



COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION



**PRE-CANDIDACY MONTHLY WORKSHOP WITH
ANNA HOLSTER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF ACCREDITATION
OPERATIONS & TECHNOLOGY**

TOPIC 4: APRIL 2022

ASSESSMENT

Megan Fujita
Executive Director

Kat Gibson-Ledl
Associate Director of
Accreditation Services

Stephanie McNally
Manager, Practice Doctorate &
Fellowship Accreditation

Monica Wylie
Department Office Manager &
Assistant to ED

Anna Holster
Associate Director of
Accreditation Operations &
Technology

Connie Adams
Accreditation Specialist

Katie Benson
Accreditation Specialist

Karen Chapman
Accreditation Specialist

Marilyn Gentner
Accreditation Specialist

Michael Leff
Accreditation Specialist

Alyson Durant
Volunteer Coordinator

Accreditation Volunteers
(Commissioners & Site Visitors)

Department of Social Work Accreditation (DOSWA)

Meet the accreditation team!

MAJOR CANDIDACY DUE DATES

(see Timetables for all due dates: <https://www.cswe.org/Accreditation/Accreditation-Process>)

| Candidacy Eligibility Application | Draft Benchmark I (BMI) to CSWE | Approval of Draft Benchmark I (BMI) by CSWE and Assignment to Agenda | Commissioner Site Visit Dates (3 are scheduled) | COA Review |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Submitted to Associate Director (ADOT) on rolling basis throughout the year. | Submitted to Associate Director (ADOT) At least 1 round of feedback before approval. Allow 2-4 weeks for feedback. | Draft BMI approved by Associate Director (ADOT), granting Pre-Candidacy status. Associate Director (ADOT) assigns program to Accreditation Specialist. First 10 Draft BMI documents approved by December 1, 2022, are placed on October 2023 Candidacy agenda. Subsequently approved programs placed on February 2024 agenda. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit 1: March 1-May 31, 2023 Visit 2: March 1-May 31, 2024 Visit 3: March 1-May 31, 2025 E-mail full BMI to commissioner and specialist one month prior to CV visit. Visit scheduled directly with visitor. Confirm visit date once scheduled at https://forms.office.com/r/FJNJEiZbAL | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidacy Status Review–Oct 2023 Year 2 Candidacy Review–Oct 2024 Initial Accreditation–Oct 2025 Covers students admitted to social work program in fall 2023 or later, regardless of graduation date. |
| Submitted to Associate Director (ADOT) of on rolling basis throughout the year. | Submitted to Associate Director (ADOT) At least 1 round of feedback before approval. Allow 2-4 weeks for feedback. | Draft BMI approved by Associate Director (ADOT), granting Pre-Candidacy status. Associate Director (ADOT) assigns program to Accreditation Specialist. First 10 Draft BMI documents approved by June 1, 2023, are placed on February 2024 Candidacy agenda. Subsequently approved programs placed on June 2024 agenda. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit 1: Sept 1-Nov 15, 2023 Visit 2: Sept 1-Nov 15, 2024 Visit 3: Sept 1-Nov 15, 2025 E-mail full BMI to commissioner and specialist one month prior to CV visit. Visit scheduled directly with visitor. Confirm visit date once scheduled at https://forms.office.com/r/FJNJEiZbAL | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidacy Status Review–Feb 2024 Year 2 Candidacy Review–Feb 2025 Initial Accreditation–Feb 2026 Covers students admitted to social work program in fall 2023 or later, regardless of graduation date. |
| Submitted to Associate Director (ADOT) on rolling basis throughout the year. | Submitted to Associate Director (ADOT) At least 1 round of feedback before approval. Allow 2-4 weeks for feedback. | Draft BMI approved by Associate Director (ADOT), granting Pre-Candidacy status. Associate Director (ADOT) assigns program to Accreditation Specialist. First 10 Draft BMI documents approved by September 1, 2023, are placed on June 2024 Candidacy agenda. Subsequently approved programs placed on October 2024 agenda. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit 1: Dec 1, 2023-Feb 28, 2024 Visit 2: Dec 1, 2024-Feb 29, 2025 Visit 3: Dec 1, 2025-Feb 28, 2026 E-mail full BMI to commissioner and specialist one month prior to CV visit. Visit scheduled directly with visitor. Confirm visit date once scheduled at https://forms.office.com/r/FJNJEiZbAL | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidacy Status Review–June 2024 Year 2 Candidacy Review–June 2025 Initial Accreditation–June 2026 Covers students admitted to social work program in fall 2023 or later, regardless of graduation date. |



Standards related to Assessment
***(Draft of all Assessment Standards due at
Benchmark I)***

2015 EPAS Assessment

Two (2) Types

Explicit curriculum: Constitutes the program's formal educational structure and includes the courses and field education used for each of its program options. (2015 EPAS, page 11)

Implicit curriculum: Refers to the **learning environment** in which the explicit curriculum is presented. It is composed of the following elements: the program's **commitment to diversity; admissions policies and procedures; advisement, retention, and termination policies; student participation in governance; faculty; administrative structure; and resources.** (2015 EPAS, page 14)

Selection of Assessment Measures

- ▶ It is within the purview of the program to select:
 - ▶ two (or more) measures which assess the explicit curriculum
 - ▶ one (or more) measure(s) which assess the implicit curriculum

Note: The COA does not endorse third-party, commercial, standardized, or customized assessment measures and packages. Although the COA does not prohibit the use of these commercial packages, it is the responsibility of programs to use assessment plans with assessment measures that are compliant with the 2015 EPAS.

Explicit Curriculum Assessment

Accreditation Standard 4.0.1; Approved at BMII

The program presents its plan for ongoing assessment of student outcomes for all identified competencies in the generalist level of practice (baccalaureate social work programs) and the generalist and specialized levels of practice (master's social work programs). Assessment of competence is done by program designated faculty or field personnel. The plan includes:

- A description of the assessment procedures that detail when, where, and how each competency is assessed for each program option.*
- At least two measures assess each competency. One of the assessment measures is based on demonstration of the competency in real or simulated practice situations.*
- An explanation of how the assessment plan measures multiple dimensions of each competency, as described in EP 4.0.*
- Benchmarks for each competency, a rationale for each benchmark, and a description of how it is determined that students' performance meets the benchmark.*
- An explanation of how the program determines the percentage of students achieving the benchmark.*
- Copies of all assessment measures used to assess all identified competencies.*

Purpose of Outcomes-Based Assessment

Assessment of student learning outcomes is an essential component of **competency-based education**. Assessment provides evidence that students have demonstrated the level of competence necessary to **enter professional practice**, which in turn shows programs are **successful in achieving their goals**.

Assessment information is used to guide student learning, assess student outcomes, assess and improve effectiveness of the curriculum, and strengthen the assessment methods used.

General Overview of AS 4.0.1

- The 2015 EPAS introduces the concept of multi-dimensional assessment of the competencies.
- *This standard explores:* **How competent are students on the basis of receiving your curriculum?**

General Overview of AS 4.0.1

- Assessment involves the systematic gathering of data about student performance and programmatic achievement of:
 - All nine (9) social work competencies (and any added by the program)
 - At the **generalist**, and for master's programs, **specialized practice** levels
 - A minimum of two (2) measures per competency. One (1) measure must be in real or simulated practice situations.
 - Assessment must be multi-dimensional (at least two (2) dimensions per competency); *Dimensions: Knowledge, Values, Skills, Cognitive and Affective Processes.*

Competency-Based Outcome Measures

- ▶ One measure must be in real or simulated practice (e.g., field measure)
- ▶ The measure based in real or simulated practice must incorporate the bulleted behaviors. Faculty or field personnel may score student competence at the behavior-level; or at the competency-level based on demonstration of all the behaviors.
- ▶ The second measure is not required to be in real or simulated practice (e.g., Exit Exam, Portfolio, Capstone Project, Seminar Assignment, Final Presentation, Competency-based Paper, Course-Embedded Measure, etc.)
- ▶ Measure(s) not based on real or simulated practice does not need to incorporate the behaviors; inclusion of the behaviors is optional.

Multi-Dimensional Assessment

- ▶ Each of the nine (9) social work competencies listed in the EPAS is followed by a paragraph that describes the competency.
- ▶ This description contains dimensions of the competency necessary for learning and developing competence throughout the course of the program.
- ▶ Programs are expected to assess competence by identifying the dimension(s) associated with each competency and measure students' performance at that level.

Multi-Dimensional Assessment

- ▶ At least two (2) dimensions of each competency are assessed (knowledge, values, skills, cognitive and affective processes)
 - *For example:* The program may identify the field evaluation as an assessment of the dimension of **SKILLS**, and their comprehensive exam as an assessment of the dimension of **KNOWLEDGE**.
 - The program selects which dimensions are assessed, as long as there are at least two (2) per competency
- ▶ Programs are not required to assess every dimension for every competency in the assessment plan

Behaviors

- Behaviors are the bulleted points under the paragraph description for each generalist competency in the EPAS.
- They are the observable components of the competency. Competence in real or simulated practice can only be demonstrated via behavior.
- ▶ Behaviors in the 2015 EPAS are only required in assessment of competencies in real (i.e., field education settings) or simulated practice situations (defined on pg. 22 of the 2015 EPAS).
- Generalist curricula are required to assess the behaviors as written in the 2015 EPAS.
- ▶ Areas of Specialized Practice are developed by the program and integrate all the dimensions. Programs write their own competency descriptions and behaviors reflective of specialized practice competence.

Behaviors

The measure assessing student outcomes in real or simulated practice **must list the behaviors associated with that competency on the measure.**

- Behaviors can be used to assess competence in two (2) ways:
 1. Each behavior related to the competency is scored individually and used in aggregate to determine a competency-level score, and therefore included in the assessment plan. **However, an individual score is not required for each behavior per the EPAS.**
 2. Each behavior related to the competency is not scored individually, the competency is assessed as a whole **based on the behaviors** and therefore behavior-level assessment scores are not included in the assessment plan.

Systems Levels in Competencies 6-9

- ▶ For competencies 6-9, it is not required to assess at the systems level (i.e., individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities).
- ▶ Programs may assess the competency as a whole, inclusive of all systems levels, or assess one (1) or more systems levels.

Generalist & Specialized Assessment Plans

- ▶ Baccalaureate programs must have a minimum of two (2) measures for each competency at the generalist level.
- ▶ Master's programs must have a minimum of two (2) measures for each competency at both the generalist and specialized levels.

Social Work Faculty or Field Personnel Assess Competence

- ▶ Assessment can only be completed only by **program-designated faculty or field personnel**
- ▶ Student self-efficacy assessments are no longer permitted
- ▶ Non-social work faculty, staff, or community members may not assess student demonstration of social work competencies for accreditation purposes

Placement of Data Collection Points

- ▶ It is within the purview of the program to select the placement of the data collection points.
- ▶ Programs may elect a formative or summative assessment approach.
- ▶ *Formative*: assess student development of competency during the length of the program (e.g., each semester, mid-term and final, etc.).
- ▶ *Summative*: assess student competency in the final year or semester of the program.

How to Choose an Explicit Measure

Select measures that fit the needs of your program; the explicit assessment is not limited to these examples.

Stakeholder

➤ Students

Assessor

➤ Faculty

or

➤ Field Personnel (includes field instructors)

Outcomes

➤ Consider the program's desired outcome, at the student- and program-levels. Map the assessment plan backwards centered on the desired the outcomes.

Dimensions

- Choose at least two (2) per competency; or one (1) unique dimension per measure:
- Knowledge
- Values
- Skills
- Cognitive & Affective Processes

Data Collection Points

- Formative (throughout the curricula)
- Summative (at the end of the curricula)
- Each semester
- Mid-point and final
- Final semester
- Concurrently with field
- Pre, during, or post field
- Capstone or integrative seminar
- Each course

Measure

Choose at least two (2) (one must be in real/simulated practice):

- Field Evaluation (real practice)
- Course-based simulation (simulated practice)
- Course-embedded measures
- Comprehensive end-of-year/exit exams
- Portfolios
- Capstone or senior seminar assignments (e.g., papers, presentations, etc.)
- Competency-based paper

Assessment Matrix Measure 1, Sample 1

| Competency | Competency Benchmark (%) | Measure | Behavior(s) | Dimension(s) | Outcome Measure Benchmark (minimum score or higher) | Assessment Procedures: Outcome Measure | Assessment Procedures: Competency |
|---|---|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 2 or more measures | Measure 1: Field Instrument | 1. apply and communicate understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels (field instrument item #8) | Knowledge; C/A Processes | For Measure 1: Students must score a minimum of 4 out of 5 points on each item (8-8). | For Measure 1: Aggregate student scores on items 6, 7, 8 on field evaluation. (Field instrument provided on pp. XX-XX) | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score of higher). Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence inclusive of 2 or more measures. Determine if this percentage is greater |
| | | | 2. present themselves as learners and engage clients | C/A Processes; Values | | | |
| | | | and constituencies as experts of their own experiences (field instrument item #7) | | | | |
| | | | 3. apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the | Skills; Values | | | than the competency benchmark. |

Sample located on the [CSWE website](#)

Note: In this sample, each behavior related to the competency is scored individually and therefore included in the assessment plan and on the measure. This is optional. See Measure 1, Sample 2 for an additional way to calculate competency scores.

Assessment Matrix Measure 1, Sample 2

| Competency | Competency Benchmark (%) | Measure | Dimension(s) | Outcome Measure Benchmark <i>(minimum score or higher)</i> | Assessment Procedures: Outcome Measure | Assessment Procedures: Competency |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 2 or more measures | Measure 1: Field Instrument | Knowledge; Values; Skills; Cognitive/ Affective Processes | For Measure 1: Students must score a minimum of 4 out of 5 points on item #2. | For Measure 1: Score on item #2 of field evaluation <i>(based on the students' demonstration of behaviors)</i> (Field instrument provided on pp. XX-XX) | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score of higher). Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence inclusive of 2 or more measures. Determine if this percentage is greater than |
| | | | | | | the competency benchmark. |

Note: Each behavior related to the competency is not scored individually in this sample, and therefore behavior-level assessment scores are not included in the assessment plan. If the program elects to assess at the competency-level, rather than the behavior-level, the measure capturing competency-based student learning outcomes in real or simulated practice situations must list the behaviors associated with that competency on the measure.

Sample located on the [CSWE website](#)

Assessment Matrix Measure 2, Sample 1

Sample located on the [CSWE website](#)

| Competency | Competency Benchmark (%) | Measure | Brief Description of the Measure | Dimension(s) | Assessment Procedures | Outcome Measure Benchmark | Assessment Procedures: Competency |
|---|---|---|---|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 2 or more measures | Measure 2: Course-Embedded Measure Exercise on Privilege in SW550: Diversity in Social Work Practice | Students complete a reflective journal entry on how the intersectionality of diverse identities influences social work practice and the role of self-awareness of power, privilege, personal biases, and cultural competency in engaging with clients and systems | Knowledge; Values; C/A Processes | For Measure 2: Aggregate student scores on rubric items 9-15 (Rubric provided on pp. XX-XX) * *A rubric or scoring instrument must be provided for course- | For Measure 2: Students must score a minimum of 8 out of 10 points on each rubric item (9-15). | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score of higher). Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence inclusive |
| | | | | | <i>embedded measures</i> | | of 2 or more measures. Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |

Competency Benchmark

- Refers to the minimum percentage of students the program expects to meet the outcome-measure benchmarks (minimum scores), inclusive of all identified measures
- Within the program's purview and are aspirational, yet realistic
- Can differ per competency

| Competency | Competency Benchmark (%) | Measure | Dimension(s) | Outcome Measure Benchmark (minimum score or higher) | Assessment Procedures: Outcome Measure | Assessment Procedures: Competency |
|---|---|-----------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 2 or more measures | Measure 1: Field Instrument | Knowledge; Values; Skills; Cognitive/ Affective Processes | For Measure 1: Students must score a minimum of 4 out of 5 points on item #2. | For Measure 1: Score on item #2 of field evaluation (based on the students' demonstration of behaviors) (Field instrument provided on pp. XX-XX) | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score of higher). Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence inclusive of 2 or more measures. Determine if this percentage is greater than |
| | | | | | | the competency benchmark. |

Sample located on the [CSWE website](#)

Outcome Measure Benchmark

- Refers to the minimum acceptable score on an identified measure
- Within the program's purview; can be different or the same for each measure
- Each measure must include a rubric where students are given a score for each competency
 - Programs can either directly give a score for attainment of the competency **OR** give a score for items on the rubric related to the competency then aggregate them

| Competency | Competency Benchmark (%) | Measure | Dimension(s) | Outcome Measure Benchmark (minimum score or higher) | Assessment Procedures: Outcome Measure | Assessment Procedures: Competency |
|---|---|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 2 or more measures | Measure 1: Field Instrument | Knowledge; Values; Skills; Cognitive/ Affective Processes | For Measure 1: Students must score a minimum of 4 out of 5 points on item #2. | For Measure 1: Score on item #2 of field evaluation (based on the students' demonstration of behaviors) (Field instrument provided on pp. XX-XX) | Determine the percentage of students that attained each outcome measure (e.g., minimum score of higher). Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence inclusive of 2 or more measures. Determine if this percentage is greater than the competency benchmark. |
| | | | | | | |

Sample located on the [CSWE website](#)

Benchmark Rationale

Respond to these questions and label them clearly:

- ▶ Why did the program choose the competency benchmarks? Why is that percentage meaningful or significant?
- ▶ Why did the program choose the outcome measure benchmarks? Why is that minimum score meaningful or significant?

Assessment Procedures

Respond to these questions and label them clearly:

- ▶ How is it determined that students' performance meets the outcome measure benchmark (minimum score)?
- ▶ How is the percentage of students achieving the competency benchmark determined, inclusive of all identified measures?

Copies of Assessment Measures

- Programs are required to provide all assessment measures used to assess all identified competencies
- Include copies of the measures directly response to AS 4.0.1; not as appendices
- This may include but is not limited to:
 - Field measure – ensure the behaviors used to assess the competency are listed on the real/simulated practice measure as the basis for assessment
 - Course-embedded measure rubric – ensure the rubric includes specific line items for competency assessment (exclusive of items such as APA formatting, timeliness of submission, etc.)
 - For course-embedded measures, a copy of the assignment and a copy of the scoring rubric used to assess competency attainment must be submitted.

Accreditation Standard 4.0.2

Reviewed for format at BMI; findings at Initial

*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.*

General Overview of AS 4.0.2

- Programs should assess all students and present data for all students, sampling students is not permitted.
- A matrix is very helpful in responding to this standard.
- When presenting the percentage of students achieving benchmarks, provide the percentage of students attaining, not the average score.
- Separate data outcomes are presented for generalist practice and each area of specialized practice. Label each set of outcomes clearly.
- Each program option should be explicitly addressed; separate data outcomes are presented for each program option, and also an aggregate of all program options combined.

Accreditation Standard 4.0.2 Sample

- 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

Accreditation Standard 4.0.2 Sample Results for Assessment of Practice Competencies

AS 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. The accompanying narrative explains to the reader how to understand and interpret the table.

| Competency | Competency Benchmark | Outcome Measure & Benchmark (Minimum Score) | Percent Attaining | Percentage of Students Achieving Competency | Competency Attained? |
|---|---|--|---|---|----------------------|
| Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice | 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 2 or more measures | Measure 1: Field Instrument Students must score a minimum of 4 out of 5 points. | Measure 1: Behavior 1*: 92% Behavior 2*: 91% Behavior 3*: 86% *include behavior-level data if each behavior related to the competency is scored individually; if behaviors are not scored individually, include the competency-level data | $92\% + 91\% + 86\% = 269/3 = 89.67\%$ $89.67\% + 78\% = 167.67/2 = 83.83\%$ 83.83% | No |
| | | Measure 2: Course-embedded Measure, Exercise on Privilege in SW550 Students must score a minimum of 8 out of 10 points. | Measure 2: 78% | | |

Sample located on the [CSWE website](#)

Accreditation Standard 4.0.3

Reviewed for format at BMI; findings at Initial

The program uses Form AS 4(B) and/or Form AS 4(M) to report its most recent assessment outcomes for each program option to constituents and the public on its website and routinely up-dates (minimally every 2 years) its findings.

General Overview of AS 4.0.3

- Regularly informing the public of assessment findings is a requirement of the Council of Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) who recognizes CSWE's COA as the accreditor for social work education.
- The CSWE website houses the required assessment outcomes form.
- **Do not alter the form. Simply fill in program information and delete the red “help text” before posting.**
- Programs document the percentage of students attaining the competency benchmark is inclusive of all identified measures.
- In the self-study, the program provides an active hyperlink to the webpage where this form is posted publicly and indicates how frequently it is updated.
 - This link also is provided in the program's [Directory of Accredited Programs](#) listing .
- Identify the program's constituencies, which always includes the public.
- You must provide detailed findings for each program option on the form; as well as in aggregate across all program options.

Form located on the
[CSWE website](#)

Accreditation Standard 4.0.3 (Baccalaureate Form)

Assessment Data Collected during the Academic Year (20XX-20XX)

| COMPETENCY | COMPETENCY BENCHMARK (%) | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | Aggregate of All Program Options n = (Number of students) | Program Option #1 (Identify location/delivery method) n = (Number of students) | Program Option #2 (Identify location/delivery method) n = (Number of students) | Program Option #3 (Identify location/delivery method) n = (Number of students) |
| <p>Competency 0: Sample Row <i>(Delete this row prior to submission and/or posting)</i></p> <p><i>Disclaimer: This is an example row. Programs are solely responsible for selecting their benchmarks. COA does not endorse nor recommend any specific benchmarks.</i></p> | <p>e.g. 80% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 2 or more measures</p> | <p>(Percent of all students, inclusive of all program options, who demonstrated competence) e.g. 85%</p> | <p>(Measure 1 + Measure 2 / 2) e.g. 80%</p> | <p>(Measure 1 + Measure 2 / 2) e.g. 90%</p> | <p>(Measure 1 + Measure 2 / 2) e.g. 85%</p> |
| <p>Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior</p> | | | | | |

Form AS 4(M) (Master's Form)

Form located on the [CSWE website](#)

Note: At the master's level, one form is completed for each program option and one form reflects the aggregate of all program options (if programs have more than one (1) program option). The aggregate form is on the next slide.

| Assessment Data Collected during the Academic Year (20XX-20XX) Program Option #1: (IDENTIFY LOCATION/DELIVERY METHOD) | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| COMPETENCY | COMPETENCY BENCHMARK (%) (GENERALIST) | COMPETENCY BENCHMARK (AREA OF SPECIALIZED PRACTICE) | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK | | | |
| | | | Generalist Practice n = (Number of students) | Area of Specialized Practice #1 (Identify Specialization) n = (Number of students) | Area of Specialized Practice #2 (Identify Specialization) n = (Number of students) | Area of Specialized Practice #3 (Identify Specialization) n = (Number of students) |
| Competency 0: Sample Row <i>(Delete this row prior to submission and/or posting)</i> Disclaimer: This is an example row. Programs are solely responsible for | e.g. 80% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 2 or more measures | e.g. 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 2 or more measures | (Measure 1 + Measure 2 / 2) e.g. 85% | (Measure 1 + Measure 2 / 2) e.g. 90% | (Measure 1 + Measure 2 / 2) e.g. 85% | (Measure 1 + Measure / 2) e.g. 80% |
| selecting their benchmarks. COA does not endorse nor recommend any specific benchmarks. | | | | | | |
| Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior | | | | | | |

Form AS 4(M)

(program options in aggregate, if applicable)

| COMPETENCY | COMPETENCY BENCHMARK (GENERALIST) | COMPETENCY BENCHMARK (AREA OF SPECIALIZED PRACTICE) | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING BENCHMARK | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Generalist Practice | Area of Specialized Practice #1 (Identify Specialization) | Area of Specialized Practice #2 (Identify Specialization) | Area of Specialized Practice #3 (Identify Specialization) |
| Competency 0: Sample Row <i>(Delete this row prior to submission and/or posting)</i> <i>Disclaimer: This is an example row, programs are solely responsible for selecting their benchmarks. COA does not endorse nor recommend any specific benchmarks.</i> | e.g. 80% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 2 or more measures | e.g. 90% of students will demonstrate competence inclusive of 2 or more measures | (Aggregate percentage of students, inclusive of all program options, who demonstrated competence) e.g. 85% | (Aggregate percentage of students, inclusive of all program options, who demonstrated competence) e.g. 95% | (Aggregate percentage of students, inclusive of all program options, who demonstrated competence) e.g. 90% | (Aggregate percentage of students, inclusive of all program options, who demonstrated competence) e.g. 80% |
| Competency 1: Demonstrate | | | | | | |

Complete this form to aggregate all program options (each campus/delivery method)

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Ethical and Professional Behavior | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Accreditation Standard 4.0.4

Process used to review outcomes approved at BMII;
findings approved at Initial

The program describes the process used to evaluate outcomes and their implications for program renewal across program options. It discusses specific changes it has made in the program based on these assessment outcomes with clear links to the data.

General Overview of AS 4.0.4

- This standard discusses the program's process for thoughtful review of data and how it informs programmatic changes.
 - What is the process or mechanism employed to formally review the assessment findings and make decisions about the implications for program improvement?
 - What is the procedure used to evaluate the meaning of the findings? Faculty committee(s), faculty retreat, etc.
 - How do decision makers decide what meaning the findings hold for the program?
- The response expands beyond changing benchmarks as a result of the assessment findings.
- A description of program changes should provide sufficient detail (e.g., course modifications, training enhancements, etc.) explicitly linked to specific findings.
- If no changes are reported, provide a rationale for that decision.
- Each program option should be explicitly addressed in each component of your discussion.

Implicit Curriculum Assessment

Accreditation Standard 4.0.5

Procedures for reviewing outcomes approved at BMII;
changes linked to outcomes at Initial

For each program option, the program provides its plan and summary data for the assessment of the implicit curriculum as defined in EP 4.0 from program defined stakeholders. The program discusses implications for program renewal and specific changes it has made based on these assessment outcomes.

Definition of Implicit Curriculum

The implicit curriculum refers to the **learning environment** in which the explicit curriculum is presented. It is composed of the following elements: the program's **commitment to diversity; admissions policies and procedures; advisement, retention, and termination policies; student participation in governance; faculty; administrative structure; and resources**. The implicit curriculum is manifested through policies that are fair and transparent in substance and implementation, the qualifications of the faculty, and the adequacy and fair distribution of resources. The culture of human interchange; the spirit of inquiry; the support for difference and diversity; and the values and priorities in the educational environment, including the field setting, inform the student's learning and development. **The implicit curriculum is as important as the explicit curriculum in shaping the professional character and competence of the program's graduates.** Heightened awareness of the importance of the implicit curriculum promotes an educational culture that is congruent with the values of the profession and the mission, goals, and context of the program.

(2015 EPAS, page 14)

Implicit Curriculum Assessment

- Minimally one (1) area of implicit curriculum is required to be assessed, and programs can change the area annually
- This assessment focuses on the implicit curriculum (learning environment) not the explicit curriculum (coursework, competencies, behaviors, or dimensions).
- This may include but is not limited to an assessment of the element(s) of **Educational Policy 3.0**:
 - The program's commitment to diversity
 - Admissions policies and procedures
 - Advisement
 - Retention and termination policies
 - Student participation in governance
 - Faculty
 - Administrative structure
 - Resources

Implicit Curriculum Assessment

- *Stakeholders may include but are not limited to:*
Students, Faculty, Alumni, Field instructors,
Community Advisory Board
- How is the program proactive on the basis of its findings?
- Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to this standard.

How to Choose an Implicit Measure

Assess an area that fits the needs of your program; the implicit assessment is not limited to these examples.

Implicit Curriculum Area

- Diversity
- Admissions policies and procedures
- Advisement
- Retention and termination policies
- Student participation in governance
- Faculty
- Administrative Structure
- Resources
- Other

Stakeholder

- Students
- Faculty
- Alumni
- Field instructors
- Community Advisory Board
- Other

Method

- Exit surveys
- Interviews
- Focus groups
- Alumni surveys
- Culture/climate surveys
- Strategic planning process
- Other

Additional Resources

Making Changes While in Candidacy

- ▶ Permitted to make changes and updates to policies, procedures, curriculum, and assessment plan 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 for compliance, so programs should be mindful of how changes impact standards that have already been approved
- ▶ Provide personnel updates via [database audit form](#) as they occur

VOLUME ONE TEMPLATES

- [BM1 Volume 1 Template \(2015 EPAS\)](#)
- [BM2 Volume 1 Template \(2015 EPAS\)](#)
- [Initial Accreditation Volume I Template \(2015 EPAS\)](#)

These are optional templates for planning and writing purposes; not a required format. Programs are encouraged to craft a benchmark/self-study document that clearly responds to the EPAS.

The purpose of these templates are to assist programs with the structuring/outlining the document; not to provide content. Programs are solely responsible for documenting compliance with the EPAS.

Always check the website for the most current forms and accreditation updates!



Program Options

- ▶ Defined on page 21 of the EPAS Glossary as:
“Various structured pathways to degree completion by which social work programs are delivered including specific methods and locations such as on campus, off campus, and virtual instruction.”
- ▶ Includes: main campus, branch campus, satellite site, online program, etc.; each program option type is defined in policy 1.2.4 of the EPAS Handbook
- ▶ Program options are **not** plans of study such as advanced standing, 16-month, 24-months, part-time, etc.
- ▶ A substantive change report is required when adding a new program option per policy 1.2.4 in the [EPAS Handbook](#)
- ▶ **Self-study:** Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.

CSWE Accreditation Web Resources

- ▶ **Candidacy Documents** - <https://www.cswe.org/Accreditation/Accreditation-Process> (select Candidacy)
 - Preparation → formatting requirements, Benchmark Grid, preparatory resources
 - Benchmark 1/2/3 → all required forms submitted at each stage
 - Timetables → timetables for the Candidacy process
 - Resources → sample format for curriculum matrices and assessment plan
- ▶ **Accreditation PowerPoints**
 - **Topics:** 2015 EPAS Overview, Assessment, Candidacy, Frequently Cited Standards, Writing an Accreditation Document
- ▶ **2015 EPAS & Glossary**
- ▶ **2015 EPAS Interpretation Guide**
- ▶ **2015 EPAS Handbook**
- ▶ **Formatting & Submission Requirements**
- ▶ **Directory of Accredited Programs**
- ▶ **COA Decisions**



Always check the website for the most current forms and accreditation updates!

Statement for Programs in Pre-Candidacy to Post on their Web Sites

Per policy 1.1.4 in
the [EPAS Handbook](#)

- [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 and had its *Benchmark I* approved in draft form to move forward with *Candidacy* review within one year. 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.
- Students who enter programs in *Pre-Candidacy* that attain *Candidacy* in 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. 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*.
- *Candidacy* by the Council on Social Work Education's Commission on Accreditation applies to all locations and 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 Candidacy to Post on their Web Sites

Per policy 1.1.3 in
the [EPAS Handbook](#)

- [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](#).

2022 EPAS

- The *2022 EPAS* is expected to be voted on in June 2022 and released to the public in July 2022. However, all forms, templates, interpretation guides, and other resources will not be released until approximately December 2022.
- Until resources are available, this workshop will focus on the *2015 EPAS*. Once resources are available, this workshop will shift to focusing on how the standards apply to both the *2015 EPAS* and the *2022 EPAS*
- Programs submitting Draft Benchmark I on or before December 31, 2022, will complete the full Candidacy process under the *2015 EPAS*.
- Programs submitting Draft Benchmark I on or after January 1, 2023, will complete the full Candidacy process under the *2022 EPAS*.
- More information at <https://www.cswe.org/accreditation/info/2022-epas/>

Ongoing Pre-Candidacy Consultation

- ✓ Sign up for a [monthly Interactive Pre-Candidacy Workshop](#) with the Associate Director of Accreditation Operations & Technology (ADOT) on the third Thursday of every month, 1-3pm ET/10am-noon PT. All program faculty or administrators at programs in *Pre-Candidacy* or earlier stages welcome
 - ✓ Email Anna R. Holster, at aholster@cswe.org for assistance with any *Pre-Candidacy* questions
- ✓ Visit <https://annaholster.youcanbook.me> to schedule a Zoom consultation with Associate Director of Accreditation Operations & Technology
- ✓ [New Pre-Candidacy Group](#) at CSWE Spark to share resources with peers
- ✓ Program designates one primary contact, but that person is encouraged to involve any other faculty or administrators in consultation appointments
- ✓ Please submit [database audit form](#), so we can keep our records of prospective programs current. Submit any time you have program updates.

Upcoming Topics (subject to change)

- ▶ October Topic (#4): Assessment (repeated from April)
- ▶ November Topic (#6): Mission, Goals, and Field Education (repeated from May)
- ▶ December Topic (#1): Candidacy Overview (repeated from June)
- ▶ January Topic (#7): Implicit Curriculum, Policies, Procedures, Handbook & Field Manual (repeated from July)
- ▶ February Topic (#5): Commissioner Visit planning with a panel of guests from the Commission on Accreditation (repeated each February)
- ▶ March Topic (#2): Explicit Curriculum (repeated from August)
- ▶ April Topic (#3): Faculty and Administration Standards (repeated from September)
- ▶ Please feel free to suggest additional topics you would like to see covered in the chat or by emailing me at aholster@cswe.org.



Thank You!

