Commission on Accreditation
Department of Social Work Accreditation

2015 EPAS | INTERPRETATION GUIDE

(version 12.8.2021)

This is a companion document to the 2015 EPAS, providing programs with information for navigating the accreditation process and understanding the Commission on Accreditation's (COA) meaning, intent, and interpretation of the EPAS. Interpretations further clarify the COA's expectations for each standard and provides guidance for developing clear and concise written compliance narratives in accreditation documents. As programs continue 2015 EPAS implementation efforts, the COA and the Department of Social Work Accreditation (DOSWA) publishes resources, training dates, and offers year-round consultative services to support accreditation processes.

Disclaimer: *This companion document will be periodically updated by COA and DOSWA. Accreditation information is subject to change. When updates occur, the program's primary contact will be notified, the guide will be posted publicly on the CSWE website, and recent clarifications will be highlighted. Clarified interpretations are effective immediately after each COA meeting. Always confirm that the program is utilizing the most current version of this document when implementing the 2015 EPAS and/or writing an accreditation document by visiting the Accreditation webpages at www.cswe.org. Programs are solely responsible for implementing, demonstrating, and maintaining compliance with the EPAS at all times.*

How to Use this Guide: Use the quick links below to navigate to the section of your choice. If searching for a specific standard, perform a search / find to locate the standard quickly. Finally, it is advisable to use this Guide as a final checklist before submitting a document to the COA to ensure each component of the standards are clearly addressed by the program. The primary reason for a citation is the narrative fails to address one or more components of the standard. Using this Guide as a checklist allows programs to cross-check their narrative with the COA's expectations per each standard.

Select a section below to review the information:

ACCREDITATION FRAMEWORK

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.

The process expands beyond quality control. Accreditation is a developmental, reflective, and renewal process by which program stakeholders craft excellent educational experiences to prepare competent social work practitioners. While accreditation is reviewed at periodic intervals, programs are expected to maintain compliance between review cycles. Accreditation can be an impetus for:

- Innovation
- Experimentation
- Improvement

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 COA.

As a CHEA-recognized programmatic accrediting body, the COA, and their partnership with COEP, are responsible for revising the EPAS at periodic intervals not to exceed seven (7) years.

The COA is composed of fellow social work educators, practitioners, and one public member. Commissioners are:

- Volunteers;
- Have background in social work education and practice (or public member);
- Active CSWE members with a minimum of 2-years site visitor experience; and
- Appointed for 3-year terms by the chair of the CSWE board of directors.

The COA convenes three (3) times per year: February, June, and October/November.

Accreditation is a peer-review process, accomplished via dedicated volunteer contributions of COA members and site visitors. The DOSWA staff liaise between the COA and the program, providing services, education and training opportunities, accreditation policies and procedures, and furnishing COA decision letters to programs.

The COA is the sole and final arbiter of compliance. Social work programs are solely responsible for implementing, demonstrating, and maintaining compliance with the 2015 EPAS.

2015 EPAS FRAMEWORK

Program Option Types and Definitions:

When the policy refers to "curriculum," this refers to the social work program curriculum, not general education requirements or non-social work curriculum. This includes both generalist and specialized social work curricula. If a student can complete 51% or more of their program online, then that constitutes an online program option. Fully online generalist curriculum, specialized curriculum, or advanced standing programs are also considered online program options.

Program Options: 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 (2015 EPAS, pg. 22). Program options are not plans/calendars of study, such as advanced standing, full-time, part-time, 16-months, 2-years, weekend, evening, night, etc.; nor are they population-based plans such as an adult learning option.

1. In-person / Face-to-Face / Traditional – Any physical location in which the instructor(s) and student(s) are concurrently in-person together. This allows for live synchronous interaction between instructors and students.

> **1a. Main / Primary Campus –** A majority, 51% or more, of the curriculum is delivered in-person at a primary physical location, such as a main campus.
>
> **1b. Branch / Satellite Campus –** A majority, 51% or more, of the curriculum is delivered in-person at a location physically detached from the main campus.

2. Distance Education – Any curriculum delivery method in which there is a separation, in time or place, between the instructor(s) and student(s). This includes both synchronous (real-time) and asynchronous (self-paced or pre-recorded) education models.

> **2a. Online –** A majority, 51% or more, of the curriculum is delivered online.
>
> **2b. Broadcast Site** – A majority, 51% or more, of the curriculum is broadcasted via television, audio, telephone, internet radio, livestream, computer-based video, or other modes of technology to students collectively convened in-person at program-established classroom location(s) physically detached from the main campus. Each physical classroom location to which the curriculum is broadcasted is considered a separate program option.
>
> **2c. Correspondence –** The whole curriculum delivered through mailing materials (videos, texts, assignments, etc.) electronically or through the post to students.

The following are not identified as a distinct program option:

3. Learning Site – Sites where only limited portions (50% or less) of the curriculum is offered offsite at a location physically detached from the main campus. A learning site is not considered an additional program option. A learning site does not require a *Substantive Change Proposal* and should not be identified as a distinct program option in accreditation-related documents.

4. Hybrid / Blended – Locations where a majority (51% or more) of the curriculum is delivered at a previously established CSWE-approved location (e.g., main campus, branch campus, etc.) and limited portions (50% or less) of the curriculum is delivered online. This model includes 50% or less of courses delivered fully virtually. This model may also include any percentage of individual hybrid / blended courses delivered partially in-person and partially virtually. A hybrid curriculum design is not considered an additional program option. Rather, it is a face-to-face program option with online course offerings / elements. A hybrid curriculum design does not require a *Substantive Change Proposal* and should not be identified as a distinct program option in accreditation-related documents.

Notable Language Changes from the 2008 EPAS to the 2015 EPAS

- Foundation practice is now termed *Generalist* practice
- Advanced practice is now termed *Specialized* practice
- Concentration is now termed *Area of Specialized Practice*
    a. *Area of Specialized Practice* is an umbrella term that gives the program autonomy to use a term of their choice, including concentrations, specializations, focus areas, advanced practice areas, tracks, or other terms.
- Practice behavior was simplified to *Behavior*

It is advisable and highly encouraged for programs to adopt and implement the language of the 2015 EPAS as using alternative terminology may lead to confusion during the review process. If a program elects to use different terms, then the program must draw equivalency in their accreditation documents between the EPAS language and program-specific language.

Holistic Competence – The 2015 EPAS recognizes competence as holistic; this means that the demonstration of competence is informed by the appropriate knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes.

Dimensions – Each of the nine social work competencies listed in the 2015 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 a program. The dimensions are:

- **Knowledge**
- **Values**
- **Skills**
- **Cognitive and Affective Processes***

This is one (1) dimension and should **not be separated into two (2) distinct dimensions for accreditation purposes*

Knowledge generally includes learning the competencies and social work concepts.

Skills generally include the ability to apply or demonstrate competencies and social work concepts.

The definition of **Values** is located in Educational Policy 1.0:

> *Service, social justice, the dignity and worth of the person, the importance of human relationships, integrity, competence, human rights, and scientific inquiry are among the core values of social work. These values underpin the explicit and implicit curriculum and*

frame the profession's commitment to respect for all people and the quest for social and economic justice.

The definition of **Cognitive and Affective Processes** is located on pg. 20 the 2015 EPAS :

Cognitive and affective processes (includes critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment)

- *Critical thinking is an intellectual, disciplined process of conceptualizing, analyzing, evaluating, and synthesizing multiple sources of information generated by observation, reflection and reasoning.*
- *Affective reactions refer to the way in which our emotions influence our thinking and subsequently our behavior.*
- *Exercise of judgment is the capacity to perceive and discern multiple sources to form an opinion.*

Dimensions are features of holistic competence: students require social work knowledge, values, skills and cognitive and affective process to be competent social work practitioners.

The paragraph description and dimensions as written in the EPAS should be reflected in the generalist social work curriculum. The curriculum also prepares students for the demonstration of competence through the behaviors associated with the competency in *real or simulated practice* situations (defined on pg. 22 of the 2015 EPAS).

Behaviors – The bullet points under the paragraph description for each competency in the EPAS are a set of behaviors that integrate the dimensions of the competency. Behaviors are the observable actions / components of the competency (defined on pg. 20 of the 2015 EPAS). Competence in *real or simulated practice* can only be demonstrated by behavior, and behavior cannot be demonstrated without incorporation of the knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes associated with the competency. Thus, behaviors in the 2015 EPAS are only required in assessment of competency-based student learning outcomes in *real* (i.e., field education settings) *or simulated practice* (defined on pg. 22 of the 2015 EPAS) situations.

All four (4) competency dimensions are mapped in the explicit curriculum via the curriculum matrix **(AS B2.0.3; AS M2.0.3; and AS M2.1.4)**, and a minimum of two (2) are assessed via competency-based student learning outcomes **(AS 4.0.1)**.

Understanding Generalist Practice and Specialized Practice

Generalist Practice – is defined as practice with diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Generalist practice is defined in **EP 2.0** and is:

- Grounded in liberal arts and person-in-environment framework
- Uses scientific inquiry, ethical principles, and critical thinking in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels
- Engages diversity in practice and advocates for human rights and social and economic justice
- Recognizes and builds upon the strengths and resiliency of all human beings

For generalist practice, baccalaureate and master's programs are required to implement the nine social work competencies (as described in the 2015 EPAS pages 7-9) and any additional competencies in their curricula relevant to their context. For generalist practice, programs must use *all behaviors exactly as written in the EPAS* and may choose to develop additional

behaviors that represent observable components of each competency that integrate the dimensions.

Specialized Practice – For specialized practice (defined on pg. 21 of the 2015 EPAS), programs develop their area(s) of specialized practice by creating competency descriptions relevant to the area of specialized practice.

For each area of specialized practice, programs must **extend and enhance** the nine social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program by describing the dimensions (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes) that comprise each of the competencies. **Extending and enhancing** the generalist competencies means *"providing students with knowledge, values, skills, cognitive and affective processes that are more advanced or more relevant to the area of specialized practice."*

To **extend and enhance** the competencies for each area of specialized practice, programs must:

- Write a specialized competency description for each of the competencies **(AS M2.1.3)**
- Incorporate the four (4) dimensions into the competency description
- Use the competencies and dimensions to design the curriculum
    - Show how the curriculum is built around the knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes necessary to develop competence as described for each competency for each area of specialized practice
- Develop specialized behaviors for each competency
    - These behaviors integrate the dimensions so that students can perform/demonstrate competence in *real or simulated* practice situations (e.g., field education settings)
    - Behaviors are the observable components of the competency

For some areas of specialized practice, for competencies 6-9, programs may **extend and enhance** those systems levels of practice (e.g., individuals, families, groups, organizations, and/or communities) that pertain to that specialization. For example, a program with a clinical specialization may decide that Competency 7: Assessment, only focuses on individuals, families, and groups and not include organizations and communities in their competency description or behaviors. However, for some specializations, the program should address all systems levels. Advanced Generalist is one such example, as are population-specific specializations such as Aging, Child and Youth, Addictions, etc. Please consult with the program's accreditation specialist if you have questions about any specializations in your program related to this option.

In the example below, note that the title of the competency is the same for generalist and specialized practice. Programs should **not** alter the titles of the competencies beyond modifying the relevant systems levels for competencies 6-9. What is different from generalist practice competencies is the specific knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes, as well as behaviors. This reflects an **extension and enhancement** of the competency for a specific specialization. The CSWE curricular guides are also a resource, many of which feature sample **extended and enhanced** competencies and behaviors.

Disclaimer: The curricular guides are peer-produced resources by task forces of national content experts. These guides are not created by nor vetted by the Commission on Accreditation or CSWE Department of Social Work Accreditation.

Example competency description and behaviors for gerontological social work practice:

Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior
Practitioners in aging respect the worth, dignity, and integrity of all older people and advocate for their self-determination, access to services, and ethical application of technology. They recognize ethical issues in practice and distinguish frameworks for decision-making that support older adults' needs and rights. To ensure ethical practice, they use self-reflection, self-regulation, and supervision, consultation, and lifelong learning to address how their attitudes and biases about aging and older adults may influence their personal and professional values and behaviors. Gero social workers recognize the dynamics of self-determination and the continuum of decision-making support. Practitioners in aging serve as leaders to ensure ethical practice with older adults and their care networks.

- *Practitioners in aging with, and on behalf of, older adults and their constituencies:*
- *Demonstrate awareness of aging-related personal and professional values through self-reflection and self-regulation.*
- *Select and incorporate ethical decision-making frameworks that integrate social work values.*
- *Practice in a culturally competent manner that demonstrates recognition of and ability to utilize the principles included in the NASW Code of Ethics, evidence-based knowledge, and relevant legal and policy-related information.*
- *Recognizing social structural social inequities, advocate within the health and social service communities and as members of interprofessional teams on behalf of older adults and their families.*

Adding an Additional Generalist or Specialized Competency

A program may choose to add one (1) or more competencies unique to the program's context. Competencies may be added at the generalist and/or specialized levels. Additional competencies do not need to include systems levels (e.g., individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities), Only the dimensions and behaviors must be addressed. For each additional competency, the program must develop a descriptive paragraph, infusing the four (4) dimensions, and also develop corresponding behaviors that will be operationalized in *real or simulated practice*.

Example additional competencies include (yet are not limited to): cultural humility, anti-racism, local / regional / population-based practice (with indigenous peoples, deaf community, immigrants and refugees, rural populations, etc.), global practice, military practice, leadership, bio-psycho-social-spiritual approach, holistic approach, etc.

When an additional competency is added, the following standards are affected: AS B/M2.0.2, AS B/M2.0.3, AS M2.1.2, AS M2.1.3, AS M2.1.4, AS B/M 2.2.2, AS M2.2.3, AS 2.2.7, AS B/M2.2.9, AS 4.0.1, AS 4.0.2, AS 4.0.3, and AS 4.0.4.

Programs adding additional **generalist-level competencies** must provide the competency descriptive paragraph and corresponding behaviors in AS B/M2.0.3, in a narrative preceding the matrix.

Program adding additional **specialized-level competencies** must provide the competency descriptive paragraph and corresponding behaviors in AS M2.1.3 in a narrative format.

Relationship Between Generalist and Specialized Practice Curricula

Since programs have the flexibility to structure and rationalize their own formal curriculum design, programs may choose to integrate generalist and specialized practice curricula. It is permissible for generalist courses to contain specialized content and vice-versa. It is not a requirement of the EPAS that the two types of curricula be explicitly distinct or separated with no cross-over. It is also not a requirement of the EPAS that students must complete the full generalist curriculum before entering specialized practice. Ultimately, it is within each program's discretion to design a cohesive curriculum that ensures multi-dimensional competency-based learning, which may include integration of generalist and specialized content within the same course.

For example, master's programs may incorporate a bridge semester or bridge courses. Programs may also begin offering specialized content early and continue offering generalist content throughout the entirety of the program. Courses can intersperse both generalist and specialized content or focus on one or the other. As long as the program has a clear rationale for their formal curriculum design (as documented in **AS M2.0.2** and **AS M2.1.2**) and facilitates multi-dimensional competency-based learning (as evidenced in the curriculum matrices in **AS M2.0.3** and **AS M 2.1.4**), they have autonomy and discretion in their sequencing, timing, progression, prerequisites, and other elements of the formal curriculum design ensuring that specialized practice builds upon generalist practice.

Curriculum Matrices

Generalist Practice Matrix (B2.0.3 and M2.0.3) – Programs must develop a curriculum map that explains how each competency is taught for development of competence during the course of the curriculum. The map provides the COA with an easy reference to how and where each competency is taught, including all four (4) dimensions per each competency. *Programs map the nine competencies and all four (4) dimensions for each competency across the curriculum.*

At a minimum, the generalist matrix must include:

- The nine social work competencies and any added competencies
- The required course(s) where each competency is demonstrated
- For competencies 6-9, the matrix identifies where individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities are each reflected in the curriculum
- Specific course content (e.g., readings, modules, assignments, class activities, etc.) from required courses where each competency is demonstrated; select the strongest examples to include in the matrix, not all required courses/content need be mapped
- The dimension(s) (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes) associated with the course content for each competency
- All dimensions for each competency must be addressed somewhere in the curriculum; programs may find that multiple dimensions are covered by one assignment, activity, etc.
- Behaviors are **not** required in the curriculum matrix

Specialized Practice Matrix (M2.1.4) – Master's programs develop their own competencies that extend and enhance the nine generalist social work competencies and any added competencies. Similar to generalist practice, master's programs must develop a curriculum map that explains how each competency is taught for development of competence during the

course of the curriculum for each area of specialized practice. The map provides the COA with an easy reference to how and where each competency is taught, including all four (4) dimensions per each competency. *Programs map the nine competencies and all four (4) dimensions for each competency across the curriculum.*

At a minimum the matrix must include:

- The nine social work competencies and any added competencies
- The required course(s) where each competency is demonstrated
- For competencies 6-9, the matrix identifies where the specialization-relevant systems levels (e.g., individuals, families, groups, organizations, and/or communities) are reflected in the curriculum
- Specific course content (e.g., readings, modules, assignments, class activities, etc.) from required courses where each competency is demonstrated; select the strongest examples to include in the matrix, not all required courses/content need be mapped
- The dimension(s) (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes) associated with the course content for each competency
- All dimensions for each competency must be addressed somewhere in the curriculum; programs may find that multiple dimensions are covered by one assignment, activity, etc.
- Behaviors are **not** required in the curriculum matrix

Syllabi for Inclusion in Volume 2 – Programs must include uniform syllabi for all courses on the curriculum matrices, both at the generalist and specialized levels. It is not necessary to include syllabi for all required courses in the program, unless the program chooses to include all required courses in a matrix. The COA crosschecks syllabi with courses/content identified on the matrix in order to more fully understand how the program teaches the competencies and dimensions. Beyond requiring submission of uniform syllabi within accreditation documents, the COA does **not** have any requirements regarding the content or formatting of syllabi. Content and formatting of syllabi is within the purview of the program.

Field Manual and Student Handbook for Inclusion in Volume 3 – Programs must include a social work field manual and student handbook. These two documents comprise Volume 3. Institution's with both baccalaureate and master's social work programs can combine field manuals and student handbooks, as long as all relevant policies and procedures are included and clearly labeled where they apply to baccalaureate and/or master's students. The COA cross-checks the policies and procedures provided in the self-study narrative (Volume 1) with the field manual and student handbook (Volume 3); thus, the content submitted in Volume 1 must match the policies and procedures submitted in Volume 3. Beyond requiring submission of the manual and handbook, the COA does **not** have any requirements regarding the content or formatting of the manual and handbook. Content and formatting of the field manual and student handbook is within the purview of the program. If a policy or procedure found in the manual or handbook cited by the COA, the program will not be asked to resubmit the Volume 3. Rather, the program must state that the manual or handbook was updated.

Assessment

Multi-Dimensional Assessment (AS 4.0.1) – The 2015 EPAS requires programs to engage in multidimensional assessment. As indicated in previous sections, the four (4) dimensions of the competencies are: *knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes*. Programs are expected to assess competence by identifying the dimension(s) associated with the

competency and measuring students' performance at that level. Each competency description in the EPAS, or developed by master's programs for each specialization, contains information that corresponds to the knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes necessary to demonstrate competence. At least two (2) dimensions per competency must be assessed. Behaviors are also required in assessment of student competence in *real or simulated practice* situations.

At the baccalaureate level:

- Programs choose their own measures; a minimum of two (2) per competency
    - Programs will have at least nine (9) competencies X two (2) measures per competency
- Programs are required to assess at least two (2) dimensions per competency
    - Programs do **not** need to assess every dimension for every competency
- One measure must be in real (i.e., field education settings) or simulated practice (defined on pg. 22 of the 2015 EPAS) situations
    - Programs must use the generalist behaviors exactly as written in the EPAS for the real or simulated practice measure (e.g., field instrument)
- The second measure can assess any dimension(s) (knowledge, values, skills, and/or cognitive and affective processes) and may be done via course-embedded measures, end-of-year exams or assignments, portfolios, comprehensive exit exams, etc.

At the master's level:

- Programs are required to assess at least two (2) dimensions per competency at both the generalist level (does not need to include advanced standing students) and specialized practice levels
    - Generalist-level competency is assessed via the competencies and behaviors as written in the EPAS
    - Specialized-level competency is assessed via the competencies and behaviors developed by the program for *each* area of specialized practice **(AS M2.1.3)**
- Programs choose their own measures; a minimum of two (2) per competency
    - Programs will have at least nine (9) competencies X two (2) measures per competency for generalist practice
    - Programs will have at least nine (9) competencies X two (2) measures per competency for *each* area of specialized practice
- Programs are required to measure at least two (2) dimensions per competency
    - Programs do **not** need to assess every dimension for every competency
- One measure must be in real (i.e., field education settings) or simulated practice (defined on pg. 22 of the 2015 EPAS) situations
    - Programs must use the generalist behaviors exactly as written in the EPAS for the real or simulated practice measure (e.g., field instrument)
    - Programs use their own developed behaviors for their area(s) of specialized practice (programs will have developed both competency descriptions and behaviors for each specialization in **AS M2.1.3**)
- The second measure can assess any dimension(s) (knowledge, values, skills, and/or cognitive and affective processes) and may be done via course-embedded measures, end-of-year exams or assignments, portfolios, comprehensive exit exams, etc.

Assessment of Implicit Curriculum (AS 4.0.5) – This is a new requirement with the 2015 EPAS. Programs will assess one aspect of the implicit curriculum as identified in **EP 4.0**.

- **EP 4.0** states, *"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 area of implicit curriculum is required to be assessed
- Competencies, behaviors, dimensions, coursework, etc. are assessment of the explicit curriculum **not** the implicit curriculum
- Examples of implicit assessment instruments include exit surveys, interviews, focus groups, alumni surveys, culture/climate surveys, strategic planning process, etc.
- Programs assess the implicit curriculum for each program option

Commercial Assessment Instruments and Packages – The COA does not endorse third-party, commercial, standardized, or customized assessment instruments 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.

NAVIGATING THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

Preparation

1. Please refer to the CSWE website/Accreditation tab for all relevant information and resources (policies, procedures, due dates, forms, samples, etc.) to help you successfully navigate the accreditation process.
    a. The EPAS Handbook houses the accreditation policies and procedures. The Handbook will be periodically updated. Accreditation staff are frequently contacted about the following sections. Staff suggest a review of the entire Handbook with specific attention to the following sections:
        1. 1.2.2. Postponement of Reaffirmation Review
        2. 1.2.3. Agenda Adjustments
        3. 1.2.4. Program Changes
        4. 1.2.5. Waivers to Accreditation Standards
        5. 1.2.11. Document Submission Policy
        6. 1.2.13. Use of Consultants
    b. The Directory of Accredited Programs details accreditation history, next accreditation review date, and current contact info for all accredited and candidate programs.
    c. COA decisions are posted publicly on the CSWE website 30-days after each meeting concludes.
        1. Accreditors are required to publicly post accreditation decisions. CSWE-COA decisions are posted on the CSWE website.
        2. However, it is not a requirement that programs share, market, or communicate their accreditation status with their stakeholders via their own website or other any other materials.
        3. What, how, and with whom programs share their accreditation status with is within their own purview.
    d. Accreditation PowerPoint presentations covering a variety of high-demand topics are available for download.
2. Accreditation processes are self-managed.
    a. Timetables (select Timetables) for each agenda date outline what is due, to whom, and when it must be submitted. Add these dates to your calendars, as programs will **not** receive prompts nor reminders.
    b. The program's agenda date is published in the Directory of Accredited Programs as the next accreditation review date.
    c. The timetable specifies the fees schedule (select Fees). For more information regarding fees or invoicing, please contact feesaccred@cswe.org.
    d. Please note, accreditation specialists do **not** handle accreditation, membership, or training fees or invoices.
3. The DOSWA offers Candidacy and Reaffirmation at-cost trainings and workshops throughout the year on a first-come, first-served basis.
    a. Learn more about trainings and register online. For more information regarding trainings, please contact accredworkshop@cswe.org.
    b. Please note, accreditation specialists do **not** handle training registration, fees, or logistics.

Writing an Accreditation Document

3. Policy 1.2.11. *Document Submission Policy* in the EPAS Handbook provides formatting and submission requirements for each type of accreditation document.
4. Programs with multiple program options are expected to explicitly address each program option in response *each* accreditation standard.
    a. A separately labeled response must be provided for each program option. If the program's response to the standard is the same across all program options, the program must explicitly state this under the relevant accreditation standard. Be cognizant of the standards in which the program's response is likely to differ due to a distinct learning environment at separate location(s) or via delivery method(s).
    b. Program options are defined on pg. 21 of the 2015 EPAS 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."* This includes branch/satellite campuses, online delivery method, etc.
    c. Program options are **not** plans/calendars of study, such as advanced standing, full-time, part-time, 16-months, 2-years, weekend, evening, night, etc.; nor are they population-based plans such as an adult learning option.
    d. The COA is paperless! Zero physical copies of accreditation documents are required. E-copies only will be accepted.
    e. Submit all documents in Microsoft Word or searchable PDF Format (unless otherwise noted in policy 1.2.11). Scanned documents are **not** accepted.
    f. **Appendices:** Information and relevant documentation for each standard must be included directly in response to that standard (not as appendices). This includes all forms, matrices, and tables.
        1. While the COA may accept information that is misplaced within the document, for example if it is not placed under the correct / relevant standard, commissioners will not search through the document for requested information.
        2. All relevant compliance information should be included directly in response to the corresponding standard.
        3. When inserting tables or graphics to articulate compliance, a narrative response to the standard must accompany the table or graphic. Alternatively, the narrative may be embedded directly in the table or graphic.
    g. Submissions are accepted by email or by mail via USB flash drive. Documents sent via the cloud (e.g., OneDrive, SharePoint, Google Drive, Dropbox, etc.), CD, SD, or DVD will **not** be accepted.
5. Most common types of accreditation documents include:
    a. **Self-study:** (Reaffirmation) A formal process during which the educational program critically examines its structure, content, strengths, areas for improvement, effectiveness, and enhancement plans in alignment with the EPAS. The self-study is the mechanism for documenting compliance with the accreditation standards every eight (8) years.
    b. **Benchmark:** (Candidacy) A formal process during which a new educational program documents compliance with a portion of accreditation standards over a 3-year period leading to a 4-year initial accreditation period.
    c. **Visit Report:** Composed by a qualified and trained visitor, this report documents the clarifying information provided to the visitor via onsite discussion and

dialogue with the program. Visitors are under the jurisdiction of the COA and do **not** determine compliance. There are two (2) types of visitors:
    1. Site Visitor = Reaffirmation
    2. Commission Visitor = Candidacy

d. **Program Response to a Visit Report:** A formal written response to the visitor's report documenting compliance with all items raised in the Letter of Instruction and Site Visit Report (Reaffirmation) or Commission Visit Report (Candidacy). This is the program's final opportunity to demonstrate and document compliance in their own voice prior to receiving a decision from the COA.

e. **Program Response to a Deferral:** A formal written response to the COA's request for clarifying information upon which they make an informed decision about the program's compliance with the EPAS. Responses to deferrals may use current/updated information or further clarify/expand upon the same information provided in the previous submission.

f. **Progress Report:** A formal written response to all outstanding concerns for which the program has not clearly demonstrated compliance during an accreditation review process. Progress reports require updated/current information documenting the program's progression.

g. **Restoration Report:** A formal written response to all outstanding noncompliance issues for which the program did not demonstrate compliance during an accreditation review process. Restoration reports require updated/current information documenting the program's evidence of compliance to restore full accredited status.

h. **Substantive Change Proposal:** A proposal documenting the program's compliance plan when preparing to offer a new program option in between accreditation review cycles. Policy 1.2.4. *Program Changes* in the EPAS Handbook provides detailed policies and procedures for submitting a *Substantive change Proposal*.

6. Self-studies and Benchmark documents comprise of three (3) volumes and one (1) review brief:
    a. Volume 1 = narrative response to every accreditation standard, including supporting documentation, compiled into one (1) continuous document
        1. *Optional Tool:* Self-study Volume 1 Template
    b. Volume 2 = course syllabi for required courses identified on the curriculum matrix compiled into one (1) continuous document
    c. Volume 3 = student handbook and field manual compiled into one (1) continuous document
    d. Review Brief = rubric for evaluating compliance used by the COA readers
7. Write to the accreditation standard **not** the educational policies
    a. Educational policies inform the program's response to the accreditation standards
        1. Educational policies are not to be altered nor need to be copied/pasted into accreditation documents
    b. **B** – indicates standards applicable to baccalaureate programs only
    c. **M** – indicates standards applicable to master's programs only
8. Each separately accredited baccalaureate and master's program are individually evaluated for compliance by the COA.
    a. Special note for collaborative programs: Collaboratives share responsibility for documenting a combined compliance plan representative of and applicable to all institutions for each accreditation standard. Thus, collaboratives may only submit one (1) benchmark / self-study document, comprised of volumes 1-3. All other

accreditation-related documents must also reflect one (1) submission, inclusive of all relevant collaborative information. Multiple documents / submissions tailored to each institution will not be accepted.
    1. Collaboratives may submit *some* duplicate benchmark / self-study required forms to demonstrate compliance across all institutions. The forms that may be submitted for each institution are: faculty summary form, faculty data forms (CVs), budget form, and librarian's report.
9. As you write a self-study (reaffirmation) or benchmark (candidacy), use the corresponding Review Brief and this Interpretation Guide to ensure all compliance requirements for each standard are addressed. The review brief is the rubric commissioners use to evaluate compliance.
    a. Use the compliance statements and subheadings to clearly address *each component* of the standard.
    b. Explicitly address each program option in response to *each* standard.
10. The accreditation process utilizes a minimum compliance framework.
    a. The Commission on Accreditation (COA) reviews programs though "minimum compliance" lens.
    b. Staff also train programs to set goals for minimum compliance requirements using the EPAS, Interpretation Guide, and other COA-sanctioned materials.
    c. This means that programs are welcome to go above and beyond minimum compliance, incorporate best-practices, or innovate *as long as* the program is meeting the minimum requirements of the standard.
    d. Programs have the flexibility to craft excellent educational experiences that exceed the EPAS minimum requirements.
    e. CSWE-COA sets the floor; programs set the ceiling.
11. Required forms (select Self-Study Forms) must be submitted with your self-study or benchmark in response to the accreditation standards.
12. **SAMPLE** curriculum matrices and assessment plans (select Resources) are available which will be helpful in the preparation of the self-study or benchmark document.
13. The self-study / benchmark content commonly reflects the full academic year prior to the submission of the document. Essentially, all information submitted in the self-study / benchmark should be current and accurate at the point of submission. The only exception is the program's assessment data. For assessment data, programs should submit their most current set of outcomes / data (which may reflect prior, yet still recent, data points).
    a. **Framing:** consider the self-study / benchmark as a **rolling snapshot** of where the program currently is; not reflecting back on previous or outdated operations and information. Programs discuss the current educational environment rather than explaining how elements of the program have changed since their last accreditation review cycle.
    b. While the document may capture the year prior to submission of the self-study / benchmark, the program should be cognizant to update their accreditation documents regarding any changes that strengthen compliance.
        1. The most frequent changes include composition of faculty, students, staff, other personnel, adding / removing program options, updated assessment data, updates to policies or procedures, or enhancements made to program operations to strengthen compliance with the EPAS.
        2. This list is not exhaustive, so it is important to ensure that all information, personnel, operations, program options, and data are captured in the self-

study are current, accurate, and aligned with the EPAS. Review policy 1.2.4 in the EPAS Handbook for more information on program changes.

c. With regard to program personnel, the program should capture the most up-to-date information in the self-study to the best of their ability. This ensures the commissioner / site visitor has access to current faculty and personnel information reflecting those with whom they will meet during their visit.
d. In the self-study, programs should capture all components they wish to have accredited / reaffirmed for compliance with the EPAS. Remember that programs are requesting the COA to accredit / affirm these operations for the next 8-years. So, the self-study / benchmark should capture the program's best compliance plan that reflects current operations now and moving forward for the next 8-years.
    1. Review policy 1.2.4 in the EPAS Handbook for more information on program changes between review cycles.
e. Submitting outdated information in the self-study, benchmark, or other accreditation documents may result in a citation or other action by the COA in order to request the most current and accurate program materials.

14. Self-study / benchmark document writing tips & framing:
    a. The self-study or benchmark is your opportunity to tell the program's story to the COA!
    b. Programs are the experts on their educational programs and are tasked with candidly, clearly, and concisely articulating the reality of how the program has implemented and compiles with the standards.
    c. Commissioners appreciate clear and concise narrative. Information provided should *always* directly relate to the standard to which the program is responding. Do **not** include information beyond what the standard is requesting.
    d. Since commissioners read for minimum compliance with the EPAS, verbose and elaborate writing styles are discouraged.
    e. COA cannot make any assumptions; describe how the programs complies with *each component* of the standard.
    f. Commissioners trust that programs are disclosing complete and accurate information.
    g. Policy *1.2.11. Document Submission Policy* in the EPAS Handbook provides formatting and submission requirements for each type of accreditation document.
15. If major changes are planned or experienced during your reaffirmation cycle, it is important to contact the program's accreditation specialist to discuss the change and how to report it.
    a. Per policy 1.2.4. *Program Changes* in the EPAS Handbook: "*The program should not implement any changes that require a Substantive Change Proposal during the candidacy or reaffirmation process. The candidacy process begins with the submission of the benchmark 1 document and ends with an initial accreditation decision. The reaffirmation process begins with the submission of the self-study and ends with a reaffirmation decision."*
16. The DOSWA encourages all administrators, full-time and part-time faculty, staff, students, field instructors, board members and other relevant program stakeholders to understand and actively participate in the accreditation process. Continuous accreditation efforts, including periodic reaffirmation reviews, are owned by and affect the entire program. Thus, team-based approaches are highly recommended.
    a. *Optional Tool:* Self-Study/Benchmark Team Approach Grid

Understanding the COA Review Process

1. Accreditation reviews occur at the three (3) COA meetings annually: February, June, and October/November
2. Each accreditation specialist collaborates with a workgroup of five (5) commissioners (e.g., COA readers)
3. The specialist assigns each document to two (2) COA readers
    - COA readers do **not** review materials from previous cycles or previously submitted materials (unless otherwise specified in policy)
4. Various types of documents may also be assigned by the COA to the specialist for review (e.g., progress reports, substantive changes, etc.)
5. The COA readers complete independent reviews
6. The reviews are sent to the specialist, compiled, and sent back to the readers for reconciling the decision type and each citation
7. Any decisions or citations where agreement is not met, are brought to the 6-person workgroup for resolution during the meeting
8. The workgroup finalizes all decision types and citations
9. All decisions are voted on and ratified by the 30-person COA
10. Programs are informed by the specialist of the decision, specifics, rationale, and any next steps after the meeting concludes
    - All final/official signed COA letters are sent 30-45 days after the meeting per policy 1.1.10. *COA Decision Making* in the EPAS Handbook

DOSWA Consultation Services

Review the CSWE Accreditation Scope, Services, & Resources document to understand how best to collaborate with accreditation staff throughout the accreditation process and between review cycles.

While accreditation staff may provide consultative services regarding the accreditation process and EPAS, the COA has sole and complete authority as the final arbiter of compliance with the EPAS. The program is solely responsible for implementing, demonstrating, and maintaining compliance with the EPAS.

Each accredited program is assigned one (1) accreditation specialist with whom they may collaborate. Accreditation specialists:

- Provide customized consultation on the accreditation process, EPAS, and COA interpretations, via phone, e-mail, video, and/or in-person at CSWE's Annual Program Meeting (APM) and the Baccalaureate Program Directors (BPD) conference
    - YouCanBookMe scheduling app conveniently linked in each specialist's email signature
    - Appointments are available to social work education programs only; not members of the public
    - Appointments may only be booked by the program's selected primary contact and/or their designees (per policy 1.2.7 in the EPAS Handbook)
    - For public inquires, feel empowered to call CSWE headquarters at (703) 683-8080 to locate the staff member who can best respond to your question(s) or review our Whom to Contact info sheet
    - Consultations services are available year-round!
- Develop and maintain accreditation templates, forms, and resources
- Communicate COA decisions, rationales, and letters
- Provide guidance in navigating the reaffirmation or candidacy process and changes between review cycles
- Provide accurate accreditation-related information and resources to programs and the public
- Assist in understanding accreditation policies and procedures
- Conduct in-person and virtual trainings and offer educational opportunities to accredited and candidate programs in Alexandria, VA; at the annual APM; and/or online year-round
- Train and support site visitors and COA volunteers
- Collaborate in individualized and group settings with programs in their efforts to reach their accreditation goals
- Manage the COA document review process
- Liaise between the COA and the program in communicating citations, decisions, rationales for decision-making, and next steps
- Communicate with the program's selected primary contact (per policy 1.2.7 in the EPAS Handbook) and designees authorized by the primary contact to speak with the Accreditation Specialist
- Does **not** conduct document reviews, provide written feedback, nor offer live or on-demand reviews of written materials
- Does **not** determine compliance/noncompliance as COA has sole and final authority as the arbiter of compliance in regulation decision-making

Always confirm accuracy of accreditation-related information with the program's accreditation specialist!

Communications with DOSWA & COA

Per policy 1.2.7. *Primary Contact, Information Sharing, and Release of COA Decision Letter* in the EPAS Handbook, *"Each accredited program selects one (1) primary contact. To streamline communication, the primary contact's responsibility is to represent the program in all exchanges with CSWE and the public."* Review the policy to become familiar with the primary contact's scope of responsibilities and procedures for updating the primary contact.

Tip: Primary contacts may choose to create listservs / group email addresses to easily organize amongst and forward accreditation communications to their internal team.

Periodic accreditation updates are emailed to program's primary contact after COA meetings. An *Accreditation News Archive* is also publicly available on the accreditation webpages CSWE website.

Changes Between Accreditation Review Cycles

The accreditation status obtained at initial accreditation or reaffirmation only covers the components that were reviewed in the self-study at the time of the COA review. Changes may take place within the program prior to its next scheduled accreditation review; however, some program changes impact compliance with EPAS and require reporting to the COA or DOSWA per policy 1.2.4 in the EPAS Handbook. Changes that do **not** require reporting are also addressed. Accreditation is an elective, program-driven, and self-managed peer-review process. Programs are solely responsible for implementing, demonstrating, and maintaining compliance with the EPAS during and in-between review cycles.

STANDARD-BY-STANDARD INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS

Educational Policy 1.0—Program Mission and Goals

The mission and goals of each social work program address the profession's purpose, are grounded in core professional values, and are informed by program context.

Values

Service, social justice, the dignity and worth of the person, the importance of human relationships, integrity, competence, human rights, and scientific inquiry are among the core values of social work. These values underpin the explicit and implicit curriculum and frame the profession's commitment to respect for all people and the quest for social and economic justice.

Program Context

Context encompasses the mission of the institution in which the program is located, and the needs and opportunities associated with the setting and program options. Programs are further influenced by their practice communities, which are informed by their historical, political, economic, environmental, social, cultural, demographic, local, regional, and global contexts and by the ways they elect to engage these factors. Additional factors include new knowledge, technology, and ideas that may have a bearing on contemporary and future social work education, practice, and research.

The social work program's mission and goals reflect the profession's purpose and values and the program's context.

Accreditation Standard 1.0—Mission and Goals

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENTS	COA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE *This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!*
1.0.1: The program submits its mission statement and explains how it is consistent with the profession's purpose and values.	Narrative provides the program's mission statement. Narrative explains how the program's mission statement is consistent with the profession's purpose and values. The narrative should discuss any ways in which the program option mission	• **AS 1.0** focuses less upon curricular offerings and more on the program's mission statement. • The mission statement is specific to program-level (master's or baccalaureate) rather than school/department-level. • Explain how there is consistency with the program's mission statement, profession's purpose, and values (profession's purpose described on pg. 5 of **EPAS**; values described in **EP 1.0**). The linkages should be clear and explicit. • Discuss each component of the profession's purpose and values as written in the **EP 1.0** using subheadings.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

	differs from the on-campus program (if applicable).	• It can be helpful to think of specific components of the program mission and tie those to specific components of both the profession's purpose and values. • Consider including a table identifying the components of the program's mission, profession's purpose, and values to visually demonstrate the relationship. • Tables help clarify consistency and visually separate text, however, a narrative discussion of *how* the mission is consistent with each component should be included. • In addition to highlighting areas of consistency and overlap, it will be necessary to provide a discussion on *how* these areas are consistent with one another. • It can be helpful to bold, underline, italicize, etc. the components of the mission that align with components of the purpose and values to highlight language consistencies. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
1.0.2: The program explains how its mission is consistent with the institutional mission and the program's context across all program options.	Narrative explains how the program's mission is consistent with the institutional mission. Narrative explains how the program's mission is consistent with the program's context across all program options. The narrative should discuss any ways in which the program option mission differs from the on-campus program (if applicable).	• **AS 1.0** focuses less upon curricular offerings and more on the program's and host institution's mission statement. • The program's mission is consistent with the institutional mission and emphasizes the program's context (context defined in **EP 1.0**). The linkages should be clear and explicit. • Discuss the mission statement's consistency, rather than programmatic components' consistency. • Context can emerge from the institution's orientation (faith-based, for example) or the geography (urban, rural, and regional) or other elements unique to the program such as "global" framework. • The context component is important in this standard, as programs will develop the discussion around *how* the program's mission is consistent with this context. • Are there certain contextual aspects, such as region-specific features or religious affiliation, that have influenced the program's mission?	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

		• For example, does the program equip students to work with a particular population based on your context? Is your student population commuter, non-traditional, first generation, etc.? • What elements of the program's context will fully allow the COA to understand your program's story? What contextual elements influence your program? • Consider including a table identifying the components of the program's mission, institution's mission, and program's context to visually demonstrate the relationship. • Tables help clarify consistency and visually separate text, however, a narrative discussion of ***how*** the program's mission is consistent with the institutional mission must be included. • It can be helpful to bold, underline, italicize, etc. the components of the program's mission that aligns with components of the institutional mission and program's context to highlight language consistencies. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
1.0.3: The program identifies its goals and demonstrates how they are derived from the program's mission.	Narrative identifies the program's goals. Narrative demonstrates how the program's goals are derived from the program's mission. The narrative should discuss goals for all program options (if different from one option to the other) and demonstrate how they are derived from the program's mission.	• **AS 1.0** focuses less upon curricular offerings and more on the program's mission statement. • Goals represent the elements or component parts of the mission. ○ Goals are defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • There should be a brief narrative describing ***how*** the goals are derived from the mission with specific linkages between the two. • Discuss how each goal is individually derived from the program's mission. • Goals are **not** identical to the nine social work competencies (**EPAS** pgs. 7-9). • Goals are specific to program-level (master's or baccalaureate) rather than school/department-level. • There is no required number of goals. • The program is typically the subject of the goal (i.e., the program will…).	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

		• The program is not required to be the subject of each goal. Goals may be student-centric, so long as the program is able to connect them to standards requiring discussion of the relationship/connection with the goals. • Goals may focus upon important elements of the program's operations and impact such as students, competency-based education, unique educational programming, community relationships, research, faculty development, alumni engagement, etc. • Consider including a table identifying the components of the program's mission and goals to visually demonstrate the relationship. • Tables help clarify alignment and visually separate text, however, a narrative discussion of *how* the program goals are derived from the mission must be included. • It can be helpful to bold, underline, italicize, etc. the components of the mission that align with components of the goals to highlight language consistencies. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

Explicit Curriculum

The explicit curriculum constitutes the program's formal educational structure and includes the courses and field education used for each of its program options. Social work education is grounded in the liberal arts, which provide the intellectual basis for the professional curriculum and inform its design. Using a competency-based education framework, the explicit curriculum prepares students for professional practice at the baccalaureate and master's levels. Baccalaureate programs prepare students for generalist practice. Master's programs prepare students for generalist practice and specialized practice. The explicit curriculum, including field education, may include forms of technology as a component of the curriculum.

Educational Policy 2.0—Generalist Practice

Generalist practice is grounded in the liberal arts and the person-in-environment framework. To promote human and social well-being, generalist practitioners use a range of prevention and intervention methods in their practice with diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities based on scientific inquiry and best practices. The generalist practitioner identifies with the social work profession and applies ethical principles and critical thinking in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Generalist practitioners engage diversity in their practice and advocate for human rights and social and economic justice. They recognize, support, and build on the strengths and resiliency of all human beings. They engage in research-informed practice and are proactive in responding to the impact of context on professional practice.

The baccalaureate program in social work prepares students for generalist practice. The descriptions of the nine Social Work Competencies presented in the **EPAS** identify the knowledge, values, skills, cognitive and affective processes, and behaviors associated with competence at the generalist level of practice.

The nine Social Work Competencies are listed in the **EPAS** on pp. 7-9. Programs may add competencies that are consistent with their mission and goals and respond to their context. The descriptions of the nine Social Work Competencies presented in the **EPAS** identify the knowledge, values, skills, cognitive and affective processes, and behaviors associated with competence at the generalist level of practice.

Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior
Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice
Competency 4: Engage In Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice
Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice
Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Accreditation Standard B2.0—Generalist Practice

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	COA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE *This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!*
B2.0.1: The program discusses how its mission and goals are consistent with generalist practice as defined in **EP 2.0**.	Narrative explains how the program's mission is consistent with generalist practice. Narrative explains how the program's goals are consistent with generalist practice. If program options have different missions and/or goals, discuss for each program option.	• This standard focuses less upon curricular offerings and more on the program's mission statement and the definition of generalist practice in **EP 2.0**. • This standard asks for a brief discussion of *how* the definition of generalist practice (located in **EP 2.0**) is consistent with the program's mission and goals detailed in **AS 1.0**. • Discuss each component of the generalist practice definition located in **EP 2.0**. • Consider including a table identifying the components of the program's mission, program's goals, and definition of generalist practice to visually demonstrate the relationship. • Tables help clarify consistency and visually separate text, however, a narrative discussion of *how* the program's mission and goals are consistent with the generalist practice definition must be included. • It can be helpful to bold, underline, italicize, etc. bold, underline, italicize, etc. the components of the mission and goals that align with components of the generalist practice definition to highlight language consistencies. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**
B2.0.2: The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.	Narrative provides a rationale for the program's formal curriculum design across all program options. Narrative explains how the program's curriculum design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both	• Curriculum is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • Curriculum design is defined on pg. 20 of the EPAS. • This is a discussion of the concepts, theories, pedagogical ideas, and precepts that inform the formal curriculum design for generalist practice (e.g., plan of study). • What content is engaged before what? What content is engaged concurrently? Why? How is course content integrated with field? Is there a developmental order to	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

	classroom and field across all program options.	the curriculum? Why does the configuration of your courses make coherent sense overall? • Is there a logical progression through the curriculum? How does a student experience the curriculum from admission through graduation? • For example, if a program representative were to walk a prospective student through the generalist level of the program what would that look like and ***why***? • It is helpful to include a visual semester-by-semester plan of study, typically a table/chart provided by the registrar's office. • Narrative should focus on required social work courses (i.e., content all students receive) but may include summary information regarding electives, general education requirements, certificate programs, dual degree programs, and other optional curricular offerings. • Rather than provide a list of courses and descriptions (e.g., course catalog), programs are expected to provide a narrative describing ***how*** the courses influence and build upon each other, as opposed to discussing each course individually. • Programs may consider sectioning the narrative by semester or year depending upon the curriculum design. • Programs determine the formal/official title of the degree awarded. ○ A single program may award multiple types of degrees for completion of the same social work program/curriculum. In such cases, the difference is typically found within the institution's general education or liberal arts requirements. • The number of credit hours for degree attainment / conferral is within the purview of the program, their institution, state-based higher education authority, and/or regional accreditor. The COA nor EPAS address credit hour requirements. Programs are advised to inquire with their state's licensing board regarding any post-degree practice implications.	

		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

B2.0.3: The program provides a matrix that illustrates how its curriculum content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program	Programs that **add additional generalist-level competencies** must provide the competency descriptive paragraph and corresponding behaviors in a narrative preceding the matrix (if applicable).
	
	Program provides a matrix illustrating how the curriculum content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program across all program options.
		• Matrix is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS.
		• A narrative preceding the assessment matrix is not required, unless the program has developed additional competencies.
		• The nine generalist social work competencies are articulated in the **EPAS** pgs. 7-9.
		  ○ Environmental justice is defined on pg. 20 of the EPAS.
		• The descriptive paragraph under each competency title, informs the content that should be reflected in the generalist curriculum. The competency descriptions may guide programs in selecting content that best prepares students for competent social work practice. Content is then mapped in the matrix.
		• Behaviors are optional / not required to be included in the matrix.
		• The generalist matrix maps specific generalist curriculum course content to the nine social work competencies (and any other competencies added by the program) as well as the four (4) dimensions (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive & affective processes) of each competency.
		• At a minimum, the generalist practice matrix should include:
		  ○ the nine social work competencies (and any other competencies added by the program);
		  ○ the course call number and full course titles where each competency is implemented;
		  ○ specific course content (e.g., readings, modules, assignments, in-class activities, etc.) where each competency is implemented; and
		  ○ the four (4) dimensions (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive & affective processes) associated with the course content for each competency.
		• The matrix should be in a table format.
			DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1 (Including Syllabi)
			
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3 (Including Syllabi)

		• The accreditation department has developed a **SAMPLE** matrix. The CSWE website houses the sample matrix.
		• The intent and purpose of the curriculum matrix different than the assessment plan matrix. The curriculum matrix is snapshot featuring specific required course content strongly relating to each competency/dimension which all students are learning in the classroom. The assessment plan matrix details how the program is capturing competency-based student learning outcomes. These matrices do **not** need to match even if the program is using a course-embedded measure assessment model.
		• The curriculum matrix is different than the assessment plan. The matrix is a snapshot of the strongest examples where the program implements all four (4) dimensions of each competency through specific course content. This is **not** where/how the program is assessing student learning outcomes.
		  ○ The curriculum matrix purpose = the strongest teaching/learning touchpoints (via specific course content) for each competency and dimension.
		  ○ The assessment plan purpose = the two (2) or more measures used to assess competency-based student learning outcomes.
		• Required courses, or content all students are receiving, should be included in the matrix.
		  ○ The matrix content features the program's guaranteed and consistent learning experiences for all students.
		  ○ Not every course must appear on the matrix, only required courses with content strongly exemplifying each competency/dimension required for all students.
		  ○ Elective courses are **not** included on the matrix.
		  ○ Content on the matrix must be delivered to all students. For example, if the program has a series of required courses in which a student must take 1 of 3 courses; then the same piece	

		of content must be consistent across all 3 courses in order to include it in the matrix. ○ It is helpful to feature a spread of required courses from across the generalist curriculum. • Field education courses on the matrix: ○ The matrix should include *specific* course content. Thus, programs must identify required content applicable to and consistent for all students. ○ For example, field seminar content may be required, specific, and consistent for all students. ○ However, field education courses / setting-based placements may not feature required, specific, and consistent content for all students because learning opportunities typically differ across settings. ○ Programs should only include field education course content on the matrix that is the same for all students regardless of field setting / site-specific learning tasks / opportunities. • The curriculum matrix is **not** intended to serve as a comprehensive curricular map. Instead, it should include the strongest / best examples of competency-based learning in the curriculum. **Not** every instance of competency-based learning in the curriculum. • Matrix content should complete the question: "The program is confident that we are preparing competent social work practitioners because they learn (dimension/s) of competency #(s) via (specific course content) in (class # and title)." ○ For example, "The program is confident that we are preparing competent social work practitioners because they learn values and cognitive/effective processes of competency #1 & #2 via a Reflection Paper on Intersectionality, Identities, and Your Social Work Goals in SW 305: Social Work Practice in a Diverse & Global Society."	

		• In the matrix, include a *brief* description of the course content, explaining what the specific content entails rather than only listing the content title.
		• Competencies 6-9 should be delineated by systems levels (e.g., individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities).
		  ○ Multiple systems levels may be connected to a single piece of course content, *as long as* the course content and description clearly links to the competency, dimensions, and systems levels identified.
		  ○ All systems levels must be represented at least once per competency.
		• A program may choose to add one (1) or more competencies unique to the program's context. If the program elects to add additional competencies, they should be included in the matrix.
		• All **four (4) dimensions** should be mapped to <u>*each*</u> competency, including any competencies added by the program.
		• Include page numbers in matrix, referring readers to Volume 2 (syllabi), and continuously paginate Volume 2 so that COA readers may easily crosscheck the specific course content with the syllabi.
		  ○ Title the specific course content consistently between the matrix and syllabi.
		  ○ The matrix content must match the syllabus content and address each component of the competency. If one or more components of the competency is not addressed clearly in the matrix and syllabi, the COA may cite the standard.
		  ○ For example, for *Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice*, the program addressed social and economic justice, yet did not identify content addressing human rights nor environmental justice.
		  ○ If the curriculum matrix is cited by the COA, the program will be asked to resubmit the syllabi.	

		• Use labels to clearly address each component of the compliance statement within the matrix. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

Accreditation Standard M2.0—Generalist Practice			
STANDARD	**COMPLIANCE STATEMENT**	**COA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS**	**DRAFT/COMPLIANCE** *This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!*
M2.0.1: The program explains how its mission and goals are consistent with generalist practice as defined in **EP 2.0**.	Narrative explains how the program's mission is consistent with generalist practice. Narrative explains how the program's goals are consistent with generalist practice. If program options have different missions and/or goals, discuss for each program option.	• This standard focuses less upon curricular offerings and more on the program's mission statement and the definition of generalist practice in **EP 2.0**. • This standard asks for a brief discussion of *how* the definition of generalist practice (located in **EP 2.0**) is consistent with the program's mission and goals detailed in **AS 1.0**. • Discuss each component of the generalist practice definition located in **EP 2.0**. • Consider including a table identifying the components of the program's mission, program's goals, and definition of generalist practice to visually demonstrate the relationship. • Tables help clarify consistency and visually separate text, however, a narrative discussion of *how* the program's mission and goals are consistent with the generalist practice definition must be included. • It can be helpful to bold, underline, italicize, etc. bold, underline, italicize, etc. the components of the mission and goals that align with components of the generalist practice definition to highlight language consistencies. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**
M2.0.2: The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and	Narrative provides a rationale for the program's formal curriculum design for generalist practice across all program options.	• Curriculum is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • Curriculum design is defined on pg. 20 of the EPAS. • This is a discussion of the concepts, theories, pedagogical ideas, and precepts that inform the formal curriculum design for generalist practice (e.g., plan of study).	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.	Narrative explains how the program's curriculum design for generalist practice is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field across all program options.	• What content is engaged before what? What content is engaged concurrently? Why? How is course content integrated with field? Is there a developmental order to the curriculum? Why does the configuration of your courses make coherent sense overall?
		• Is there a logical progression through the curriculum? How does a student experience the curriculum from admission through the generalist curriculum?
		• For example, if a program representative were to walk a prospective student through the generalist level of the program what would that look like and *why*?
		• It is helpful to include a visual semester-by-semester plan of study, typically a table/chart provided by the registrar's office.
		• Narrative should focus on required social work courses (i.e., content all students receive) but may include summary information regarding electives, general education requirements, certificate programs, dual degree programs, and other optional curricular offerings.
		• Rather than provide a list of courses and descriptions (e.g., course catalog), programs are expected to provide a narrative describing *how* the courses influence and build upon each other, as opposed to discussing each course individually.
		• Programs may consider sectioning the narrative by semester or year depending upon the curriculum design.
		• Since programs have the flexibility to structure and rationalize their own formal curriculum design, master's programs may choose to integrate generalist and specialized practice curricula.
		  ○ It is permissible for generalist courses to contain specialized content and vice-versa.
		• Programs determine the formal/official title of the degree awarded.
		  ○ A single program may award multiple types of degrees for completion of the same social work program/curriculum. In such cases, the difference is typically found within the	

		institution's general education or liberal arts requirements. • The number of credit hours for degree attainment / conferral is within the purview of the program, their institution, state-based higher education authority, and/or regional accreditor. The COA nor EPAS address credit hour requirements. Programs are advised to inquire with their state's licensing board regarding any post-degree practice implications. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

M2.0.3: The program provides a matrix that illustrates how its generalist practice content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program.	Programs that **add additional generalist-level competencies** must provide the competency descriptive paragraph and corresponding behaviors in a narrative preceding the matrix (if applicable). Program provides a matrix illustrating how the program's generalist practice curriculum content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program across all program options.	• Matrix is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS.
		• A narrative preceding the assessment matrix is not required, unless the program has developed additional competencies.
		• The nine generalist social work competencies and corresponding behaviors are articulated in the **EPAS** pgs. 7-9.
		  ○ Environmental justice is defined on pg. 20 of the EPAS.
		• The descriptive paragraph under each competency title, informs the content that should be reflected in the generalist curriculum. The competency descriptions may guide programs in selecting content that best prepares students for competent social work practice. Content is then mapped in the matrix.
		• Behaviors are optional / not required to be included in the matrix.
		• The generalist matrix maps specific generalist curriculum course content to the nine social work competencies (and any other competencies added by the program) as well as the four (4) dimensions (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive & affective processes) of each competency.
		• At a minimum, the generalist practice matrix should include:
		  ○ the nine social work competencies (and any other competencies added by the program);
			DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1 (Including Syllabi)
			
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3 (Including Syllabi)

		○ the course call number and full course titles where each competency is implemented; ○ specific course content (e.g., readings, modules, assignments, in-class activities, etc.) where each competency is implemented; and ○ the four (4) dimensions (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive & affective processes) associated with the course content for each competency. • The matrix should be in a table format. • The accreditation department has developed a **SAMPLE** matrix. The CSWE website houses the sample matrix. • The intent and purpose of the curriculum matrix is different than the assessment plan matrix. The curriculum matrix is snapshot featuring specific required course content strongly relating to each competency/dimension which all students are learning in the classroom. The assessment plan matrix details how the program is capturing competency-based student learning outcomes. These matrices do **not** need to match even if the program is using a course-embedded measure assessment model. • The curriculum matrix is different than the assessment plan. The matrix is a snapshot of the strongest examples where the program implements all four (4) dimensions of each competency through specific course content. This is **not** where/how the program is assessing student learning outcomes. ○ The curriculum matrix purpose = the strongest teaching/learning touchpoints (via specific course content) for each competency and dimension. ○ The assessment plan purpose = the two (2) or more measures used to assess competency-based student learning outcomes. • Required courses, or content all students are receiving, should be included in the matrix. ○ The matrix content features the program's guaranteed and consistent learning experiences for all students.	

		○ Not every course must appear on the matrix, only required courses with content strongly exemplifying each competency/dimension required for all students. ○ Elective courses are **not** included on the matrix. ○ Content on the matrix must be delivered to all students. For example, if the program has a series of required courses in which a student must take 1 of 3 courses; then the same piece of content must be consistent across all 3 courses in order to include it in the matrix. ○ It is helpful to feature a spread of required courses from across the generalist curriculum. • Field education courses on the matrix: ○ The matrix should include *specific* course content. Thus, programs must identify required content applicable to and consistent for all students. ○ For example, field seminar content may be required, specific, and consistent for all students. ○ However, field education courses / setting-based placements may not feature required, specific, and consistent content for all students because learning opportunities typically differ across settings. ○ Programs should only include field education course content on the matrix that is the same for all students regardless of field setting / site-specific learning tasks / opportunities. • The curriculum matrix is **not** intended to serve as a comprehensive curricular map. Instead, it should include the strongest / best examples of competency-based learning in the curriculum. **Not** every instance of competency-based learning in the curriculum. • Matrix content should complete the question: "The program is confident that we are preparing competent social work practitioners because they learn (dimension/s) of competency #(s) via (specific course content) in (class # and title)."	

		○ For example, "The program is confident that we are preparing competent social work practitioners because they learn values and cognitive/effective processes of competency #1 & #2 via a Reflection Paper on Intersectionality, Identities, and Your Social Work Goals in SW 305: Social Work Practice in a Diverse & Global Society." • In the matrix, include a *brief* description of the course content, explaining what the specific content entails rather than only listing the content title. • Competencies 6-9 should be delineated by systems levels (e.g., individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities). ○ Multiple systems levels may be connected to a single piece of course content, *as long as* the course content and description clearly links to the competency, dimensions, and systems levels identified. ○ All systems levels must be represented at least once per competency. • A program may choose to add one (1) or more competencies unique to the program's context. If the program elects to add additional competencies, they should be included in the matrix. • All **four (4) dimensions** should be mapped to <u>*each*</u> competency, including any competencies added by the program. • Include page numbers in matrix, referring readers to Volume 2 (syllabi), and continuously paginate Volume 2 so that COA readers may easily crosscheck the specific course content with the syllabi. ○ Title the specific course content consistently between the matrix and syllabi. ○ If the curriculum matrix is cited by the COA, the program will be asked to resubmit the syllabi. • Use labels to clearly address each component of the compliance statement within the matrix. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

Educational Policy M2.1—Specialized Practice

Specialized practice builds on generalist practice as described in **EP 2.0**, adapting and extending the Social Work Competencies for practice with a specific population, problem area, method of intervention, perspective or approach to practice. Specialized practice augments and extends social work knowledge, values, and skills to engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate within an area of specialization. Specialized practitioners advocate with and on behalf of clients and constituencies in their area of specialized practice. Specialized practitioners synthesize and employ a broad range of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary knowledge and skills based on scientific inquiry and best practices, and consistent with social work values. Specialized practitioners engage in and conduct research to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery.

The master's program in social work prepares students for specialized practice. Programs identify the specialized knowledge, values, skills, cognitive and affective processes, and behaviors that extend and enhance the nine Social Work Competencies and prepare students for practice in the area of specialization.

Accreditation Standard M2.1— Specialized Practice

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	COA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE *This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!*
M2.1.1: The program identifies its area(s) of specialized practice (**EP M2.1**) and demonstrates how it builds on generalist practice.	Narrative identifies the program's area(s) of specialized practice across all program options. Narrative demonstrates how the program's areas of specialized practice build on generalist practice across all program options.	• Specialized practice is defined on pg. 21 of the EPAS. • Specialized practice prepares students for practice roles with a specific population, problem area, method of intervention, perspective or approach to practice (**EP M2.1**). • List the name of each specialization (e.g., advanced generalist, clinical, policy, etc.), and discuss *how* each area of specialized practice builds upon the elements of generalist practice (as defined in **EP 2.0**). • Discuss *how* each specialization builds upon one or more of the following systems levels: individuals, families, groups, organizations, and/or communities. • Consider including a table for each specialization identifying how the specialization aligns with components of the definition of generalist practice to visually demonstrate the relationship. • Tables help clarify consistency and visually separate text, however, a narrative discussion of *how* each area	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

		of specialized practice builds upon the generalist practice definition in **EP 2.0** must be included. • It can be helpful to bold, underline, italicize, etc. the elements of the specialization that build upon the elements of the generalist practice definition in **EP 2.0** to highlight language consistencies. • Though "area of specialized practice" is an umbrella term, a program may use language such as specialization, concentration, track, focus, area, etc. as a label. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
M2.1.2: The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for specialized practice demonstrating how the design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.	Narrative provides a rationale for the program's formal curriculum design for specialized practice across all program options. Narrative explains how the program's curriculum design for specialized practice is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field across all program options.	• Curriculum is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • Curriculum design is defined on pg. 20 of the EPAS. • This is a discussion of the concepts, theories, pedagogical ideas, and precepts that inform the formal curriculum design for *each* specialization (e.g., plan of study). • What content is engaged before what? What content is engaged concurrently? Why? How is course content integrated with field? Is there a developmental order to the curriculum? Why does the configuration of your courses make coherent sense overall? • Is there a logical progression through the curriculum? How does a student experience the curriculum from admission through graduation? • For example, if a program representative were to walk a prospective student through the specialized level of the program what would that look like and *why*? • It is helpful to include a visual semester-by-semester plan of study, typically a table/chart provided by the registrar's office. • Narrative should focus on required social work courses (i.e., content all students receive) but may include summary information regarding electives, general education requirements, certificate programs, dual degree programs, and other optional curricular offerings.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

		• Rather than provide a list of courses and descriptions (e.g., course catalog), programs are expected to provide a narrative describing *how* the courses influence and build upon each other, as opposed to discussing each course individually.
		• Programs may consider sectioning the narrative by semester or year depending upon the curriculum design.
		• Since programs have the flexibility to structure and rationalize their own formal curriculum design, master's programs may choose to integrate generalist and specialized practice curricula.
		  ○ It is permissible for generalist courses to contain specialized content and vice-versa.
		• Programs determine the formal/official title of the degree awarded.
		  ○ A single program may award multiple types of degrees for completion of the same social work program/curriculum. In such cases, the difference is typically found within the institution's general education or liberal arts requirements.
		• The number of credit hours for degree attainment / conferral is within the purview of the program, their institution, state-based higher education authority, and/or regional accreditor. The COA nor EPAS address credit hour requirements. Programs are advised to inquire with their state's licensing board regarding any post-degree practice implications.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

M2.1.3: The program describes how its area(s) of specialized practice extend and enhance the nine Social Work Competencies (and any additional competencies developed by the program) to prepare students for	Narrative describes how each of the program's areas of specialization extend and enhance each of the nine competencies (and any additional competencies developed by the program) to prepare students for	• Specialized practice extends and enhances the nine required competencies (and any other competencies added by the program) beyond generalist practice as defined in **EP 2.0**. • Extending and enhancing the nine required generalist competencies (and any other competencies added by the program) means providing students with knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive & affective	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

practice in the area(s) of specialization.	practice in the area(s) of specialization across all program options.	processes that are advanced or more relevant to the area of specialized practice. • Programs can create additional competencies specific to an area of specialized practice that are only covered at the specialized level. • Programs extend and enhance the nine social work competencies (and any other competencies added by the program) for its specializations by developing a descriptive paragraph incorporating the four (4) dimensions (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive & affective processes) that comprise each competency and corresponding behaviors. • The descriptive paragraph under each competency title, informs the content that should be reflected in the specialized curriculum and represents the underlying content and processes that informs the bulleted behaviors. Behaviors are the observable components of the competency which operationalize the competency in *real or practice situations* (e.g., field education settings). ○ A minimum of one (1) behavior should be developed per competency. There is no maximum number of expected behaviors per competency. • The accreditation department has developed **SAMPLES** of extended and enhanced competencies and behaviors. The CSWE website houses the samples. Programs may also refer to the curricular guides on the CSWE website for **SAMPLE** extended and enhanced competencies and behaviors. ○ *Disclaimer:* The curricular guides are peer-produced resources by task forces of national content experts. These guides are not created by nor vetted by the Commission on Accreditation or CSWE Department of Social Work Accreditation. • Extending and enhancing goes beyond adding the specialization name to each competency or behavior. • Each competency should include the title, descriptive paragraph incorporating the four (4) dimensions, and	

		bulleted behaviors specific to the area of specialized practice. ○ For competencies 1-5, the competency title will remain the same as the nine generalist level competences, however, the competency description (paragraph) and bulleted behaviors will be re-written by the program. ○ For competencies 6-9, the competency title may change depending upon which relevant systems levels (e.g., individuals, families, groups, organizations, and/or communities) the program chooses to focus on for each specialization. The extended and enhanced systems levels should match what the program identified in response to **AS M2.1.1.** • The advanced generalist and population-specific specializations and should extend enhance all five (5) systems levels. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
M2.1.4: For each area of specialized practice, the program provides a matrix that illustrates how its curriculum content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program.	Program provides a matrix illustrating how the program's specialized practice curriculum content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program across all program options.	• Matrix is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • A narrative preceding the assessment matrix is not required, unless the program has developed additional competencies. • Programs develop and write the specialized social work competencies and corresponding behaviors for each area of specialized practice. ○ Environmental justice is defined on pg. 20 of the EPAS. • The descriptive paragraph under each competency title, informs the content that should be reflected in the specialized curriculum. The competency descriptions may guide programs in selecting content that best prepares students for competent social work practice. Content is then mapped in the matrix. • Behaviors are optional / not required to be included in the matrix. • Each specialized matrix maps specific specialized curriculum course content to the nine social work	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1 (Including Syllabi in Volume 2)** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3 (Including Syllabi in Volume 2)**

		competencies (and any other competencies added by the program) as well as the four (4) dimensions (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive & affective processes) of each competency.
		• At a minimum, each specialized practice matrix should include:
		  ○ the nine social work competencies (and any other competencies added by the program);
		  ○ the course call number and full course title where each competency is implemented;
		  ○ specific course content (e.g., readings, modules, assignments, in-class activities, etc.) where each competency is implemented; and
		  ○ the four (4) dimensions (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive & affective processes) associated with the course content for each competency.
		• The matrix should be in a table format.
		• The accreditation department has developed a **SAMPLE** matrix. The CSWE website houses the sample matrix.
		• The intent and purpose of the curriculum matrix is different than the assessment plan matrix. The curriculum matrix is snapshot featuring specific required course content strongly relating to each competency/dimension which all students are learning in the classroom. The assessment plan matrix details how the program is capturing competency-based student learning outcomes. These matrices do **not** need to match even if the program is using a course-embedded measure assessment model.
		• The curriculum matrix is different than the assessment plan. The matrix is a snapshot of the strongest examples where the program implements all four (4) dimensions of each competency through specific course content. This is **not** where/how the program is assessing student learning outcomes.
		  ○ The curriculum matrix purpose = the strongest teaching/learning touchpoints (via specific course content) for each competency and dimension.	

		○ The assessment plan purpose = the two (2) or more measures used to assess competency-based student learning outcomes. • Required courses, or content all students are receiving, should be included in the matrix. ○ The matrix content features the program's guaranteed and consistent learning experiences for all students. ○ Not every course must appear on the matrix, only required courses with content strongly exemplifying each competency/dimension required for all specialization students. ○ Elective courses are **not** included on the matrix. ○ Content on the matrix must be delivered to all students. For example, if the program has a series of required courses in which a student must take 1 of 3 courses; then the same piece of content must be consistent across all 3 courses in order to include it in the matrix. ○ It is helpful to feature a spread of required courses from across the specialized curriculum. • Field education courses on the matrix: ○ The matrix should include *specific* course content. Thus, programs must identify required content applicable to and consistent for all students. ○ For example, field seminar content may be required, specific, and consistent for all students. ○ However, field education courses / setting-based placements may not feature required, specific, and consistent content for all students because learning opportunities typically differ across settings. ○ Programs should only include field education course content on the matrix that is the same for all students regardless of field setting / site-specific learning tasks / opportunities. • The curriculum matrix is **not** intended to serve as a comprehensive curricular map. Instead, it should include the strongest / best examples of competency-	

		based learning in the curriculum. **Not** every instance of competency-based learning in the curriculum.
		• Matrix content should complete the question: "The program is confident that we are preparing competent social work practitioners because they learn (dimension/s) of competency #(s) via (specific course content) in (class # and title)."
		  ○ For example, "The program is confident that we are preparing competent social work practitioners because they learn values and cognitive/effective processes of competency #1 & #2 via a Reflection Paper on Intersectionality, Identities, and Your Social Work Goals in SW 305: Social Work Practice in a Diverse & Global Society."
		• In the matrix, include a *brief* description of the course content, explaining what the specific content entails rather than only listing the content title.
		• Competencies 6-9 should be delineated by systems levels (e.g., individuals, families, groups, organizations, and/or communities) relevant to the specialization.
		  ○ Multiple systems levels may be connected to a single piece of course content, *as long as* the course content and description clearly links to the competency, dimensions, and systems levels identified.
		  ○ All systems levels must be represented at least once per competency.
		• A program may choose to add one (1) or more competencies unique to the program's context. If the program elects to add additional competencies, they should be included in the matrix.
		• All **four (4) dimensions** should be mapped to *each* competency, including any competencies added by the program.
		• Include page numbers in matrix, referring readers to Volume 2 (syllabi), and continuously paginate Volume 2 so that COA readers may easily crosscheck the specific course content with the syllabi.
		  ○ Title the specific course content consistently between the matrix and syllabi.	

		○ If the curriculum matrix is cited by the COA, the program will be asked to resubmit the syllabi. • Use labels to clearly address each component of the compliance statement within the matrix. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

Educational Policy 2.2—Signature Pedagogy: Field Education

Signature pedagogies are elements of instruction and of socialization that teach future practitioners the fundamental dimensions of professional work in their discipline—to think, to perform, and to act ethically and with integrity. Field education is the signature pedagogy for social work. The intent of field education is to integrate the theoretical and conceptual contribution of the classroom with the practical world of the practice setting. It is a basic precept of social work education that the two interrelated components of curriculum—classroom and field—are of equal importance within the curriculum, and each contributes to the development of the requisite competencies of professional practice. Field education is systematically designed, supervised, coordinated, and evaluated based on criteria by which students demonstrate the Social Work Competencies. Field education may integrate forms of technology as a component of the program.

Accreditation Standard 2.2—Field Education

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	COA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE *This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!*

2.2.1: The program explains how its field education program connects the theoretical and conceptual contributions of the classroom and field settings	Narrative explains how the program's field education program connects the theoretical and conceptual contributions of classroom and field across all program options.	• This is a discussion of how classroom instruction is linked to the field experience.
		• How are class and field intentionally integrated? Describe their symbiotic relationship using specific examples.
		  ○ Identify specific concepts and theories learned in a variety of courses, including but not limited to field seminar.
		  ○ It is insufficient to discuss field seminar only.
		• *Theory:* A set of principles that guide social work practice. These principles often reflect well-substantiated facts / evidence gathered through the scientific method / research and explain a phenomenon, condition, event, or observation. Theories seek to answer the question of "why?"
		  ○ Examples: systems theory, psychosocial development theory, social learning theory, etc.
		• *Concepts:* A general idea or principle rooted in social work practice.
		  ○ Examples: empowerment, anti-racist and anti-oppressive practice, human rights, self-care, social action, power dynamics, systemic issues,
			DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1
			
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3

		whole health and well-being, empathy, biopsychosocial-spiritual model, etc. ○ Language from the social work competencies may help identify key social work concepts as well as other resources such as social work dictionaries, peer-reviewed journals, NASW publications, etc. • Include examples of activities, assignments, etc. students complete that connect field and the classroom. ○ For example, do students participate in journaling? Any assignments that include students taking a case from field and incorporating it into a course assignment? Do students engage in process recordings, term papers, case-based analysis, critical self-reflective exercises, presentations, etc.? ○ What underlying theories and/or concepts are integrated into the examples? *How* do these examples allow students to integrate classroom-learned theories and concepts to practice in field? • For master's programs, discuss examples from both the generalist and specialized curriculums. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
B2.2.2: The program explains how its field education program provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities and illustrates how this is accomplished in field settings.	Narrative explains how the field education program provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities across all program options. Narrative illustrates how these generalist practice opportunities are	• This is a discussion about how the program ensures the field education experience captures the full scope of generalist practice. • Programs provide examples of how field-settings allow opportunities for students to practice competencies with the five (5) systems levels: individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. • Examples that assert students have opportunities to practice with all five (5) systems levels include: ○ *Mechanisms:* Learning agreements, field-setting contracts, memorandum of understanding, site visit agendas, field instructor orientation, etc.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**

	accomplished in field settings across all program options.	○ *Examples:* In a table format, select a few field-settings and provide multiple examples of tasks, roles, and/or opportunities relevant to each of the five (5) systems levels. One example is insufficient. Alternatively, provide various sample deidentified completed learning agreements. Examples do not need to be connected to a field agency; a general list of sample competency-based tasks may be provided. • Considering limited field practice opportunities in some areas, it is within the purview of the field education program to coach field sites to creatively meet the learning needs of students and ensure students experience the full scope of generalist practice. Learning opportunities are **not** expected to be consistent across field sites. Include relevant written policies from the program's field manual (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
M2.2.2: The program explains how its field education program provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities and illustrates how this is accomplished in field settings.	Narrative explains how the field education program provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities across all program options. Narrative illustrates how these generalist practice opportunities are accomplished in field settings across all program options.	• This is a discussion about how the program ensures the field education experience captures the full scope of generalist practice. • Programs provide examples of how field-settings allow opportunities for students to practice competencies with the five (5) systems levels: individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. • Examples that assert students have opportunities to practice with all five (5) systems levels include: ○ *Mechanisms:* Learning agreements, field-setting contracts, memorandum of understanding, site visit agendas, field instructor orientation, etc. ○ *Examples:* In a table format, select a few field-settings and provide multiple examples of tasks, roles, and/or opportunities relevant to each of the five (5) systems levels. One example is insufficient.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**

		○ Alternatively, provide various sample deidentified completed learning agreements. Examples do not need to be connected to a field agency; a general list of sample competency-based tasks may be provided. • Considering limited field practice opportunities in some areas, it is within the purview of the field education program to coach field sites to creatively meet the learning needs of students and ensure students experience the full scope of generalist practice. • Learning opportunities are **not** expected to be consistent across field sites. • Include relevant written policies from the program's field manual (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
M2.2.3: The program explains how its field education program provides specialized practice opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies within an area of specialized practice and illustrates how this is accomplished in field settings.	Narrative identifies how the program's field education program provides specialized opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies within an area of specialized practice across all program options. Narrative illustrates how these specialized practice opportunities are accomplished in field settings across all program options.	• This is a discussion about how the program ensures the field education experience captures the full scope of specialized practice opportunities. • Programs provide examples of how field-settings allow opportunities for students to practice competencies within an area of specialized practice. ○ For competencies 6-9, for each area of specialized practice, the relevant systems levels (i.e., individuals, families, groups, organizations, and/or communities) should be discussed and described. • Examples that assert students have opportunities to practice with all five (5) systems levels include: ○ *Mechanisms:* Learning agreements, field-setting contracts, memorandum of understanding, site visit agendas, field instructor orientation, etc. ○ *Examples:* In a table format, select a few field-settings and provide multiple examples of tasks, roles, and/or opportunities relevant to each of the five (5) systems levels. One example is insufficient. Alternatively,	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**

		provide various sample deidentified completed learning agreements. Examples do not need to be connected to a field agency; a general list of sample competency-based tasks may be provided. • Considering limited field practice opportunities in some areas, it is within the purview of the field education program to coach field sites to creatively meet the learning needs of students and ensure students experience the full scope of generalist practice. • Learning opportunities are **not** expected to be consistent across field sites. • Include relevant written policies from the program's field manual (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

2.2.4: The program explains how students across all program options in its field education program demonstrate social work competencies through in-person contact with clients and constituencies.	Narrative explains how students across all program options in the program's field education program demonstrate social work competencies through in-person contact with clients and constituencies.	• This is a discussion of how the field education program ensures demonstration of social work competencies is through in-person contact, which refers to interpersonal interactions with clients and constituencies, and may include the use of digital technologies.
		  ○ In-person contact is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS.
		• Clients and constituencies are those served by social workers including individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities (defined on pg. 20 of the EPAS).
		• Students must be interacting with humans, **not** simulations, avatars, etc.
		  ○ Simulation may supplement the student's education, but not replace required field experience hours.
		  ○ How does the program ensure students are completing required field education hours within field-settings rather than simulated practice situations?
		• There is neither a minimum requirement regarding in-person/direct client contact hours nor a maximum regarding virtual client contact hours.
			DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1
			
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3

		• Provide examples of how this is accomplished. • How does the program ensure in-person contact is accomplished? Via a mechanism (e.g., learning agreements, field-setting contracts, etc.)? How is the mechanism reviewed to verify in-person contact is occurring? • Include relevant written policies from the program's field manual (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

2.2.5: The program describes how its field education program provides a minimum of 400 hours of field education for baccalaureate programs and a minimum of 900 hours for master's programs.	Narrative describes how the program's field education program provides a minimum of 400 hours of field education for baccalaureate programs across all program options.
	
	Narrative describes how the program's field education program provides a minimum of 900 hours for master's programs across all program options.
		• Where in the curriculum are students completing field education hours?
		  ○ Frequency and format of field hours is within the purview of the program to design.
		  ○ Examples: junior year, senior year, begin the 1st term, wait until 2nd term, 16 hours per week for 3 terms, 10 hours in-person weekly and 5 hours of virtual, fall and spring only, year-round, concurrent placements, summer block placements, etc.)
		• It is within the purview of the program to select the number of field settings, organizations, and agencies in which students complete their required field hours.
		  ○ For example, programs may permit students to complete all required hours at one field setting; one field setting for generalist practice and a different field setting for specialized practice; a different field setting each semester, etc.
		• For master's programs, it is within the purview of the program to determine the number of generalist-level field education hours and the number of specialized field education hours.
		• Master's programs may accept students' generalist field education hours completed in their baccalaureate social work programs to ensure students are not repeating their previous achievements (required per AS M3.1.1).
		• Master's programs with advanced standing status option, must discuss how the program ensures that
			DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1
			
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3

		advanced standing students complete a total of 900 field education hours between their accredited baccalaureate and master's social work programs. ○ For example, students complete 400 hours of field education at the baccalaureate level and 500 hours of field education at the master's level, for a total of 900 hours. • Remote/virtual field activity has always been permitted. • The following may be counted toward the minimum field hours required if such activities are based on enhancing student social work competence: field supervision and field seminar classroom meeting time. • Simulated practice situations may supplement the student's education, but not replace required field experience hours. • There is no minimum nor maximum number of field hours required for students to practice with each system level (e.g., individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities) in field settings. Hours do not need to be distributed evenly across the system levels; rather students should have exposure to and opportunities to practice the competencies with across the system levels. • If a program offers a supplemental experience in field, but labels it as experiential learning, exploratory, junior field, pre-field, etc. these hours may be counted toward the minimum hours required as long as the supplemental experience complies with all the standards under **AS 2.2**. • Programs may consider implementing a mechanism for students to track or log field hours completed; however, this is at the discretion of the program and not required. • Include relevant written policies from the program's field manual (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
2.2.6: The program provides its criteria for admission into field education and explains	Narrative provides the program's criteria for admission into field	• Detail all criteria for admission to field education.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1**

how its field education program admits only those students who have met the program's specified criteria.	education across all program options. Narrative explains how the program's field education program admits only those students who have met the program's specified criteria across all program options.	○ Criteria may be found in the student handbook, field manual, and/or on the application itself. ○ For example, criteria may include admission to field upon admission to the social work program, prerequisite course work, interview, essay, minimum GPA, reviewing relevant professional codes of conduct, field manual, or preparatory materials, completion of online learning modules, etc. • Programs can simultaneously admit students into both the program and field education and use the same criteria and process for both. • Discuss the process for implementing those criteria. • It is helpful to explain how any dispositional criteria (e.g., personal essays, interviews, readiness for field, professional maturity/behaviors, etc.) are evaluated. • Does the program have a mechanism for ensuring only students who have met the criteria are admitted into field? • Include relevant written policies from the program's field manual (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**
2.2.7: The program describes how its field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for selecting field settings; placing and monitoring students; supporting student safety; and evaluating student learning and field setting effectiveness congruent with the social work competencies.	Narrative describes how the program's field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for selecting field settings across all program options. Narrative describes how the program's field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for placing and monitoring students across all program options.	• This is a full discussion of the administration of the field education program. Much of this material may be adaptable from the program's field manual and related documents. • For each component of this standard be sure to discuss policies, criteria, and procedures separately. There are 18 components to this standard. Detail separate *policies*, *procedures*, **<u>and</u>** *criteria* for: ○ Selecting field-settings ○ Placing students ○ Monitoring students ○ Supporting student safety ○ Evaluating student learning ○ Evaluating field-setting effectiveness • Definitions of policies, procedures, and criteria	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**

	Narrative describes how the program's field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for supporting student safety across all program options. Narrative describes how the program's field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for evaluating student learning and field setting effectiveness congruent with the social work competencies, including any additional competencies added by the program across all program options.	○ Policy: A rule or regulation. The specific written policy that is published and available to stakeholders and ensures continuity even with turnover. ○ Procedures: Series of steps or actions. The specific steps undertaken by the program to implement the policy. ○ Criteria: Principles or standards for decision making or the minimum benchmarks for evaluation. • Students can assist in locating their own field placements. ○ In such cases, programs must ensure that the student-identified field settings meet the program's policies, procedures, and criteria for selecting qualified field settings. • Out-of-state and international field placements: Programs are solely responsible for complying with all field standards (**AS 2.2**), ensuring out-of-state and international field settings meet the programs requirements, and verifying that such settings can offer competency-based field experiences. Programs should also confirm that their scope (as defined by their institution, state-based higher education authority, and/or regional accreditor) allows them to place students out-of-state or internationally. Programs are also advised to inquire with their state's licensing board regarding any post-degree practice implications. • The format and frequency of field instructors providing supervision to students is within the purview of the program. ○ For example, students may meet with their field instructor individually, in a group setting, weekly, monthly, 1-hour sessions, 30-minute check-ins, in-person, virtually, etc. ○ There are no requirements regarding frequency (weekly, biweekly, monthly, etc.), modality (in-person, videoconferencing, telephone, additional time added to the end of field seminar, etc.), or individual versus	

		group structure for field supervision by a qualified field instructor or through reinforcement by the program (AS B/M 2.2.9). • Separately discuss evaluating student learning *and* evaluating field-setting effectiveness. • Evaluating field-setting effectiveness congruent with the social work competencies refers to evaluating the field-setting **not** the student. ○ How does the program ensure field education settings can provide students with safe, meaningful, and quality competency-based learning experiences? ○ Examples: students evaluate their field setting offerings, tasks, and options for fulfilling the competencies via a survey or focus group in field seminar; field liaisons collect information during their visits or through scheduled interviews/touch points with students; field director conducts an annual survey or visit to review and renew the site and field instructors' ability to provide a safe competency-based field placement; etc. • Policies, criteria, and procedures for supporting student safety is new to 2015 **EPAS**. • For example, supporting student safety may include offering limited liability insurance for students, field site-specific safety training onsite, discussions on agenda for site visits, orientation training, online training modules, review of learning agreements, promoting access to health facilities and/or mental health services, training students on awareness of burnout, compassion fatigue, transference and other concepts that affect the social worker's health and safety when working with clients, structured activities in field seminar or check-in points such as journaling, discussion, structured dialogue, etc. ○ Regarding criteria for supporting field-based student safety: Since a criterion is a principle or standard by which something	

		may be judged or decided, it can be helpful to consider what elements signify student safety in field settings? What does an unsafe field setting look like? What protections can the program put in place to maintain quality field settings where safety is a priority? What standards does the social work program expect their partner field settings to uphold to ensure safety in the learning environment? • Include relevant written policies, criteria, and procedures from the program's field manual. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
2.2.8: The program describes how its field education program maintains contact with field settings across all program options. The program explains how on-site contact or other methods are used to monitor student learning and field setting effectiveness.	Narrative describes how the program's field education program maintains contact with field settings across all program options. Narrative explains how on-site contact or other methods are used to monitor student learning and field setting effectiveness across all program options.	• This is a full discussion of the administration of the field education program. Much of this material may be adaptable from the program's field manual and related documents. • If onsite contact with field sites is not possible for some or all students, specify for which student populations (online, abroad, beyond a defined local perimeter, etc.) onsite contact is not possible and explain how contact is maintained. • The number of site visits is within the purview of the program to determine. • Discuss *how* the field education program maintains contact, who conducts visits, how often, what format, etc. • Include relevant written policies from the program's field manual (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**
B2.2.9: The program describes how its field education program specifies the credentials and practice experience of its field	Narrative describes how the program's field education program specifies the credentials and practice experience of its field	• This is a discussion of the program's specified minimum credentials for field instructors. • The COA nor EPAS address licensing of field personnel. Such criteria are beyond accreditation and within the purview of the program.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**

instructors necessary to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program social work competencies. Field instructors for baccalaureate students hold a baccalaureate or master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-social work degree practice experience in social work. For cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited social work degree or does not have the required experience, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.	instructors necessary to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program social work competencies across all program options.
	
	Narrative demonstrates that field instructors for baccalaureate students across all program options hold a baccalaureate or master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-social work degree practice experience in social work.
	
	Narrative demonstrates that for cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited social work degree or does not have the required experience, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective across all program options.
	
	Narrative describes how the social work perspective is reinforced across all program options.
		• Does the program ensure field instructors for baccalaureate students hold a baccalaureate or master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-social work degree practice experience in social work?
		  ○ Typically, most field instructors meet the minimum credential requirements of this standard and any additional requirements established by the program. However, there are two (2) alternatives to meeting this standard when a credentialed field instructor is not available in the field setting.
		  ○ Alternative #1: Field instructors may have a CASWE-accredited degree (from the Canadian social work accreditor, recognized through an MOU with CSWE and CASWE) or an internationally earned ISWDRES-evaluated degree; and 2-years post degree practice experience in social work.
		  ○ Alternative #2: For cases in which a credentialed field instructor is not available in the field setting, the program assigns a social worker to reinforce the social work perspective directly with the student(s).
		• Post–social work degree practice experience is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS.
		• How does the program ensure field instructors meet the specified credentials? (i.e., collecting CVs from field instructors, field instructors complete a form, information is collected, reviewed, and stored in database or personnel files, etc.). It is helpful to explain the review process and who verifies the credentials.
		• The program must have a process to address reinforcement of a social work perspective even if the program only employs credentialed field instructors as an exception may occur.
		  ○ Even in cases where programs work only with credentialed field instructors in field-settings, the program is still expected to address how the it assumes responsibility	

		for reinforcing a social work perspective and describe how this is accomplished. ○ There may be quality placements, yet not credentialed field instructor onsite. ○ A field instructor could suddenly vacate their position during a student's field experience. ○ The program should be prepared with a process for managing such cases. • Reinforcement must occur directly with the student and **not** indirectly with the field instructor. • Field seminar may **not** be used to reinforce the social work perspective for cases in which a field instructor does not have the specified credentials. ○ Students without a credentialed field instructor must receive social work perspective reinforcement *above and beyond* what all students receive in field seminar. ○ Alternatively, field seminar instructors may add additional supervision time to the end of the seminar class for students who do not have the credentialed field instructor. • Would someone at the institution or in the community provide supervision for the student? ○ For example, faculty, field liaisons, field seminar instructors, credentialed community practitioners, credentialed local alumni, etc. may serve as field instructor and meet individually or with a group of students weekly, monthly, etc. • Would there be a task supervisor onsite at the field-setting for the student to work with on a daily basis? • Details must be provided to understand how reinforcement is accomplished. A declarative statement that reinforcement occurs with an alternative supervisor is insufficient. • *Note for **AS 4.0.1**:* The social worker reinforcing the social work perspective must assess or be involved jointly in the assessment of student attainment of social work competencies.	

		• If a program offers a supplemental experience in field, but labels it as experiential learning, exploratory, junior field, pre-field, etc. or separate from the formal field education program described under **AS 2.2**, the supplemental experience does **not** need to comply with **AS B/M2.2.9**, as long as the program has a formal field education experience that complies with all the standards under **AS 2.2**. • Include relevant written policies from the program's field manual (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

M2.2.9: The program describes how its field education program specifies the credentials and practice experience of its field instructors necessary to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program social work competencies. Field instructors for master's students hold a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-master's social work practice experience. For cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited social work degree or does not have the required experience, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.	Narrative describes how the program's field education program specifies the credentials and practice experience of its field instructors necessary to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program social work competencies across all program options.
	
	Narrative demonstrates that field instructors for master's students across all program options hold a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-master's social work degree practice experience in social work.
	
	Narrative demonstrates that for cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited master's
		• This is a discussion of the program's specified minimum credentials for field instructors.
		• The COA nor EPAS address licensing of field personnel. Such criteria are beyond accreditation and within the purview of the program.
		• Does the program ensure field instructors for field instructors for master's students hold a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-master's social work practice experience?
		  ○ Typically, most field instructors meet the minimum credential requirements of this standard and any additional requirements established by the program. However, there are two (2) alternatives to meeting this standard when a credentialed field instructor is not available in the field setting.
		  ○ Alternative #1: Field instructors may have a CASWE-accredited degree (from the Canadian social work accreditor, recognized through an MOU with CSWE and CASWE) or an internationally earned ISWDRES-evaluated degree; and 2-years post degree practice experience in social work.
		  ○ Alternative #2: For cases in which a credentialed field instructor is not available
			DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1
			
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3

	social work degree or does not have the required experience, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective across all program options. Narrative describes how the social work perspective is reinforced in such cases across all program options.	in the field setting, the program assigns a social worker to reinforce the social work perspective directly with the student(s). • Post–social work degree practice experience is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • How does the program ensure field instructors meet the specified credentials? (i.e., collecting CVs from field instructors, field instructors complete a form, information is collected, reviewed, and stored in database or personnel files, etc.). It is helpful to explain the review process and who verifies the credentials. • The program must have a process to address reinforcement of a social work perspective even if the program only employs credentialed field instructors as an exception may occur. o Even in cases where programs work only with credentialed field instructors in field-settings, the program is still expected to address how it assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective and describe how this is accomplished. o There may be quality placements, yet not credentialed field instructor onsite. o A field instructor could suddenly vacate their position during a student's field experience. o The program should be prepared with a process for managing such cases. • Reinforcement must occur directly with the student and **not** indirectly with the field instructor. • Field seminar may **not** be used to reinforce the social work perspective for cases in which a field instructor does not have the specified credentials. o Students without a credentialed field instructor must receive social work perspective reinforcement *above and beyond* what all students receive in field seminar. o Alternatively, field seminar instructors may add additional supervision time to the end	

		of the seminar class for students who do not have the credentialed field instructor. • Would someone at the institution or in the community provide supervision for the student? ○ For example, faculty, field liaisons, field seminar instructors, credentialed community practitioners, credentialed local alumni, etc. may serve as field instructor and meet individually or with a group of students weekly, monthly, etc. • Would there be a task supervisor onsite at the field-setting for the student to work with on a daily basis? • Details must be provided to understand how reinforcement is accomplished. A declarative statement that reinforcement occurs with an alternative supervisor is insufficient. • *Note for **AS 4.0.1**:* The social worker reinforcing the social work perspective must assess or be involved jointly in the assessment of student attainment of social work competencies. • If a program offers a supplemental experience in field, but labels it as experiential learning, exploratory, pre-field, etc. or separate from the formal field education program described under **AS 2.2**, the supplemental experience does **not** need to comply with **AS B/M2.2.9**, as long as the program has a formal field education experience that complies with all the standards under **AS 2.2**. • Include relevant written policies from the program's field manual (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
2.2.10: The program describes how its field education program provides orientation, field instruction training, and continuing dialog with field education	Narrative describes how the program's field education program provides orientation, field instruction training, and continuing dialog with field education	• This discussion details how new field instructors are recruited, oriented, and trained, as well as a description of ongoing modes of contact with instructors and settings. • Discuss orientation, field instruction training, and continuing dialog separately.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**

settings and field instructors.	settings and field instructors across all program options.	• Programs may combine orientation and field instruction training and explicitly state if this model is employed. • Identify for whom orientation and training are provided. For example: Is orientation for new instructors only? Is orientation an annual refresher training for all field instructors? Are trainings regularly offered to new and returning field instructors? • Identify the orientation and training formats. For example: Is orientation in-person or virtual? Is it primarily in-person yet recorded and shared with those unable to attend or located a distance away from the main campus? Are alternative formats offered for field instructors who are unable to attend? • This standard focuses on the relationship between the program and the field instructor **not** the field instructor and the students they supervise. • Include relevant written policies from the program's field manual (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
2.2.11: The program describes how its field education program develops policies regarding field placements in an organization in which the student is also employed. To ensure the role of student as learner, student assignments and field education supervision are not the same as those of the student's employment.	Narrative describes how the field education program develops policies regarding field placements in an organization in which the student is also employed across all program options. Narrative describes how assignments and field education supervision are not the same as those of the student's employment across all program options.	• This is a discussion of policies for managing field placements in settings in which the student is also employed. • Student field assignments and employment tasks may be the same and counted toward required field hours if the tasks have clear links to the social work competencies, including any competencies added by the program, and their related behaviors. • The field instructor and employment supervisor of a student may be the same person. In such cases, supervision time for field education learning must be separate from supervision time for employment. • While these options are permissible, each program has the autonomy, authority, and discretion to develop its own policies regarding field placements in an organization in which the student is also employed. These interpretations present options, not requirements.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1 (Including Field Manual in Volume 3)** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3 (Including Field Manual in Volume 3)**

		• Paid field placements in any form (e.g., salary, stipend, etc.) are permitted Payment may include both hours spent in field and/or in employment. • Include relevant written policies from the program's field manual. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

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.

Educational Policy 3.0—Diversity

The program's expectation for diversity is reflected in its learning environment, which provides the context through which students learn about differences, to value and respect diversity, and develop a commitment to cultural humility. The dimensions of diversity are understood as the intersectionality of multiple factors including but not limited to age, class, color, culture, disability and ability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, marital status, political ideology, race, religion/ spirituality, sex, sexual orientation, and tribal sovereign status. The learning environment consists of the program's institutional setting; selection of field education settings and their clientele; composition of program advisory or field committees; educational and social resources; resource allocation; program leadership; speaker series, seminars, and special programs; support groups; research and other initiatives; and the demographic make-up of its faculty, staff, and student body.

Accreditation Standard 3.0—Diversity

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	COA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE *This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!*
3.0.1: The program describes the specific and continuous efforts it makes to provide a learning environment that models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference.	Narrative describes the specific and continuous efforts the program makes to provide a learning environment that models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference across all program options.	• The curriculum is a component of the learning environment; however, given that this standard falls within the implicit curriculum the emphasis is upon activities and efforts *beyond* the classroom that maximize attention to diversity and difference throughout the entire program learning environment. • The focus of this standard is on how every component of program operations, *outside* of formal class and field offerings, reflect attention and commitment to diversity. • Per **EP 3.0**, *"The learning environment consists of the program's institutional setting; selection of field*	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**

		education settings and their clientele; composition of program advisory or field committees; educational and social resources; resource allocation; program leadership; speaker series, seminars, and special programs; support groups; research and other initiatives; and the demographic make-up of its faculty, staff, and student body." • Include examples of the specific efforts the program makes to provide a learning environment that models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference. For example, extracurricular programs, events, conferences, speaker series, initiatives, student organization projects, culture/climate work, scholarship programs, community partnerships, etc. • The program may discuss major contextual features unique to the program's location. • The program may discuss a variety of dimensions of diversity and their intersectionality per **EP 3.0**, however, programs do **not** need to discuss every dimension of diversity. • The program may discuss collaborations with the broader institution and/or other departments; however, the program must explicitly explain their active role in those efforts. • The focus of this standard is on the efforts specific to the program-level (i.e., baccalaureate or master's) rather than the school/department-level. • There is less emphasis on demographics and statistics of faculty, administration, and students. Rather the focus is upon diversity and difference efforts in the implicit curriculum (*outside* of the classroom) that contribute to and shape the learning environment. • It is helpful to think of the diversity standards as interconnected using a *What, So What, and Now What?* model. AS 3.0.1 identifies what the program is currently doing to prioritize diversity efforts in the implicit curriculum (What?); AS 3.0.2 identifies the impact of those diversity implicit curriculum efforts (So What?); and AS 3.0.3 identifies what the program will do in the future to continue to prioritize diversity efforts in the implicit curriculum (Now What?).	

		• Include relevant written policies (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
3.0.2: The program explains how these efforts provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment.	Narrative explains how these efforts provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment across all program options.	• This discussion should demonstrate that attention to diversity and difference is a high priority. • The program should describe how efforts described in response to **AS 3.0.1,** provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment. • What does the learning environment look like as a result of the efforts discussed in **AS 3.0.1**? What is the impact? Describe the setting/culture as a result of programmatic diversity-centered efforts. • The discussion expands beyond demographic and statistical diversity; however, it may be supported by data. • The program may discuss a variety of dimensions of diversity and their intersectionality per **EP 3.0**, however, programs do **not** need to discuss every dimension of diversity. • It is helpful to think of the diversity standards as interconnected using a *What, So What, and Now What?* model. AS 3.0.1 identifies what the program is currently doing to prioritize diversity efforts in the implicit curriculum (What?); AS 3.0.2 identifies the impact of those diversity implicit curriculum efforts (So What?); and AS 3.0.3 identifies what the program will do in the future to continue to prioritize diversity efforts in the implicit curriculum (Now What?). • Include relevant written policies (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**
3.0.3: The program describes specific plans to continually improve the learning environment to affirm and support persons with diverse identities.	Narrative describes specific plans to continually improve the learning environment to affirm and support persons with diverse identities across all program options.	• This is a discussion of the program's plans to improve attention to diversity and difference. • Describe how the learning environment emphasizes attention to the dimensions of diversity described in **EP 3.0**. • Discuss specific plans moving forward/on the horizon.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3**

		• Programs must describe new specific plans, rather than continuing current operations only. • It is helpful to think of the diversity standards as interconnected using a *What, So What, and Now What?* model. AS 3.0.1 identifies what the program is currently doing to prioritize diversity efforts in the implicit curriculum (What?); AS 3.0.2 identifies the impact of those diversity implicit curriculum efforts (So What?); and AS 3.0.3 identifies what the program will do in the future to continue to prioritize diversity efforts in the implicit curriculum (Now What?). • Include relevant written policies (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

Educational Policy 3.1—Student Development

Educational preparation and commitment to the profession are essential qualities in the admission and development of students for professional practice. Student participation in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs are important for students' professional development. To promote the social work education continuum, graduates of baccalaureate social work programs admitted to master's social work programs are presented with an articulated pathway toward specialized practice.

Accreditation Standard 3.1—Student Development: Admissions; Advisement, Retention, and Termination; and Student Participation

Admissions

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	COA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE *This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!*
B3.1.1: The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program.	Narrative identifies the criteria the program uses for admission to the social work program across all program options.	• Also address transfer student admission information. • Programs can simultaneously admit students into both the institution and program, using the same criteria and process for both. Explicitly state if this is the case and list the criteria. • International students: Baccalaureate programs may admit international students as long as the program follows their institution's, state-based higher education authority's, and/or regional accreditor's policies and procedures for admitting international students. • Include relevant written policies (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**
M3.1.1: The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program. The criteria for admission to the master's program must	Narrative identifies the criteria the program uses for admission to the social work program across all program options.	• Also address transfer student admission information. • Programs can simultaneously admit students into both the institution and program, using the same criteria and process for both. Explicitly state if this is the case and list the criteria.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

include an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association. Baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs are not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.	Narrative demonstrates the criteria for admission to the master's program include an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association across all program options. Narrative demonstrates that baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs are not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs across all program options.	• International students: Programs may admit international students as long as the program follows their institution's, state-based higher education authority's, and/or regional accreditor's policies and procedures for admitting international students. • Programs must have a process / mechanism for ensuring that baccalaureate social work graduates do not repeat their undergraduate social work achievements. Lack of a process / mechanism is not acceptable. • How does the program ensure baccalaureate social work graduates do not repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs? Is there a specific process the program employs when reviewing baccalaureate social work graduates' applications? Is there a separate application? • This process/mechanism is within the purview of the program to determine. Examples include: minimum GPA, earning a B or better in a social work course, review of transcripts, passing a placement or equivalency exam, qualifying for advanced standing status, etc. • Programs may identify advanced standing admission as the process/mechanism through which they ensure previous achievements are not repeated. • It is within each program's discretion to determine whether they wish to include the following students in their process or mechanism for ensuring achievements are not repeated: o Graduates from unaccredited baccalaureate social work programs o International graduates without a Canadian Association for Social Work Education (CASWE)-accredited degree (from the Canadian social work accreditor, recognized through a memorandum of understanding with CSWE and CASWE) • International graduates without an internationally earned International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Service-evaluated degreeInclude relevant written policies (if applicable).	

		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
3.1.2: The program describes the policies and procedures for evaluating applications and notifying applicants of the decision and any contingent conditions associated with admission.	Narrative describes the policies and procedures for evaluating admission applications across all program options. Narrative describes the policies and procedures for notifying applicants of the admission decision across all program options. Narrative describes the policies and procedures for notifying applicants of any contingent conditions associated with admission across all program options.	• Provide relevant written policies ***and*** procedures for evaluating admissions application, notifying applicants of admission decisions, and for notifying applicants of any contingent conditions associated with admission. • Programs can elect to rely on the institution's application, evaluation, and notification policies and procedures. Explicitly state if this is the case and include written policies and procedures. • It is helpful to explain how any dispositional criteria (e.g., personal essays, interviews, professional maturity/behaviors, etc.) are evaluated. • How are applicants notified when they are/not admitted to the program? Email? A letter in the post? • Explicitly address conditional / contingent admissions. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**
M3.1.3: The program describes the policies and procedures used for awarding advanced standing. The program indicates that advanced standing is awarded only to graduates holding degrees from baccalaureate social work programs accredited by CSWE, recognized through its International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Services***, or covered under a memorandum of understanding with international social work accreditors.	Narrative describes the policies and procedures used for awarding advanced standing across all program options. Narrative indicates that advanced standing is awarded only to graduates holding degrees from baccalaureate social work programs accredited by CSWE, those recognized through its International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Service, or covered under a memorandum of understanding with	• Provide relevant written policies ***and*** procedures. • ***This and all references to degrees from social work programs accredited by CSWE, include degrees from CSWE-accredited programs or recognized through CSWE's International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Service, or covered under a memorandum of understanding with international social work accreditors. CSWE currently has one memorandum of understanding with the social work accreditor in Canada (CASWE). ○ The program's written policies and procedures must include advanced standing eligibility for graduates holding degrees from baccalaureate social work programs accredited by CSWE, recognized through its International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Services, or covered under a memorandum	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

	international social work accreditors across all program options.	of understanding with international social work accreditors. • Master's programs may elect to contingently grant advanced standing status to students that graduated from a baccalaureate social work program in candidacy *as long as* the program receives initial accreditation while the student in enrolled in the master's program. ○ In such cases, students cannot be fully awarded advanced standing status until they can document that their baccalaureate social work program was granted initial accreditation and that accredited status covers their degree. ○ This affects students graduating close to / immediately before the baccalaureate program's initial accreditation date. ○ Candidacy programs are encouraged to graduate their first cohort as close to their initial accreditation date as possible. ○ Each master's program has the autonomy to select and implement their own admissions and advanced standing policies and procedures. • Programs may not offer advanced standing only programs. Master's social work programs must offer / meet accreditation standards for both generalist and specialized practice. ○ As long as the program offers its full curriculum for at least one program option; a second program option can be advanced standing only. • Programs may offer fulltime and/or part-time plans of study to advanced standing students. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
3.1.4: The program describes its policies and procedures concerning the transfer of credits.	Narrative describes the program's policies and procedures concerning the	• Transfer of credits is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • Provide relevant written policies *and* procedures. • Transfer credit policies and procedures are within the purview of the program.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

	transfer of credits across all program options.	• Programs may adopt the institutional transfer credit policies and procedures; however, they must also address the transfer of field education and practice course credits from other CSWE-accredited or candidate social work programs. Explicitly state if this is the case and include the written policies and procedures.
		• Programs may only accept field education and practice course transfer credits from other CSWE-accredited or candidate social work programs.
		  ○ If the program accepts field education and practice course transfer credits from programs **not** accredited by CSWE, it must explain how the program assesses course equivalency to comply with all **AS 2.2** (field education) standards and **AS 3.2.2** (practice course instructor qualifications).
		  ○ While transfer credit policies and procedures do not need to explicitly state this, documentation cannot oppose / violate that interpretation.
		• Non-practice course transfer credits, for required or elective courses, are within the program's purview to accept or not.
		• Discuss the procedures for reviewing transcripts and determining course equivalency.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

3.1.5: The program submits its written policy indicating that it does not grant social work course credit for life experience or previous work experience. The program documents how it informs applicants and other constituents of this policy.	Narrative submits the program's written policy indicating that it does not grant social work course credit for life experience or previous work experience across all program options. Narrative documents how the program informs	• Provide relevant written policies. • "Course credit" refers to course credit hours granted by the institution and social work program, not specific elements, activities, or assignments within an individual course.How are stakeholders notified of the policy? For example, via the website, student handbook, prospective student materials, etc. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

	applicants and other constituents of this policy across all program options.	• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
Advisement, Retention, and Termination			
3.1.6: The program describes its academic and professional advising policies and procedures. Professional advising is provided by social work program faculty, staff, or both.	Narrative describes the program's academic and professional advising policies and procedures across all program options. Narrative documents that professional advising is provided by social work program faculty, staff, or both across all program options.	• Provide relevant written policies *and* procedures. • Address *both* academic *and* professional advising. ○ Absence of professional advising policies and procedures is insufficient. • Professional advising may include field education supports, but also expands beyond field education. • Examples include professional coaching, career development, licensing prep, interviewing tips, career materials prep such as a resumes, portfolio, online professional presence, facilitating networking, connecting students to informational interviews, providing guidance in preparing research, publications, or presentations at professional conferences, support in preparing a final product, thesis, or dissertation, providing feedback and professional development resources, etc. • Professional advising typically focuses upon post-graduation preparation for entry into the profession. • Programs frequently discuss professional and academic advising together, however, for the purposes of this standard it is important to discuss how professional and academic advising are differentiated. • Specify who provides both academic and professional advising to students (i.e., faculty, staff). • Academic advising may be done within the social work program or centralized through the institution. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**
3.1.7: The program submits its policies and procedures for evaluating student's	Narrative submits the program's policies and procedures for evaluating	• Provide relevant written policies *and* procedures. • Grading scales are within the purview of program, institution, and/or other regulatory bodies such as the	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1**

academic and professional performance, including grievance policies and procedures. The program describes how it informs students of its criteria for evaluating their academic and professional performance and its policies and procedures for grievance.	student's academic and professional performance, including grievance policies and procedures, across all program options. Narrative describes how the program informs students of the program's criteria for evaluating their academic and professional performance and its policies and procedures for grievance across all program options.	state-based higher education authority and/or regional accreditor. • Professional performance criteria may include adhering to an educational or professional code of conduct, code of ethics, or behavioral expectations. • This discussion expands beyond field education as students are expected demonstrate professionalism in other spaces. Beyond field-settings may include the classroom, committees, student organizations, extracurricular activities, etc. • Provide student grievance policies and procedures. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**
3.1.8: The program submits its policies and procedures for terminating a student's enrollment in the social work program for reasons of academic and professional performance. The program describes how it informs students of these policies and procedures.	Narrative submits the program's policies and procedures for terminating a student's enrollment in the social work program for reasons of academic and professional performance across all program options. Narrative describes how the program informs students of these policies and procedures across all program options.	• Provide relevant written policies *and* procedures. • Address *both* academic *and* professional performance. • Programs can elect to rely on the institution's termination policies and procedures. Explicitly state if this is the case and include written policies and procedures. ○ In such cases, programs may reflect on their institution's policies and procedures for termination due to professional performance. Since social work is a professional degree granting program, are there specific professional behaviors or issues that would cause termination that are unique/specific to social work not covered in the institution's policies and procedures (e.g., violating the code of ethics)? • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**
Student Participation			
3.1.9: The program submits its policies and procedures specifying students' rights	Narrative describes the program's policies and procedures specifying	• Provide relevant written policies *and* procedures.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1**

and opportunities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs.	students' rights and opportunities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs for each program option.	• The focus of this standard is on program-level (i.e., baccalaureate or master's) specific information rather than the school/department-level. • It can be helpful to consider "rights" as what is codified in policy and "opportunities" as the specific procedures / steps for how students participate. • Examples include participation on standing committees, administrative meetings with the student body/union, town hall meetings, participation in faculty governance/meetings, etc. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**
3.1.10: The program describes how it provides opportunities and encourages students to organize in their interests.	Narrative demonstrates how the program provides opportunities and encourages students to organize in their interests for each program option.	• The focus of this standard is on program-level (i.e., baccalaureate or master's) specific information rather than the school/department-level. • Programs may discuss student organizations that allow social work students to organize in their interests. • Examples include student union, social work club, social work honor society, social justice fairs, activism events, and other creative ways to help students organize in their interests. • Include relevant written policies (if applicable). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1 (Including Student Handbook in Volume 3)** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3 (Including Student Handbook in Volume 3)**

Educational Policy 3.2—Faculty

Faculty qualifications, including experience related to the Social Work Competencies, an appropriate student-faculty ratio, and sufficient faculty to carry out a program's mission and goals, are essential for developing an educational environment that promotes, emulates, and teaches students the knowledge, values, and skills expected of professional social workers. Through their teaching, research, scholarship, and service—as well as their interactions with one another, administration, students, and community—the program's faculty models the behavior and values expected of professional social workers. Programs demonstrate that faculty is qualified to teach the courses to which they are assigned.

Accreditation Standard 3.2—Faculty

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	COA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE *This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!*

3.2.1: The program identifies each full- and part-time social work faculty member and discusses his or her qualifications, competence, expertise in social work education and practice, and years of service to the program.	The program submits a complete faculty summary form and uniform faculty data forms (CVs) for each full- or part-time faculty member teaching in the current academic year inclusive of faculty across all program options.	• **REQUIRED FORM:** The CSWE website houses the required *Faculty Summary Form*.
		  ○ For institutions with both baccalaureate and master's programs, one form may be completed for both programs listing all faculty. The final column on the form ensures the program lists the percentage of time assigned to each program level.
		  ○ Beyond combining program info on this form, the remainder of the faculty standards and self-study must be specific to the program level – baccalaureate or master's – not both.
		• **REQUIRED FORM:** The CSWE website houses the required *Faculty Data Form* (CV template).
		  ○ Faculty can use a different format for their CVs, as long as the format is uniform and includes all the components of the faculty data form.
		  ○ CVs must include the month/year degrees were earned and dates for all experiences documented in order to verify the requisite degree and post-degree practice was earned for **AS 3.2.2** and other accreditation standards
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1, 2, and 3

		• Information provided for each faculty member should be consistent on the required *Faculty Summary Form* and faculty data forms (CVs). • Include faculty who taught during the academic year reflected in the self-study. Prior to submission, make any updates to reflect the faculty composition at the time of the submission of the self-study. • A narrative or autobiographical sketch is **not** required for each faculty member. • The COA nor EPAS address licensing of social work faculty. Such criteria are beyond accreditation and within the purview of the program. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
3.2.2: The program documents that faculty who teach social work practice courses have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post–master's social work degree practice experience.	Narrative identifies and documents that faculty who teach social work practice courses have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post–master's social work degree practice experience across all program options.	• Narrative should affirm that faculty who teach social work practice courses have the requisite credentials. • Faculty teaching practice courses may have a CSWE-accredited degree, CASWE-accredited degree (from the Canadian social work accreditor, recognized through an MOU with CSWE and CASWE) or an internationally earned ISWDRES-evaluated degree; and 2-years post degree practice experience in social work. • The list of faculty that teach social work practice courses should be consistent with the information reported on the faculty summary form. • If the program identifies that all faculty have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post–master's social work degree practice experience on the faculty summary form and faculty data forms (CVs), the program does **not** need to list the individual names of the faculty that teach practice courses. • Faculty data forms (CVs) must include the month/year degrees were earned and dates for all experiences documented in order to verify the requisite degree and post-degree practice was earned. • Post–social work degree practice experience is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1, 2, and 3**

		○ Through documentation on the CVs, programs must make the case for what experience is considered post-degree practice in accordance with the EPAS definition. Accreditation staff cannot evaluate nor determine if specific faculty experience(s) count towards the 2-year minimum. ○ It is within the purview of the program to calculate the total hours of full-time / equivalent post-degree practice experience. • It is within the purview of the program to define which courses they consider to be social work practice courses. Examples include: ○ Field education courses ○ Courses with the term "practice" in the title (e.g., practice with individuals and families, practice with organizations and communities, etc.) ○ Courses that are focused on any stage of intervention with client, constituent, and community systems ○ Courses where most of the curriculum / content provides hands-on / experiential opportunities for students to develop and test their skills to prepare them for competent and safe post-degree practice (e.g., therapeutic relationship skills, macro practice lab, etc.) ○ Courses where the content is primarily theoretical or based on academic achievement may **not** be framed as a practice course vs. those courses that are intentionally focused on practicing / building professional competency capacity ○ Programs have the final discretion in classifying which courses in their curriculum are considered practice courses. • For non-practice courses, it is within the purview of the program to determine the best faculty members and qualifications needed to teach that course/content.	

		There are no credentials nor practice-experience required to teach non-practice courses. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. • The program may be eligible to apply / request a waiver for certain components of this standard. Waiver approvals are not guaranteed. Learn more in policy *1.2.5. Waivers to Accreditation Standards* in the EPAS Handbook. If the program was granted any waivers relevant to this standard, it should be submitted in the accreditation documents.	
3.2.3: The program documents a full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio not greater than 1:25 for baccalaureate programs and not greater than 1:12 for master's programs and explains how this ratio is calculated. In addition, the program explains how faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; number of program options; class size; number of students; advising; and the faculty's teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities.	Narrative documents a full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio not greater than 1:25 for baccalaureate programs and not greater than 1:12 for master's programs inclusive of all program options. Narrative explains how this ratio is calculated inclusive of all program options. Narrative explains how faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; number of program options; class size; number of students; advising; and the faculty's teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities across all program options.	• Full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty-to-student ratio is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • The FTE faculty-to-student ratio is **not** intended to be used as a required or recommended class size. Your class enrollment can vary and be any size the program and institution choose. • The ratio is intended to ensure the program maintains sufficient trained social work faculty to educate and prepare students for competent professional practice. • Provide numerical FTE ratio (X:X). • The ratio submitted must be current. Programs may calculate their ratio per academic year, or per semester. At minimum the ratio submitted must include the current semester upon submission of the accreditation document. • This is a firm standard. The program must demonstrate a ratio of 1:25 or 1:12 or lower. Any numerical ratio beyond the minimum will be cited by the COA. • It is within the purview of the program to determine and explain how the FTE ratio is calculated. Details of the calculation must be provided. • Although the institution's faculty workload policy is commonly used to calculate the full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty-to-student ratio, programs may use any calculation or formula as long as the program clearly explains the calculation method. ○ At the program's discretion, the FTE faculty calculation on the *Faculty Summary Form*	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3**

		may be used to support compliance with AS 3.2.3. ▪ If using this form, the FTE ratio should be consistent with the number identified on the form. ○ Typically, programs calculate the FTE ratio according to the program's faculty workload policy (faculty) and credit hour policy (students). ○ For example, if the full-time teaching workload is six courses per academic year, each course covered by a part-time faculty member constitutes one-sixth FTE. ○ For example, if full-time credit hours are considered 12 per semester, a student taking 6 credit hours per semester constitutes one-half FTE. • While the previous example used teaching workload to calculate the FTE, the program may include all workload policy roles in the calculation (e.g., teaching, administration, research, service, or other workload policy roles, etc.). ○ For example, if a faculty member has a 75% appointment to teaching and 25% appointment to administration, that faculty member is 100% (1.0 FTE) assigned to the social work program. ○ The program director (AS B/M 3.3.4c) and the field director (AS B/M 3.3.5c) can count their administrative assigned time in their FTE calculation. • Part-time students must be included in the FTE ratio calculation. • Part-time faculty may be included in the FTE ratio calculation, at the program's discretion. Part-time faculty is widely defined and varies across institutions. Part-time may include adjunct, lecturers, or other ranks / titles. • Individuals designated as faculty may be included. • Field directors may be included in the FTE ratio even if they are not designated as faculty or serve in a full-time	

		administrative / staff role as long as they meet the minimum field director standards (AS B/M3.3.5a-c).
		• Programs must count students formally admitted to the social work program.
		  ○ It is within the purview of the program to elect to count, or not, students who are pursuing social work admittance, yet have not entered the program formally (e.g., declared majors, pre-majors, etc.).
		  ○ It is advisable to count students for whom the social work program is primarily responsible for their education (courses, advising, services, etc.).
		• Staff, teaching assistants, graduate student assistants, research assistants, doctoral students, and field instructors may not be included in the FTE ratio *unless* they are designated as faculty members on a faculty line.
		• Non-social work students taking social work courses (e.g., interprofessional education, other social sciences, etc.) are **not** counted in the ratio.
		• The number of faculty should support the context of the program.
		• Discuss how each program option has sufficient faculty. Each program option can have different faculty distribution, as long as the faculty makeup is determined to be sufficient by the program.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. The FTE ratio provided should be inclusive of all program options. A separate FTE ratio is **not** requested nor required for each program option.	

B3.2.4: The baccalaureate social work program identifies no fewer than two full-time faculty assigned to the baccalaureate program, with full-time appointment in social work, and whose	Narrative identifies the program has no fewer than two full-time faculty assigned to the social work program, whose principal assignment is to the	• Faculty identified in response to this standard are required to have a full-time overall appointment to social work with principal assignment (51% or more) of their appointment dedicated solely to the baccalaureate social work program. The remainder of the identified faculty's time may be dedicated to teaching,	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK** **1, 2, 3**

principal assignment is to the baccalaureate program. The majority of the total full-time baccalaureate social work program faculty has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program, with a doctoral degree preferred.	baccalaureate program across all program options. Narrative demonstrates that the majority of the total full-time baccalaureate social work program faculty has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program, with a doctoral degree preferred, across all program options.	administration, research, service, or other workload policy roles. • Faculty identified in response to this standard may have an appointment outside of social work (e.g., chairing a multi-disciplinary department, teaching, etc.). • The field director, even if they are not designated as faculty or serve in a full-time administrative role, may be counted as one of the minimum required faculty as long as they meet the minimum field director standards (AS B3.3.5a-c) and have a principal assignment to the baccalaureate social work program. • This is **not** a full-time equivalency (FTE) calculation. At least two (2) full-time faculty must be identified. This requirement cannot be distributed across multiple part-time faculty members. • The majority (51% or more) of the **total** full-time baccalaureate social work program faculty must have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. ○ For example: 2 out of 2; 3 out of 4; 6 out of 10, etc. • Full-time faculty identified in the majority may have a CSWE-accredited degree, CASWE-accredited degree (from the Canadian social work accreditor, recognized through an MOU with CSWE and CASWE) or an internationally earned ISWDRES-evaluated degree. • Full-time administrative support staff who also teach are not considered full-time faculty, and as such may **not** be counted as one of the minimum required faculty. • Overload appointments are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Programs must make the case for sufficiency if any minimum full-time faculty dedicated to the baccalaureate social work program have an overload appointment. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. • The program may be eligible to apply / request a waiver for certain components of this standard. Waiver approvals are not guaranteed. Learn more in policy	

		1.2.5. Waivers to Accreditation Standards in the EPAS Handbook. If the program was granted any waivers relevant to this standard, it should be submitted in the accreditation documents.	
M3.2.4: The master's social work program identifies no fewer than six full-time faculty with master's degrees in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and whose principal assignment is to the master's program. The majority of the full-time master's social work program faculty has a master's degree in social work and a doctoral degree, preferably in social work.	Narrative identifies no fewer than six full-time faculty with master's degrees in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and whose principal assignment is to the master's program across all program options. Narrative demonstrates the majority of the full-time master's social work program faculty has a master's degree in social work and a doctoral degree, preferably in social work, across all program options.	• Faculty identified in response to this standard are required to have a full-time overall appointment to social work with principal assignment (51% or more) of their appointment dedicated solely to the master's social work program. The remainder of the identified faculty's time may be dedicated to teaching, administration, research, service, or other workload policy roles. • Faculty identified in response to this standard may have an appointment outside of social work (e.g., chairing a multi-disciplinary department, teaching, etc.). • The field director, even if they are not designated as faculty or serve in a full-time administrative role, may be counted as one of the minimum required faculty as long as they meet the minimum field director standards (AS M3.3.5a-c) and have a principal assignment to the master's social work program. • This is **not** a full-time equivalency (FTE) calculation. At least six (6) full-time faculty must be identified. This requirement cannot be distributed across multiple part-time faculty members. • The majority (51% or more) of the **total** full-time master's social work program faculty must have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and a doctoral degree (in any discipline). ○ For example: 4 out of 6; 5 out of 8; 6 out of 10, etc. • Full-time faculty identified in the majority may have a CSWE-accredited degree, CASWE-accredited degree (from the Canadian social work accreditor, recognized through an MOU with CSWE and CASWE) or an internationally earned ISWDRES-evaluated degree. • Full-time administrative support staff who also teach are not considered full-time faculty, and as such may **not** be counted as one of the minimum required faculty.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 (3 faculty)** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 (5 faculty)** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3 (6 faculty)** *Note for Candidacy programs:* The program must ensure the majority of full-time faculty meet the requirement and report this in their Benchmark 3/Initial Accreditation document. This is **not** a requirement at Benchmark 1 nor Benchmark 2). For example, at minimum, four (4) out of six (6) full-time faculty must have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and a doctoral degree when the Benchmark 3/Initial Accreditation document is submitted.

		• The majority (51% or more) of the full-time master's social work program faculty must have a master's degree in social work and a doctoral degree.
		• While a doctoral degree in social work is preferred, the doctoral degree may be in any discipline.
		  ○ Faculty holding a JD (professional law degree) have earned a doctorate and may be counted in the majority.
		  ○ ABD does not count as an earned doctoral degree.
		• Overload appointments are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Programs must make the case for sufficiency if any minimum full-time faculty dedicated to the master's social work program have an overload appointment.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

3.2.5: The program describes its faculty workload policy and discusses how the policy supports the achievement of institutional priorities and the program's mission and goals.	Narrative describes the program's faculty workload policy across all program options. Narrative discusses how the policy supports the achievement of institutional priorities and the program's mission and goals across all program options.	• Discuss the workload policy for each faculty rank. • Provide specific examples of institutional priorities, program's mission, and program's goals supported by the workload policy. The linkages should be clear and explicit. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3**
3.2.6: Faculty demonstrate ongoing professional development as teachers, scholars, and practitioners through dissemination of research and scholarship, exchanges with external constituencies such as practitioners and agencies, and through other professionally relevant	Narrative demonstrates ongoing professional development as teachers, scholars, and practitioners through dissemination of research and scholarship, exchanges with external constituencies such as practitioners and agencies, and through other professionally relevant	• This is a general discussion and does **not** need to address each/every faculty member. • Provide a few specific examples of faculty recently demonstrating professional development. ○ While the program may provide a general overview of opportunities/access to professional development, specific examples are required. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3**

creative activities that support the achievement of institutional priorities and the program's mission and goals.	creative activities that support the achievement of institutional priorities and the program's mission and goals across all program options.	• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
3.2.7: The program demonstrates how its faculty models the behavior and values of the profession in the program's educational environment.	Narrative demonstrates how the program's faculty models the behavior and values of the profession in the program's educational environment across all program options.	• This is a general discussion and does not need to address each/every faculty member. • Provide a few examples. • Discuss values as defined in **EP 1.0:** *"Service, social justice, the dignity and worth of the person, the importance of human relationships, integrity, competence, human rights, and scientific inquiry are among the core values of social work."* • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3**

Educational Policy 3.3—Administrative and Governance Structure

Social work faculty and administrators, based on their education, knowledge, and skills, are best suited to make decisions regarding the delivery of social work education. Faculty and administrators exercise autonomy in designing an administrative and leadership structure, developing curriculum, and formulating and implementing policies that support the education of competent social workers. The administrative structure is sufficient to carry out the program's mission and goals. In recognition of the importance of field education as the signature pedagogy, programs must provide an administrative structure and adequate resources for systematically designing, supervising, coordinating, and evaluating field education across all program options.

Accreditation Standard 3.3—Administrative and Governance Structure

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	COA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE *This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!*
3.3.1: The program describes its administrative structure and shows how it provides the necessary autonomy to achieve the program's mission and goals.	Narrative describes the program's administrative structure across all program options. Narrative demonstrates how the program's administrative structure provides the necessary autonomy to achieve the program's mission and goals across all program options.	• Discuss the program's location in the institutional authority structure. How are decisions made? What is the program's role in the decision-making process? • Discuss authority, accountability, and autonomy. "Autonomy" is a relative term defined by the program. Does the program have sufficient latitude to effectively implement its mission and goals? • It is helpful to make a statement of autonomy; a professional judgment of the program's latitude to actualize its mission and goals. • Provide specific examples of how the program's autonomy supports meeting its mission and goals. The linkages should be clear and explicit. • It is helpful to discuss the program's location in the institutional authority structure in the context of comparable programs. ○ For example, to what extent is the social work program's locus in the hierarchy similar to nursing, physical therapy, psychology, etc. • It is helpful to provide an institutional organizational chart.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**

		• It is helpful to provide a program-level organizational chart. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
3.3.2: The program describes how the social work faculty has responsibility for defining program curriculum consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards and the institution's policies.	Narrative describes how the social work faculty has responsibility for defining program curriculum consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards and the institution's policies across all program options.	• Curriculum is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • Discuss how the curriculum is developed, reviewed, and approved both within the program and within the larger institution. What are the roles and responsibilities of social work faculty in the curriculum development process? Does the program have sufficient latitude to effectively implement the EPAS? • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**
3.3.3: The program describes how the administration and faculty of the social work program participate in formulating and implementing policies related to the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of program personnel.	Narrative describes how the administration and faculty of the social work program participate in formulating and implementing policies related to the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of program personnel across all program options.	• Discuss how social work faculty participate in formulating *and* implementing policies that govern the entire faculty personnel process at the program-level and within the larger institution. ○ This standard explores how the social work program faculty and administrators have a voice within the institution, typically through shared faculty governance models, committee work, or chain of command, to impact those faculty-related policies. • *Formulating:* How do faculty participate in governance processes by creating and stewarding the personnel-related policies and procedures? • *Implementing:* How are faculty involved in verifying that processes are executed? Is there accountability to ensure that faculty have a voice in governance and personnel processes? • Discuss separately: recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, *and* tenure of program personnel. • *Retention:* Incentivizing and reducing barriers to faculty continuing employment with the program / institutions. Does the program or institution have a strategy, plan, or policy for retaining talented faculty and avoiding turnover? For example: annual review processes,	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**

		recognizing and rewarding faculty, showing appreciation, providing competitive pay, benefits, healthy-work-life balance, etc. • Include relevant written policies and procedures. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

3.3.4: The program identifies the social work program director. Institutions with accredited baccalaureate and master's programs appoint a separate director for each.	Narrative identifies the social work program director inclusive of all program options.
	
	In institutions with accredited baccalaureate and master's programs, narrative demonstrates that a separate director is appointed to each program.
		• If the program is co-located (has both the accredited baccalaureate and master's social work program), identify the separately appointed program director for the other program-level.
		• The formal title and rank of the program director is within the purview of the program.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.
		• The program director identified must have administrative oversight over the program in its entirety, inclusive of all program options.
		  ○ Separate program directors are not requested nor required for each program option.
		  ○ Programs may also choose to appoint additional program option-specific personnel such coordinators, associate directors, etc. yet they should not be included in the program director-related standards.
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1, 2, 3

B3.3.4(a): The program describes the baccalaureate program director's leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in social work. The program documents that the director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-	Narrative describes the baccalaureate program director's leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in social work across all program options. Narrative documents that the director has a master's	• Explicitly state that the director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and refer to the location of the director's CV within the self-study. • The program director may have a CSWE-accredited degree, CASWE-accredited degree (from the Canadian social work accreditor, recognized through an MOU with CSWE and CASWE) or an internationally earned ISWDRES-evaluated degree. • Faculty data forms (CVs) must include the month/year degrees were earned and dates for all experiences documented in order to verify the requisite degree was earned.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1, 2, 3**

accredited program with a doctoral degree in social work preferred.	degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program with a doctoral degree in social work preferred.	• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. • The program may be eligible to apply / request a waiver for certain components of this standard. Waiver approvals are not guaranteed. Learn more in policy *1.2.5. Waivers to Accreditation Standards* in the EPAS Handbook. If the program was granted any waivers relevant to this standard, it should be submitted in the accreditation documents.	
B3.3.4(b): The program provides documentation that the director has a full-time appointment to the social work baccalaureate program.	Narrative provides documentation that the director has a full-time appointment to the social work baccalaureate program inclusive of all program options.	• Include documentation, such as a letter, contract, or hiring letter signed by the dean, chair, human resources, etc. explicitly stating the director's full-time appointment to the social work program. • The intent of the standard is to document a full-time appointment to social work; either to the baccalaureate program or to social work overall. • The program director must have a principal assignment (51% or more of their time) dedicated to the baccalaureate social work program. • An email is insufficient documentation. • Program directors are permitted to cross teach (or have other workload policy-based responsibilities) within social work school/department. • Program directors may teach or have other workload policy-based responsibilities outside of social work as long as they have documented a full-time appointment to social work. • Program directors may chair inter/multidisciplinary departments. • Program directors may also fulfill the field director role as long as the program complies with the field director-related standards (**AS B/M3.3.5a-c**). • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1, 2, 3**
B3.3.4(c): The program describes the procedures for calculating the program	Narrative describes the procedures for calculating the program director's	• Clearly discuss the procedures for determining the director's assigned time, include a specific numerical percentage (X%), and show the calculation. What is	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1, 2, 3**

director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program. To carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the social work program, a minimum of 25% assigned time is required at the baccalaureate level. The program discusses that this time is sufficient.	assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program inclusive of all program options.
	
	Narrative demonstrates a minimum of 25% of assigned time is provided to carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the social work program inclusive of all program options.
	
	Narrative discusses that this time is sufficient for each program option.
		the process from beginning to end? Who is involved in decision-making and approval of assigned time?
		• Discuss whether the program finds the director's assigned time sufficient to carry out administrative duties. *Why?*
		  ○ If time is insufficient, address this in the narrative.
		  ○ Make an explicit statement / professional judgment about the sufficiency of the program director's time.
		• Educational and administrative leadership does **not** include teaching responsibilities.
		• Baccalaureate program directors may cross-teach (or have other workload policy-related responsibilities) in the master's social work program, or outside of social work, as long as they meet the requirements of the program director standards. Principal responsibilities (51% or more) of their time should be dedicated solely to the baccalaureate level program.
		• The program may include all workload policy roles (e.g., teaching, administration, research, service, etc.) in the calculation of assigned time.
		  ○ For example, the program director may typically teach a 4/4 workload and be released from one (1) course per semester (equating 25%).
		  ○ Alternatively, the program director may be released from the institution's 20% research requirement and 5% service requirement to fulfill the 25%.
		  ○ These are examples and the program must calculate according to their institution's unique workload policy.
		• Assigned time can be distributed across the year, as long as the program describes the sufficiency of release time each term the program is operating (e.g., 20% fall release + 40% spring release = 30% overall release).
		• Only one (1) program director is identified. Assigned time for administrative leadership cannot be distributed across multiple individuals.	

		• Overload appointments are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Programs must make the case for sufficiency of the program director's time dedicated to educational and administrative leadership. • It is within the purview of the program to determine if the program director will be on a faculty or administrative / staff line. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. • Collaborative programs may identify either one single program director representing all institutions; or one program director per institution. It is within the program's purview to determine how they will divide the program director's assigned administrative time in order to meet the standard.	
M3.3.4(a): The program describes the master's program director's leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in social work. The program documents that the director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. In addition, it is preferred that the master's program director have a doctoral degree, preferably in social work.	Narrative describes the master's program director's leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in social work across all program options. Narrative documents that the director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program.	• Explicitly state that the director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and refer to the location of the director's CV within the self-study. • The program director may have a CSWE-accredited degree, CASWE-accredited degree (from the Canadian social work accreditor, recognized through an MOU with CSWE and CASWE) or an internationally earned ISWDRES-evaluated degree. • Faculty data forms (CVs) must include the month/year degrees were earned and dates for all experiences documented in order to verify the requisite degree was earned. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. • The program may be eligible to apply / request a waiver for certain components of this standard. Waiver approvals are not guaranteed. Learn more in policy *1.2.5. Waivers to Accreditation Standards* in the EPAS Handbook. If the program was granted any waivers relevant to this standard, it should be submitted in the accreditation documents.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK** **1, 2, 3**

M3.3.4(b): The program provides documentation that the director has a full-time appointment to the social work master's program.	Narrative provides documentation that the director has a full-time appointment to the social work master's program inclusive of all program options.	• Include documentation, such as a letter, contract, or hiring letter signed by the dean, chair, human resources, etc. explicitly stating the director's full-time appointment to the social work program. • The intent of the standard is to document a full-time appointment to social work; either to the master's program or to social work overall. • The program director must have a principal assignment (51% or more of their time) dedicated to the master's social work program. • An email is insufficient documentation. • Program directors are permitted to cross teach (or have other workload policy-based responsibilities) within social work school/department. • Program directors may teach or have other workload policy-based responsibilities outside of social work as long as they have documented a full-time appointment to social work. • Program directors may chair inter/multidisciplinary departments. • Program directors may also fulfill the field director role as long as the program complies with the field director-related standards (**AS B/M3.3.5a-c**). Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1, 2, 3**

M3.3.4(c): The program describes the procedures for determining the program director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program. To carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the social work program, a minimum of 50% assigned time is required at the master's level. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.	Narrative describes the procedures for determining the program director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program inclusive of all program options.
	
	Narrative demonstrates a minimum of 50% of assigned time is provided to carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the social
		• Clearly discuss the procedures for determining the director's assigned time, include a specific numerical percentage (X%), and show the calculation. What is the process from beginning to end? Who is involved in decision-making and approval of assigned time?
		• Discuss whether the program finds the director's assigned time sufficient to carry out administrative duties. *Why?*
		  ○ If time is insufficient, address this in the narrative.
		  ○ Make an explicit statement / professional judgment about the sufficiency of the program director's time.
		• Educational and administrative leadership does **not** include teaching responsibilities.
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1, 2, 3

	work program inclusive of all program options.
	
	Narrative discusses that this time is sufficient for each program option.
		• Master's program directors may cross-teach (or have other workload policy-related responsibilities) in the baccalaureate social work program, or outside of social work, as long as they meet the requirements of the program director standards. Principal responsibilities (51% or more) of their time should be dedicated solely to the master's level program.
		• The program may include all workload policy roles (e.g., teaching, administration, research, service, etc.) in the calculation of assigned time.
		  ○ For example, the program director may typically teach a 4/4 workload and be released from two (2) courses per semester (equating 50%).
		  ○ Alternatively, the program director may be released from the institution's 20% research requirement, 5% service requirement, and one (1) course per semester (equating 25%) to fulfill the 50%.
		  ○ These are examples and the program must calculate according to their institution's unique workload policy.
		• Assigned time can be distributed across the year, as long as the program describes the sufficiency of release time each term the program is operating (e.g., 40% fall release + 60% spring release = 50% overall release).
		• Only one (1) program director is identified. Assigned time for administrative leadership cannot be distributed across multiple individuals.
		• Overload appointments are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Programs must make the case for sufficiency of the program director's time dedicated to educational and administrative leadership.
		• It is within the purview of the program to determine if the program director will be on a faculty or administrative / staff line.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

		• Collaborative programs may identify either one single program director representing all institutions; or one program director per institution. It is within the program's purview to determine how they will divide the program director's assigned administrative time in order to meet the standard.	

3.3.5: The program identifies the field education director.	Narrative identifies the social work field education director inclusive of all program options.	• If the program is co-located (has both the accredited baccalaureate and master's social work program), the field director may fulfill this role for both program levels as long as they receive the required assigned time for each program level (i.e., 25% BSW release + 50% MSW release = 75% minimum release).
		• The program director may also fulfill the field director role as long as they receive the required assigned time.
		  ○ For BSW programs: 25% BSW program director release + 25% BSW field director release = 50% minimum release
		  ○ For MSW programs: 50% MSW program director release + 50% MSW field director release = 100% minimum release
		• Unlike for the program director, the standards do **not** specify that the field director have a full-time appointment in social work.
		• The formal title and rank of the field director is within the purview of the program.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.
		• The field director identified must have administrative oversight over the field education program in its entirety, inclusive of all as program options.
		  ○ Separate field directors are not requested nor required for each program option.
		  ○ Programs may also choose to appoint additional program option-specific personnel such coordinators, associate directors, etc. yet they should not be included in the field director-related standards.
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1, 2, 3

3.3.5(a): The program describes the field director's	Narrative describes the field director's ability to provide	• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK**

ability to provide leadership in the field education program through practice experience, field instruction experience, and administrative and other relevant academic and professional activities in social work.	leadership in the field education program through practice experience, field instruction experience, and administrative and other relevant academic and professional activities in social work.	• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**1, 2, 3**
B3.3.5(b): The program documents that the field education director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post-baccalaureate or post-master's social work degree practice experience.	Narrative documents that the field education director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post-baccalaureate or post-master's social work degree practice experience.	• Explicitly state that the director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post-baccalaureate or post-master's social work degree practice experience and refer to the location of the director's CV within the self-study. • The field director may have a CSWE-accredited degree, CASWE-accredited degree (from the Canadian social work accreditor, recognized through an MOU with CSWE and CASWE) or an internationally earned ISWDRES-evaluated degree; and 2-years post degree practice experience in social work. • Post–social work degree practice experience is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • Faculty data forms (CVs) must include the month/year degrees were earned and dates for all experiences documented in order to verify the requisite degree and post-degree practice was earned. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. • The program may be eligible to apply / request a waiver for certain components of this standard. Waiver approvals are not guaranteed. Learn more in policy *1.2.5. Waivers to Accreditation Standards* in the EPAS Handbook. If the program was granted any waivers relevant to this standard, it should be submitted in the accreditation documents.	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK** **1, 2, 3**
M3.3.5(b): The program documents that the field education director has a master's degree in social	Narrative documents that the field education director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-	• Explicitly state that the director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post-master's social work degree	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK** **1, 2, 3**

work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post-master's social work degree practice experience.	accredited program and at least 2 years of post-master's social work degree practice experience.	practice experience and refer to the location of the director's CV within the self-study. • The field director may have a CSWE-accredited degree, CASWE-accredited degree (from the Canadian social work accreditor, recognized through an MOU with CSWE and CASWE) or an internationally earned ISWDRES-evaluated degree; and 2-years post degree practice experience in social work. • Post–social work degree practice experience is defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • Faculty data forms (CVs) must include the month/year degrees were earned and dates for all experiences documented in order to verify the requisite degree and post-degree practice was earned. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. • The program may be eligible to apply / request a waiver for certain components of this standard. Waiver approvals are not guaranteed. Learn more in policy *1.2.5. Waivers to Accreditation Standards* in the EPAS Handbook. If the program was granted any waivers relevant to this standard, it should be submitted in the accreditation documents.	

B3.3.5(c): The program describes the procedures for calculating the field director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education. To carry out the administrative functions of the field education program, at least 25% assigned time is required for baccalaureate programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.	Narrative describes the procedures for determining the field director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education inclusive of all program options.
	
	Narrative demonstrates a minimum of 25% of assigned time is provided to carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the field
		• Clearly discuss the procedures for determining the director's assigned time, include a specific numerical percentage (X%), and show the calculation. What is the process from beginning to end? Who is involved in decision-making and approval of assigned time?
		• Discuss whether the program finds the director's assigned time sufficient to carry out administrative duties. *Why?*
		  ○ If time is insufficient, address this in the narrative.
		  ○ Make an explicit statement / professional judgment about the sufficiency of the field director's time.
		• Programs must list the field director's administrative duties and explain sufficiency.
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK
			1, 2, 3

	education program inclusive of all program options.
	
	Narrative discusses that this time is sufficient for each program option.
		• Only one (1) field director is identified. Assigned time for administrative leadership cannot be distributed across multiple individuals.
		• Overload appointments are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Programs must make the case for sufficiency of the field director's time dedicated to educational and administrative leadership.
		• Educational and administrative leadership does **not** include teaching responsibilities (including field courses and field seminar).
		• The program may include all workload policy roles (e.g., teaching, administration, research, service, etc.) in the calculation of assigned time.
		  ○ For example, the field director may typically teach a 4/4 workload and be released from one (1) course per semester (equating 25%).
		  ○ Alternatively, the field director may be released from the institution's 20% research requirement and 5% service requirement to fulfill the 25%.
		  ○ These are examples and the program must calculate according to their institution's unique workload policy.
		• Assigned time can be distributed across the year, as long as the program describes the sufficiency of release time each term the program is operating (e.g., 20% fall release + 40% spring release = 30% overall release).
		• It is within the purview of the program to determine if the field director will be on a faculty or administrative / staff line.
		• Field directors are not required to have a full-time appointment to the social work program (unless they are identified as a minimum faculty member for AS B3.2.4); however, the field director must still have the full-time equivalent of 25% assigned time for leadership and administrative duties.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	

		• The program may be eligible to apply / request a waiver for certain components of this standard. Waiver approvals are not guaranteed. Learn more in policy *1.2.5. Waivers to Accreditation Standards* in the EPAS Handbook. If the program was granted any waivers relevant to this standard, it should be submitted in the accreditation documents. • Collaborative programs may identify either one single field director representing all institutions; or one field director per institution. It is within the program's purview to determine how they will divide the field director's assigned administrative time in order to meet the standard.	

M3.3.5(c): The program describes the procedures for calculating the field director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education. To carry out the administrative functions of the field education program at least 50% assigned time is required for master's programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.	Narrative describes the procedures for determining the field director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education inclusive of all program options.
	
	Narrative demonstrates a minimum of 50% of assigned time is provided to carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the field education program inclusive of all program options.
	
	Narrative discusses that this time is sufficient for each program option.
		• Clearly discuss the procedures for determining the director's assigned time, include a specific numerical percentage (X%), and show the calculation. What is the process from beginning to end? Who is involved in decision-making and approval of assigned time?
		• Discuss whether the program finds the director's assigned time sufficient to carry out the administrative duties. *Why?*
		  ○ If time is insufficient, address this in the narrative.
		  ○ Make an explicit statement / professional judgment about the sufficiency of the field director's time.
		• The COA does not delineate which field-based administrative tasks are acceptable for field directors. Programs must list the field director's administrative duties and explain sufficiency.
		• Only one (1) field director is identified. Assigned time for administrative leadership cannot be distributed across multiple individuals.
		• Overload appointments are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Programs must make the case for sufficiency of the field director's time dedicated to educational and administrative leadership.
		• Educational and administrative leadership does **not** include teaching responsibilities (including field courses and field seminar).
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK
			1, 2, 3

		• The program may include all workload policy roles (e.g., teaching, administration, research, service, etc.) in the calculation of assigned time.
		  ○ For example, the field director may typically teach a 4/4 workload and be released from two (2) courses per semester (equating 50%).
		  ○ Alternatively, the field director may be released from the institution's 20% research requirement, 5% service requirement, and one (1) course per semester (equating 25%) to fulfill the 50%.
		  ○ These are examples and the program must calculate according to their institution's unique workload policy.
		• Assigned time can be distributed across the year, as long as the program describes the sufficiency of release time each term the program is operating (e.g., 40% fall release + 60% spring release = 50% overall release).
		• It is within the purview of the program to determine if the field director will be on a faculty or administrative / staff line.
		• Field directors are not required to have a full-time appointment to the social work program (unless they are identified as a minimum faculty member for AS M3.2.4); however, the field director must still have the full-time equivalent of 50% assigned time for leadership and administrative duties.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.
		• Collaborative programs may identify either one single field director representing all institutions; or one field director per institution. It is within the program's purview to determine how they will divide the field director's assigned administrative time in order to meet the standard.	

3.3.6: The program describes its administrative structure for field education	Narrative describes the program's administrative	• Include all field personnel in the administrative structure.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2**

and explains how its resources (personnel, time and technological support) are sufficient to administer its field education program to meet its mission and goals.	structure for field education across all program options.
	
	Narrative explains how the program's resources (personnel, time and technological support) are sufficient to administer its field education program to meet its mission and goals for each program option.
		• It may be helpful to include a field education organizational chart.
		• Discuss sufficiency. *How* are resources sufficient?
		  ○ If resources are insufficient, address this in the narrative.
		  ○ Make an explicit statement / professional judgment about the sufficiency of the field resources.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3

Educational Policy 3.4—Resources

Adequate resources are fundamental to creating, maintaining, and improving an educational environment that supports the development of competent social work practitioners. Social work programs have the necessary resources to carry out the program's mission and goals and to support learning and professionalization of students and program improvement.

Accreditation Standard 3.4—Resources

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	COA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE *This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!*
3.4.1: The program describes the procedures for budget development and administration it uses to achieve its mission and goals. The program submits a completed budget form and explains how its financial resources are sufficient and stable to achieve its mission and goals.	Narrative describes the procedures for budget development and administration the program uses to achieve its mission and goals across all program options. Narrative includes a completed budget form for all program options. Narrative explains how the program's financial resources are sufficient and stable to achieve its mission and goals for each program option.	• **REQUIRED FORM:** The CSWE website houses the required budget form. • All budget line items, including financial aid, should be program-level specific (baccalaureate or master's). **Not** at the institutional or school/department-levels. • Baccalaureate and master's social work program must submit *separate* budget forms specific to their own revenue and expenses. • Budget items at the institutional-level are not included on the form and should be explicitly identified as such. For these line items, the program may indicate N/A or $0 on the budget form. • Budget form line item definitions: ○ *Fringe*: Any extra benefits supplementing an employee's salary (e.g., the full compensation package, which may include retirement contributions, insurance, tuition reimbursement, employee meal plans, etc.). ○ *Technological resources:* Any technology expensed by the social work program including machinery, equipment, platforms, applications, etc. ○ *Student financial aid:* Any student financial support expensed by the social work program which may include scholarships, grants,	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

		stipends, work-study, loans, funds, etc. that help make education more affordable. ○ • "Hard Money" in the budget form is reliable, stable, scheduled, and/or continuous stream of funds. Grants and other contingent funds are **not** hard money. • Discuss sufficiency. *How* are resources sufficient? ○ If financial resources are insufficient, address this in the narrative. ○ Make an explicit statement / professional judgment about the sufficiency of the financial resources. • Discuss stability. *How* are resources stable? ○ If resources are unstable, address this in the narrative. ○ Discuss the 3-year span covered by the budget form. ○ Discuss the future stability of the budget given the larger context in which the program is situated. • Provide specific examples of how the program's financial resources supports meeting its mission and goals. The linkages should be clear and explicit. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
3.4.2: The program describes how it uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program.	Narrative describes how the program uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program for each program option.	• Provide a few examples of challenges the social work program recently experienced and how resources were used to address it. Resources include fiscal, personnel, time, technology, etc. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3**
3.4.3: The program demonstrates that it has sufficient support staff, other personnel, and technological resources to	Narrative demonstrates that the program has sufficient support staff, other personnel, and technological resources to support all of its educational	• Discuss sufficiency. *How* are resources sufficient? ○ If resources are insufficient, address this in the narrative. ○ Make an explicit statement / professional judgment about the sufficiency of the support	**COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 1 and 3**

support all of its educational activities, mission and goals.	activities, mission and goals for each program option.	staff, other personnel, and technological resources. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
3.4.4: The program submits a library report that demonstrates access to social work and other informational and educational resources necessary for achieving its mission and goals.	Narrative submits a library report that demonstrates access to social work and other informational and educational resources necessary for achieving the program's mission and goals for each program option.	• **REQUIRED FORM:** The CSWE website houses the required library form. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**

3.4.5: The program describes and demonstrates sufficient office and classroom space and/or computer-mediated access to achieve its mission and goals.	Narrative describes and demonstrates sufficient office and classroom space and/or computer-mediated access to achieve the program's mission and goals for each program option.	• The standard is similar to an environmental scan.
		• Computer-mediated access refers to program constituents having electronic access to complete the work of the educational program, usually virtually or remotely. This is facilitated learning and human communication through computers. Examples: devices, platforms, technology, learning management systems, shared networks, collaborative tools, online repositories/resources, etc.
		  ○ Addressing computer-mediated access is important for online program options.
		• Discuss sufficiency. *How* are resources sufficient?
		  ○ If resources are insufficient, address this in the narrative.
		  ○ Make an explicit statement / professional judgment about the sufficiency of the classroom space and/or computer mediated access.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.
			DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1
			
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3

3.4.6: The program describes, for each program option, the availability of and access to assistive technology, including	Narrative describes, for each program option, the availability of and access to assistive technology,	• Provide examples of the assistive technology available (books on braille, audiobooks, screen reader technology, etc.), This information may be retrieved from student services, disabilities services, library services, etc.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK**

materials in alternative formats.	including materials in alternative formats.	• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	**2 and 3**

Educational Policy 4.0—Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment is an integral component of competency-based education. Assessment involves the systematic gathering of data about student performance of Social Work Competencies at both the generalist and specialized levels of practice.

Competence is perceived as holistic, involving both performance and the knowledge, values, critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment that inform performance. Assessment therefore must be multi-dimensional and integrated to capture the demonstration of the competencies and the quality of internal processing informing the performance of the competencies. Assessment is best done while students are engaged in practice tasks or activities that approximate social work practice as closely as possible. Practice often requires the performance of multiple competencies simultaneously; therefore, assessment of those competencies may optimally be carried out at the same time.

Programs assess students' demonstration of the Social Work Competencies through the use of multi-dimensional assessment methods. Assessment methods are developed to gather data that serve as evidence of student learning outcomes and the demonstration of competence. Understanding social work practice is complex and multi-dimensional, the assessment methods used, and the data collected may vary by context.

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

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.

Accreditation Standard 4.0—Assessment

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	COA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE *This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!*
4.0.1: 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	The program's assessment plan was presented for generalist levels of practice (baccalaureate social work programs) and the generalist and specialized levels of practice (master's social work programs) for each program option.	• This standard explores: *How competent are students on the basis of receiving your curriculum?* • Student learning outcomes is defined on pg. 21 of the EPAS. • A matrix in table format is *very* helpful in responding to this standard. A narrative preceding the assessment matrix is required.	**DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2 and 3**

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
	Assessment of competence was done by program designated faculty or field personnel for all program options.
	
	Program provides a description of the assessment procedures that detail when, where, and how each competency is assessed for each program option, including any competencies added by the program.
	
	Program provides at least two measures to assess each competency, including any competencies added by the program for all program options.
	
	At least one of the assessment measures is based on demonstration of the competency in real or simulated practice situations for all program options.
	
	Narrative explains how the assessment plan measures multiple dimensions of each competency, as described in EP4.0 (involving both performance and the knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes) for all program options.
		• A narrative thoroughly describing the assessment plan in response to each bullet point under **AS 4.0.1** is required.
		• The accreditation department has developed a **SAMPLE** matrix. The CSWE website houses the sample matrix.
		• The intent and purpose of the curriculum matrix (**AS B2.0.3**; **AS M2.0.3**; **AS M2.1.4**) is different than the assessment plan matrix. The curriculum matrix is snapshot featuring specific required course content strongly relating to each competency/dimension which all students are learning in the classroom. The assessment plan matrix details how the program is measuring competency-based student learning outcomes. These matrices do **not** need to match even if the program is using a course-embedded measure assessment model.
		  ○ Curriculum Matrix = assuring / delivering content
		  ○ Assessment Plan = demonstrating / assessing competence
		• Each generalist and specialized competency must be assessed twice minimally:
		  ○ One (1) measure assessing student demonstration in *real or simulated practice* situations. Behaviors are only required to be the basis of assessment for *real or simulated practice* measures. Individual behaviors may be scored (behavior-level data collected) or the program may list the behaviors on the instrument as the criteria for scoring each competency, yet **not** collect behavior-level scores (competency-level data collected).
		  ○ For generalist practice, programs must use all behaviors *exactly as written in the EPAS* and may choose to develop additional behaviors that represent observable components of each competency that integrate the dimensions.
		  ○ Typically, programs choose a field-based evaluation of student performance in their real practice setting.	

percentage of students achieving the benchmark. • Copies of all assessment measures used to assess all identified competencies.	Narrative includes benchmarks for each competency for all program options. Narrative includes a rationale for each benchmark across all program options. Narrative includes a description of how it is determined that students' performance meets the benchmark for all program options. Narrative provides an explanation of how the program determines the percentage of students achieving each benchmark for all program option. Program provides copies of all assessment measures used to assess all identified competencies for all program options.	○ One (1) direct / demonstration-based measure elsewhere the program chooses. This measure is at the competency-level rather than the behavior-level. Programs may incorporate behaviors into the second measure if desired, although it is **not** required. ○ Examples include course-embedded measures, end-of-year exams, capstone and senior seminar assignments (e.g., papers, presentations, etc.), portfolios, comprehensive exit exams, etc. • Simulated practice situations are defined on pg. 22 of the EPAS. • It is within the purview of the program to select a minimum of two (2) measures that fulfill the requirements of the 2015 **EPAS**. • Separate assessment plans are submitted for generalist practice and each area of specialized practice. ○ At least two (2) measures / instruments must assess generalist competencies as written in the EPAS. ○ At least two (2) measures / instruments must assess specialized competencies as written by the program (per AS M2.1.3). Thus, two (2) instruments should be selected per specialization. • For example, if a master's program has 3 specializations they would need: 2 generalist measures + 6 specialized measures (2 measures per each of the 3 specializations) = 8 total measures. • Programs must use two (2) distinct / unique measures / instruments to assess each competency. ○ Both measures can be field-related, yet each must be distinct. ○ For example, a program may identify a field evaluation and field-based case study as their two (2) unique measures. ○ However, one (1) measure used to assess competence at two (2) points in time (e.g., a mid-term and final field evaluation) is	

		insufficient to meet the requirements of the standard. • The COA does not endorse third-party, commercial, standardized, or customized assessment instruments 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**. • It is within the purview of the program to select the placement of the data collection points. ○ Programs may elect a formative and/or summative assessment approach. ○ Formative: assess student development of competency during the length of the program (e.g., each semester). ○ Summative: assess student competency in the final year or semester of the program. • Multi-dimensional assessment means programs assess a minimum of two (2) dimensions per competency and one (1) per measure. • Programs should assess all students and present data for all students, sampling students is **not** permitted. • Student self-assessment measures are **not** permitted for assessment of competency-based student learning outcomes per the 2015 **EPAS**. ○ Only faculty or field personnel may assess student demonstration of social work competencies for accreditation purposes. ○ The social worker reinforcing the social work perspective, per **AS B/M2.2.9**, must assess or be involved jointly in the assessment of student attainment of social work competencies. ○ *Field personnel:* Any individuals that facilitate the field education experience. This may include, yet is not limited to, the field director (regardless of their formal title), field liaisons, field instructors / supervisors, etc. Thus, any of these individuals may be designated as field personnel by the program and may execute	

		assessment of competency-based student learning outcomes. ○ Any other non-faculty or non-field program stakeholders (e.g., community members / local social workers, etc.) or student self-assessments may be used for internal purposes only. Such information should not be included in the assessment plan nor in any competency-based scores / calculations. Such assessments should not be reported in accreditation-related documents for compliance. • 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. • If the program elects to add additional competencies, they should be assessed and included in the matrices. • There are two distinct types of benchmarks: ○ *Outcome measure benchmark* refers to the minimum acceptable score or higher on an identified measure. For example, 4 out of 5 points, 12 out of 15 correct, etc. This is an example only and should be tailored to the program's chosen measures and benchmarks. ○ *Competency benchmark* refers to the percentage of students the program wants to achieve the minimum scores inclusive of all identified measures. For example, 90% of students will score of 4 out of 5 on their field measure and 12 out of 15 correct on the exam questions related to competency 1. This is an example only and should be tailored to the program's chosen measures and benchmarks. • The outcome measure benchmarks and competency benchmarks are within the purview of the program to select. ○ The program must be able to provide a rationale for each outcome measure and competency benchmark.	

		○ The rationale for each benchmark must be rational. Why did you choose those benchmarks? What information did you base the benchmarks on? What does the benchmark represent? Explain why the number is meaningful or significant to measuring student learning and program outcomes. • Benchmarks may be realistic, yet aspirational. Programs can choose to weight outcome measures differently when calculating the percentage of students achieving benchmarks. • Include copies of all assessment instruments, including rubrics (applicable to programs using course-embedded measures). • For course-embedded measures: ○ A copy of the assignment and a copy of the scoring rubric used to assess competency attainment must be submitted. ○ A copy of the assignment is the written instructions given to students in order to complete the assignment. This may be found in a syllabus or a separate document explaining the purpose, parameters, components, and requirements of the assignment. ○ The copy of the rubric is table, chart, or scoring sheet explaining to the students how they will be scored on each competency-based criterion demonstrated by completing the assignment components. ○ Course-embedded measures should **not** include items that do not directly assess the competency (i.e., APA formatting, timely submission, grammar, etc.). ○ If the program elects to use course-embedded measures, it is helpful to clearly label on the instrument which competency each rubric line item is capturing. • Programs must provide specific criteria for the basis of competency-based assessment (e.g., behaviors, rubric line items, demonstratable components of the competencies, etc.).	

		○ Criteria clarifies: What is being observed? What are students performing? What are faculty or field personnel scoring to determine student's competence? What exactly must the student show the assessor to indicate competence? • For exams, programs must submit an answer key and include a clear delineation of which questions relate to each competency. • For group projects, the program must ensure there is a component of the project where the faculty member is assessing each individual student's demonstration of competency. • For portfolios, programs must provide: ○ A copy of the assignment for the overall portfolio, **not** individual assignments/artifacts that comprise the portfolio if consistent across students. ○ A copy of the scoring rubric that provides consistent competency-based criteria for consistent assessment whether assignments/artifacts differ across students. • For portfolio-based assessment: ○ Students may select their own portfolio artifacts, similar to how a student may select their own topic for a paper or assignment. Alternatively, the program may require specific artifacts be input into the portfolio. ○ As long as the program has a competency-based rubric and faculty or field personnel score students on their demonstration of the competencies, what content students submit as evidence or artifacts does not need to be the same / identical for each student. Students may have the autonomy to determine what to include in their portfolios. ○ However, assessment must be conducted the same way for all students via a consistent rubric. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.	

		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. Programs may choose to utilize the same or different assessment plans for each program option.	

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.	Narrative provides the program's most recent year of summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of the identified competencies for each program option.
	
	Narrative specifies the percentage of students achieving program benchmarks for each program option.
		• For assessment data, programs should submit their most current set of outcomes / data (which may reflect prior, yet still recent, data points).
		  ○ It is not required for the data points to be from the same academic year, nor the same set of students being assessed unless the program requires such assessment factors to be in place to support their data analysis and calculations/formula.
		• When presenting data programs should only include social work students.
		  ○ If the program has an assessment point in cross-listed or interdisciplinary courses, they must parse out the social work students.
		  ○ For accreditation purposes, non-social work students enrolled in social work courses (e.g., interprofessional education, other social sciences, etc.) are not included in the data because programs are assessing student competence for professional social work practice.
		  ○ Only social work students graduating from the social work program and preparing for professional practice need to be assessed and competency-based outcomes reviewed to inform the program's efficacy/continuous improvement.
		• Provide a narrative describing the findings competency-by-competency. This information can be captured in a table format.
		• The accreditation department has developed a **SAMPLE** table. The CSWE website houses the sample table.
		• A brief accompanying narrative should be provided explaining how the table is organized, what is included, and how to read/interpret the table.
			DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2
			
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3

		• It is within the purview of the program to determine their calculation method / formula for determining the percentage of students attaining competency.
		  ○ Programs may choose to include or exclude data for students who dropped a class as well as those who may not have completed an assessment.
		  ○ Ultimately, what data comprises the final results is within the program's purview to determine as long as programs assess all social work students and are not sampling.
		• When presenting the percentage of students achieving benchmarks, present aggregate percentages **not** means. Means may skew data due to outliers.
		• For master's programs, separate data outcomes are presented for generalist practice *and* each area of specialized practice. Label each set of outcomes clearly.
		• Programs present multiple levels of data:
		  ○ Programs present behaviors-level data (if collected via the *real or simulated practice* measure).
		  ○ Programs present competency-level for *each* measure.
		  ○ Programs present competency-level data, aggregated to include all measures per competency (e.g., Measure 1 + Measure 2 / 2 = Total % of Students Achieving Competency, etc.).
		  ○ Programs must include data for each program option.
		  ○ Programs must include data in aggregate, inclusive of all program options
		• Programs must present all levels of data by the COA's final decision phase. If data is incomplete, partial, or missing for one or more program options, the COA may choose a variety of decision types including but not limited to deferral, progress report, etc.
		• *For programs under review for an Initial Accreditation decision:* If the program documents that they will graduate their first cohort of students within 1-year, the	

		program may be granted initial accreditation with a progress report. In such cases, the program is allowed up to 1-year to collect and present assessment outcomes. • Programs are **not** required to meet their benchmarks. However, programs should articulate their plan to make data informed changes in response to AS 4.0.4. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. Separate data outcomes are presented for each program option. ○ Programs should delineate students by program option where they are receiving a majority (51% or more) of the social work curriculum.	

4.0.3: 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.	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.
	
	The program updates Form AS 4 (B) and/or Form AS 4(M) on its website with the most recent assessment outcomes for each program option.
	
	The program updates the Form AS 4(B) and/or Form AS 4(M) minimally every 2 years for each program option.
		• **REQUIRED FORM:** The CSWE website houses the required assessment outcomes form.
		• For assessment data, programs should submit their most current set of outcomes / data (which may reflect prior, yet still recent, data points).
		  ○ It is not required for the data points to be from the same academic year, nor the same set of students being assessed unless the program requires such assessment factors to be in place to support their data analysis and calculations/formula.
		• When presenting data programs should only include social work students.
		  ○ If the program has an assessment point in cross-listed or interdisciplinary courses, they must parse out the social work students.
		  ○ For accreditation purposes, non-social work students enrolled in social work courses (e.g., interprofessional education, other social sciences) are not included in the data because programs are assessing student competence for professional social work practice.
		  ○ Only social work students graduating from the social work program and preparing for social work practice need to be assessed and
			DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2
			
			COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3

		competency-based outcomes reviewed to inform the program's efficacy/continuous improvement.
		• Programs must embed a copy of Form AS 4(B) or AS 4(M) directly in the accreditation document and submit an active hyperlink to verify that to program is posting and routinely updating assessment findings for program stakeholders and the public.
		  ○ Provide an active hyperlink to the social work webpage where this form is posted publicly.
		  ○ The hyperlink should **not** lead directly to a .pdf or other file type because submitting an individual file link does **not** provide evidence that the form is readily accessible on the social work program's website.
		  ○ COA and accreditation staff must be able to easily verify the public-facing location where the form is posted and will not search websites for the form.
		  ○ The form submitted in the accreditation document must match exactly the form posted on the social work program's website.
		• 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 sole accreditor for social work education in the U.S. and its territories.
		• On this required form, the percentage of students attaining the competency benchmark is inclusive of all identified measures for that competency (e.g., Measure 1 + Measure 2 / 2 = Total % of Students Achieving Competency, etc.).
		• Programs must present all levels of data by the COA's final decision phase. If data is incomplete, partial, or missing for one or more program options, the COA may choose a variety of decision types including but not limited to deferral, progress report, etc.
		• Identify the program's constituencies, which always includes the public.	

		• Identify the frequency at which the program posts the required AS 4 forms / updates their website. The frequency should not exceed two (2) years.
		  ○ Data presented on the program's website must be within two (2) years at all times. The two (2) years is calculated from the date the data was collected, not the date the program posted the form.
		  ○ For example, if a program posted data from Fall 2019 / Spring 2020 in September 2020, then the program would be due to post data again at the end of Spring 2022.
		• If programs have cohorts that only admit students every three (3) years, programs may post assessment findings for those cohorts every three (3) years.
		• Programs are **not** required to meet their benchmarks. However, programs should articulate their plan to make data informed changes in response to AS 4.0.4.
		• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.
		• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.
		  ○ If the program only has one (1) program option, then they only need to complete the "Program Option 1" column. The "Aggregate" column is not applicable and may be deleted.	

4.0.4: 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.	The narrative describes the process used to evaluate outcomes for each program option. The narrative describes the implications for program renewal across all program options. The narrative discusses specific changes it has made in the program based on these assessment outcomes with clear links to	• This standard discusses the program's process for continually and thoughtfully reviewing data to inform programmatic renewal and 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? For example, faculty committee(s), faculty retreat, student involvement, community or field advisory boards, etc. • How do decision makers decide what meaning the findings hold for the program? How are decisions made to modify the program based on the data findings?	**(Process Only)** **DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **(Process Only)** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2** **(Complete)** **DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2** **(Complete)** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3**

	the data for each program option.	• Programs are **not** required to meet their benchmarks. However, programs should articulate their plan to make data informed changes. • Programs must discuss data-informed changes and implications for program renewal or provide a rationale and discussion for not making changes and the implications for program renewal. ○ Identified changes can be minor or major as long as the program is actively / intentionally working toward competency attainment. • The response expands beyond changing benchmarks as a result of the assessment findings. It is insufficient to discuss adjusting benchmarks only. • A description of program changes must provide sufficient detail (e.g., course modifications, training enhancements, new extracurricular offerings, etc.) explicitly linked to specific findings. If no changes are reported, provide a rationale for that decision. • Programs must present all levels of data by the COA's final decision phase. If data is incomplete, partial, or missing for one or more program options, the COA may choose a variety of decision types including but not limited to deferral, progress report, etc. and programs will be asked to submit specific data-informed changes. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
4.0.5: 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.	For each program option, the narrative provides the program's plan for assessing the implicit curriculum, including program-defined stakeholders. For each program option, the narrative provides summary data for the assessment of the implicit curriculum, as defined in EP	• New standard in 2015 **EPAS**. • Must assess a minimum of one (1) aspect of the implicit curriculum defined in **EP 4.0** (e.g., diversity, student development, faculty, administrative and governance structure, resources, etc.). • Programs may assess how well they are implementing one or more standards in **AS 3** (implicit curriculum). • Clearly identify which area(s) of the implicit curriculum the program is assessing. ○ If a program is using a measure that features both implicit and explicit assessments questions, the program must clearly identify the specific questions that	**(Plan Only)** **DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1** **(Plan Only)** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2** **(Complete)** **DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2** **(Complete)** **COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3**

	4.0, including program-defined stakeholders. For each program option, the narrative discusses the implications for program renewal and specific changes it has made based on these assessment outcomes.	assess one or more areas of the implicit curriculum. • This assessment focuses on the implicit curriculum (learning environment) **not** the explicit curriculum (e.g., coursework, competencies, behaviors, dimensions, student learning outcomes, etc.). • Different from the assessment of competency-based student learning outcomes, program may utilize student self-assessment measures based on aspects of the implicit curriculum. Student self-assessment of competence is **not** an implicit curriculum measure. • Assessment must take place at the program-level rather than the institution-level. Social work program-specific plan, data, and changes must be presented. • Any social work program stakeholders may participate in the assessment. For example, students, staff, faculty, administrators, alumni, field instructors, committees, community advisory board, etc. • Sampling is permitted. • Programs may choose to assess a different aspect of the implicit curriculum each year. • Example measures include exit surveys, interviews, focus groups, alumni surveys, culture/climate surveys, strategic planning process data collection, etc. • How is the program proactive on the basis of its findings? • A description of program changes must provide sufficient detail (e.g., course modifications, training enhancements, new extracurricular offerings, resource enhancements, policy and procedure changes, new events, conferences, speaker series, initiatives, student organization projects, culture/climate work, strategic planning goals, scholarship programs, community partnerships) explicitly linked to specific findings. If no changes are reported, provide a rationale for that decision. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	