy will eventually attain Candidacy or Initial Accreditation. Students who enter programs that attain Candidacy in or before the academic year in which they begin their program of study will be retroactively recognized as having graduated from a CSWE-accredited program once the program attains Initial Accreditation. Candidacy by the Council on Social Work Education’s Commission on Accreditation applies to all program sites and program delivery methods of an accredited program. Accreditation provides reasonable assurance about the quality of the program and the competence of students graduating from the program.

• For more information about social work accreditation, you may contact Accreditation.
Competency-Based Education

• The nine Social Work Competencies are listed in the EPAS on pp. 7-9. Programs must use the competencies verbatim for generalist practice, but may add competencies that are consistent with their mission and goals and respond to their context.

• Holistic Competence - the demonstration of competence informed by 4 dimensions:
  • Knowledge
  • Values
  • Skills
  • Cognitive/Affective Processes

• The dimensions of each competency are represented (paragraph description)

• The dimensions are operationalized in field education by behaviors (bullet points)

See 2015 EPAS Glossary for more information.
Generalist Practice (Baccalaureate and Master’s programs)

• Uses the nine competencies as written in the 2015 EPAS.
• Competencies include a paragraph describing the dimensions of the competencies and behaviors that operationalize the competency through field education
• Programs can add additional competencies
  • Additional competencies should relate to your program’s specific mission or context, which is both covered in the curriculum and assessed for both generalist and specialized practice
Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior

Social workers understand the value base of the profession and its ethical standards, as well as relevant laws and regulations that may impact practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Social workers understand frameworks of ethical decision-making and how to apply principles of critical thinking to those frameworks in practice, research, and policy arenas. Social workers recognize personal values and the distinction between personal and professional values. They also understand how their personal experiences and affective reactions influence their professional judgment and behavior. Social workers understand the profession’s history, its mission, and the roles and responsibilities of the profession. Social Workers also understand the role of other professions when engaged in inter-professional teams. Social workers recognize the importance of life-long learning and are committed to continually updating their skills to ensure they are relevant and effective. Social workers also understand emerging forms of technology and the ethical use of technology in social work practice. Social workers:

- make ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision-making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context;
- use reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations;
- demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior; appearance; and oral, written, and electronic communication;
- use technology ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes; and
- use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Work Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Engage in Policy Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specialized Practice (Master’s Programs)

• “Extends and enhances” the nine social work competencies for each area of specialized practice.

• Programs must write a specialized paragraph and specialized behaviors for each competency that cover all four dimensions of that competency for specialized practice.

• Programs must use the competency names verbatim, but modify the paragraph and behavior.
  • Only exception is that names of competencies 6-9 can be modified to reflect only the systems levels that apply to the area of specialized practice.

• Programs may add additional competencies that are specific to the area of specialized practice as part of how they extend and enhance.
Sample Curriculum Matrix, part 1

Content in the curriculum matrix references where and how each competency is covered through the required curriculum.

This is not where it is assessed, but is where it is covered in the curriculum to ensure competence prior to assessment at some later point.

Programs must provide content related to all four dimensions of every competency.

This should be the best places where the competency is covered, rather than all places.

Programs are expected to provide syllabi for all courses in the curriculum matrix.
Sample Curriculum Matrix, part 1

APPENDIX A, part 2

Sample Generalist Practice Curriculum Matrix with 2015 EPAS Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Course Content</th>
<th>Dimension(s)</th>
<th>Page Number in Volume 2*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 6: Engage with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Optional column

- Programs are expected to identify content related to each of the five systems levels for competencies 6-9.
- This can be done through the displayed format or by adding a column to the table on the previous page for systems level that applies to competencies 6-9.
Multi-Dimensional Assessment (AS 4.0.1)

- At least two measures assess each competency.
  - One based on demonstration of the competency in real or simulated practice situations (incorporating behaviors).
  - Other measure(s) based on demonstration of competency, but does not need to incorporate behaviors or be based on real or simulated practice.

- Identify the dimension(s) addressed with each measure for each competency. At least two dimensions of each competency required.

- Baccalaureate programs must have a minimum of two measures for each competency at the generalist level.

- Master’s programs must have a minimum of two measures for each competency at both the generalist and specialized levels.
Sample Assessment Plan

**COMPETENCY BENCHMARK**

- Competency benchmark is minimum percent of students you expect to meet outcome-measure benchmarks

**OUTCOME-MEASURE BENCHMARK**

- Outcome-measure benchmark is minimum score students are aiming for

**PROGRAMS MUST**

- Programs must assess at least two dimensions of each competency between the 2 (or more) measures

**MEASURE**

- Measure based on real or simulated practice must incorporate bulleted behaviors
  - Most popular practice measure is field evaluation

For competencies 6-9, you don’t need to assess every systems level
Sample Assessment Plan (continued)

- Second measure (and optional additional measures) assessed at competency level
- All outcome measures must be based on a faculty member or field personnel assessing demonstration
- Possible outcome measures
  - Exit Exam
  - Capstone Project
  - Portfolio
  - Final Presentation
  - Course-Embedded Measures
- Each measure must include a rubric where students are given a separate score for each assessed competency
  - Either directly giving a score for attainment of the competency; or
  - Giving a score for items on the rubric related to the competency that are aggregated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</th>
<th>Competency Benchmark</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimension(s)</th>
<th>Assessment procedures</th>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Assessment Procedures: Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Measure 2: Exercise on Privilege (Course-embedded measure)</td>
<td>The Exercise on Privilege assignment asks students to apply an understanding of diversity in practice through managing the influence of their personal biases and experiences or work with clients.</td>
<td>Knowledge; Values; CJA Processes</td>
<td>For Measure 2: Aggregate student scores on rubric items 9-15 (Rubric provided on pp. XX-XX*).</td>
<td>*If rubrics are used they should be provided.</td>
<td>For Measure 2: Students must score a minimum of 8 out of 10 on rubric items (9-15).</td>
<td>Determine the percentage of students that attained the benchmark for each outcome measure. Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence. Determine whether this percentage is larger than the Competency Benchmark (see Appendix E).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar tables for each competency would follow. The accompanying narrative would describe the field instrument and course-embedded measure(s). For full details on the narrative accompanying this table, please see the compliance statement for AS 4.0.1 located in the Compliance, Concerns, and Noncompliance Statement-2015 EPAS.

#APM19
## APPENDIX E
### Results for Assessment of Practice Competencies

**WHAT ARE THE FINDINGS?**

**Accreditation Standard 4.0.2:** The program provides its most recent year of summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of the identified competencies, specifying the percentage of students achieving program benchmarks for each program option.

For this standard, provide the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Competency Benchmark</th>
<th>Outcome Measure Benchmark</th>
<th>Percent Attaining</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Achieving Competency</th>
<th>Competency Attained?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Students must score a minimum of 4 out of 5 points.</td>
<td>Measure 1*: Behavior 1: 92% Behavior 2: 91% Behavior 3: 86%</td>
<td>(92% + 91% + 86%) / 3 = 89.67%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 2: Students must score a minimum of 8 out of 10 points.</td>
<td>Measure 2: 78%</td>
<td>83.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying narrative would provide the reader with an explanation of how to understand the table and where the data came from. The narrative might refer to appendices with more detailed data, etc.

*Instruments capturing student learning outcomes for “real or simulated practice situations” will list the behaviors associated with that competency.

- Present a separate table of assessment outcomes for each program option to determine the percent of all students in that program option that demonstrate competence
  - Program options are locations and delivery methods
- Aggregate all program options in a separate table to determine the percent of all students that demonstrate competence
- Baccalaureate – generalist assessment
- Master’s – both generalist and specialized assessment
Implicit Curriculum Assessment (AS 4.0.5)

• EP 4.0: “Assessment also involves gathering data regarding the implicit curriculum, which may include but is not limited to an assessment of diversity, student development, faculty, administrative and governance structure, and resources. Data from assessment continuously inform and promote change in the explicit curriculum and the implicit curriculum to enhance attainment of Social Work Competencies.”

• Minimally one standard under AS3 is required to be assessed.

• Provide instrument(s), findings, and program changes tied to those findings

• Examples of implicit assessment methods could involve having students, faculty, alumni, field instructors, community members, or some other constituent group(s) assess the program
Candidacy Workshop

• 2015 EPAS Candidacy Training

• Next Workshop: Friday, February 21, 2020
  o Face-to-face session
  o Detailed review of policies, procedures, and Benchmark I standards and Draft Benchmark II standards

• Visit https://cswe.org/Accreditation/Training/Candidacy-Workshops to learn more and register
  • Limited spaces remaining
2022 EPAS Feedback Opportunities

• Feedback Session: Future Directions in Field Education 2022 EPAS and Beyond
  - Thursday, October 24th | 3:30-4:30PM | Plaza Building, Governor’s Square 15

• Feedback Session #1:
  - Friday, October 25th | 10:30-11:30AM | Plaza Building, Governor’s Square 12

• Feedback Session #2:
  - Saturday, October 26th | 1:45-2:45PM | Plaza Building, Governor’s Square 12

• Online survey open now through December 13, 2019
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation-related fees</td>
<td><a href="mailto:feesaccred@cswe.org">feesaccred@cswe.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership-related inquiries/Fees</td>
<td><a href="mailto:membership@cswe.org">membership@cswe.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaffirmation/Candidacy workshops</td>
<td><a href="mailto:accredworkshop@cswe.org">accredworkshop@cswe.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visitor procedures/Training</td>
<td>Sheila Bell <a href="mailto:sbell@cswe.org">sbell@cswe.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File a complaint/Request a waiver</td>
<td>Mary Kurfess <a href="mailto:mkurfess@cswe.org">mkurfess@cswe.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other accreditation-related questions; contact your program’s accreditation specialist!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Holster <a href="mailto:Aholster@cswe.org">Aholster@cswe.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Gibson-Ledl <a href="mailto:kgibson@cswe.org">kgibson@cswe.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Gentner <a href="mailto:mgentner@cswe.org">mgentner@cswe.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Benson <a href="mailto:kbenso@cswe.org">kbenso@cswe.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer L. Middleton, MSW <a href="mailto:smiddleton@cswe.org">smiddleton@cswe.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whom Do I Contact?
CSWE Accreditation Staff

Mary Kurfess, MSSW, LCSW-C
Director
mkurfess@cswe.org
703.519.2078

Anna R. Holster, MSW, MPhil
Accreditation Specialist
aholster@cswe.org
703.519.2044
https://annaholster.youcanbook.me

Katie “Kat” Gibson-Ledl, LLMSW-Macro
Accreditation Specialist
kgibson@cswe.org
703.519.2063
https://katgibson-ledl.youcanbook.me

Marilyn Gentner, LMSW, LICSW
Accreditation Specialist
mgentner@cswe.org
703.519.2040
https://mgentner.youcanbook.me

Katie Benson, MSW
Accreditation Specialist
kbenson@cswe.org
571.527.3483
https://katiebenson.youcanbook.me

Spencer L. Middleton, MSW
Accreditation Specialist
smiddleton@cswe.org
703.519.2052

Monica Wylie
Department Manager/
Assistant to the Director
mwylie@cswe.org
703.519.2073

Sheila Bell
Site Visit Coordinator
sbell@cswe.org
703.519.2042

Social Work
Education: Looking Back, Looking Forward
Questions, Concerns, Comments?

Thank you for attending the 2015 EPAS Candidacy Session!