

Leading
Critical
Conversations

2021

**RACIAL, ECONOMIC,
& ENVIRONMENTAL
JUSTICE**

CSWE 67th Annual
Program Meeting
November 4-7, 2021
Orlando, Florida



Frequently-Cited Standards

What Accreditation Standards are most commonly cited?

Presented by the CSWE Department of Social Work Accreditation



Disclaimer

Similar to accredited programs, the Commission on Accreditation (COA) and accreditation team engage in continuous quality improvement efforts. This translates to updates and enhancements to policies, procedures, interpretations, requirements, and resources.

Please note that this presentation is for baccalaureate and master's programs and reflects interpretations for the 2015 EPAS. The 2022 EPAS are still under development and content and interpretation of the standards may differ for the 2022 EPAS.

Content in this presentation is subject to change!

Always check the cswe.org website or contact DOSWA staff for the most current accreditation info.

Housekeeping

- This presentation will cover the ten (10) most frequently cited standards with the exception of assessment, which is covered in a separate presentation
- There will be limited time for Q&A at the end of the presentation
- Primary contacts may connect with your program's assigned accreditation specialist for follow up post-presentation as needed; DOSWA offers services year-round!
- This presentation will be available on the CSWE website at <https://www.cswe.org/Accreditation/Information/Accreditation-Powerpoints>

Megan Fujita
Executive Director

Kat Gibson-Ledl
Associate Director of Accreditation
Services

Stephanie McNally
Manager, Practice Doctorate &
Fellowship Accreditation

Monica Wylie
Department Office Manager &
Assistant to ED

Anna Holster
Associate Director of Accreditation
Operations & Technology

Katie Benson
Accreditation Specialist

Karen Chapman
Accreditation Specialist

Michael Leff
Accreditation Specialist

Marilyn Gentner
Accreditation Specialist

Hiring!
Accreditation Specialist

Hiring!
Volunteer Coordinator

Accreditation Volunteers
(Commissioners & Site Visitors)

Department of Social Work Accreditation (DOSWA)

*Meet the accreditation team!
We offer year-round accreditation
services and would love to collaborate
with you.*

Quality Assurance

- Three Commission on Accreditation meetings per year
 - February
 - June
 - October
- Programs are reviewed for decisions related to various stages of the Reaffirmation and Candidacy processes at these three(3) meetings
- The citations are tracked after each meeting and calculated for an end-of-year report that is presented to the Commission on Accreditation

Minimum Compliance Framework

- The Commission on Accreditation (COA) reviews programs through “minimum compliance” lens.
- Staff also train programs to set goals for minimum compliance requirements using the EPAS, Interpretation Guide, and other COA-sanctioned materials.
- This means that programs are welcome to go above and beyond minimum compliance or incorporate best-practices as long as the program is meeting the minimum requirements of the standard.
- Programs have the flexibility to craft excellent educational experiences that exceed the EPAS minimum requirements.
- We set the floor; you set the ceiling!

Writing to an Accreditation Standard

- Write succinctly and clearly
- Write to each element/component of the standard
- Many citations occur because information was missing or unclear
- Use the Interpretation Guide, self-study or benchmark optional Volume 1 templates, and appropriate review brief to structure your response to each element of each standard
- COA cannot make any assumptions; describe how the programs complies with each standard
- Explicitly address each program option in response to each standard

2015 EPAS Interpretation Guide

- Much of the material covered today is located in the 2015 EPAS Interpretation Guide
- This Guide is a companion 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
- It is updated after every COA meeting, 3 times per year, and sent to all program's primary contacts as well as posted on CSWE's website
- Changes are highlighted for ease of tracking updates
- The most current version is posted at:
<https://www.cswe.org/Accreditation>

Program Options

- Defined on page 21 of the EPAS Glossary as:

“Various structured pathways to degree completion by which social work programs are delivered including specific methods and locations such as on campus, off campus, and virtual instruction.”

- Includes: main campus, branch campus, satellite site, online program, etc.
- Program options are **not** plans of study such as advanced standing, 16-month, 24-months, part-time, etc.
- A substantive change report is required when adding a new program option per policy 1.2.4 in the EPAS Handbook
- **Self-study & Benchmark Documents:** Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.

2020-2021 Academic Year COA Meeting Statistics

- 428 programs were reviewed at the October 2020, February 2021, and June 2021 COA meetings
 - 1026 standards were cited
 - 124 Reaffirmation decision reviews
 - 84 Letters of Instruction (LOI) issued
 - 76 Candidacy decision reviews
 - Candidacy, 2nd Year of Candidacy, or Initial
 - 76 Progress report reviews
 - 9 Restoration report reviews
 - 58 Substantive change proposal reviews
 - 1 Fellowship review

Standards by Number of AY2020-2021 Citations

#	Standard	#	Standard	#	Standard
69	AS 4.0.1 (Assessment)	26	AS 3.0.2 (Diversity)	20	AS 3.4.1 (Budget)
50	ASB/M2.0.3(Curriculum Matrix)	26	AS B/M 3.3.4(b) (PD full-time)	20	AS B/M 2.2.9(Field instructors)
47	AS 3.2.3 (Ratio)	25	AS 3.0.3 (Diversity)	19	AS B/M 3.1.1 (Admissions)
43	AS 4.0.5 (Assessment)	24	AS 3.1.2 (Admissions)	18	AS 1.0.3 (Mission & Goals)
30	AS 4.0.4 (Assessment)	22	AS 3.4.3 (support staff)	18	AS 3.0.1 (Diversity)
36	AS 4.0.2 (Assessment)	22	AS B/M 2.0.2 (Gen Curriculum)	17	AS 3.4.2 (Using resources)
35	AS B/M 3.3.5(c) (FD Release)	21	AS 3.1.9(Student participation)	15	AS 3.3.6 (Field Structure)
33	AS 4.0.3 (Assessment)	21	AS B/M 2.0.1 (Gen Curriculum)	15	AS M2.1.4 (Curriculum Matrix)
30	AS B/M 3.3.4(c) (PD Release)	21	AS B/M 2.2.2 (Field Opps)	14	AS 1.0.1 (Mission & Goals)
28	AS 2.2.7 (Field Policies)	20	AS 1.0.2 (Mission & Goals)	14	AS 3.3.1 (Admin structure)
27	AS 3.1.7 (Evaluating students)	20	AS 3.1.6 (Advisement)	13	AS 2.2.4 (Field contact)

Standards by # of AY2020-2021 Citations (continued)

#	Standard	#	Standard	#	Standard
12	AS 3.2.1 (Faculty qualifications)	5	AS 2.2.8 (monitoring field)	3	ASM3.1.3 (advanced standing)
11	AS 3.2.5 (Faculty workload)	5	AS B/M3.3.4(a) (director credentials)	3	AS 3.3.5 (field director name)
9	AS 3.3.3 (Faculty policies)	5	AS B/M3.3.5(b) (field director credentials)	2	AS 3.1.4 (transfer policies)
8	AS 2.2.1 (Field/classroom)	4	AS M2.1.1 (identifying area of specialized practice)	2	AS 3.3.4 (program director name)
8	AS 3.1.8 (Termination)	4	AS M2.1.2 (curriculum design)	1	AS 2.2.5 (field hours)
8	AS 3.2.2 (Practice faculty)	4	AS M2.2.3 (sp. Practice opps)	1	AS 3.2.7 (faculty modeling)
7	AS 2.2.10 (Field training)	4	AS 2.2.11 (field/employment)	1	AS 3.3.2 (curriculum design)
7	AS B3.2.4/M3.2.4 (# of faculty)	4	AS 3.1.10 (student organizing)	1	AS 3.4.4 (library report)
6	AS 3.1.5 (Credit for life/work)	4	AS 3.2.6 (faculty development)	1	AS 3.4.6 (assistive technology)
6	AS 3.4.5 (Class & office space)	4	AS 3.3.5(a) (field director experience)		
5	AS 2.2.6 (field admission)	3	AS M2.1.3 (extend & enhance)		Every AS cited at least once.

Standards Included in this Presentation

1. AS B/M 2.0.3/M2.1.4
2. AS 3.2.3
3. AS B/M 3.3.4(c)/3.3.5(c)
4. AS 2.2.7
5. AS 3.1.7
6. AS 3.0.2/3.0.3
7. AS B/M 3.3.4(b)
8. AS 3.1.2
9. AS 3.4.3
10. AS B/M2.0.2/M2.1.2

Curriculum Matrices

Accreditation 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.

Curriculum Matrices

Accreditation 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.*

Accreditation 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.*

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program does not incorporate the dimensions into curriculum matrix.
- All four dimensions are not specified for each competency.
- Program does not provide content related to all five systems levels for competencies 6-9.
- The description of identified course content is vague or unclear.
- Program does not provide syllabi for all courses in curriculum matrix.
- Program added a competency(ies), but does not include it/them in the curriculum matrix.

Main Reasons for Citation (continued)

- Content in the curriculum matrix could not be located in the referenced syllabus.
- Curriculum matrix does not reference specific course content.
- Program focuses on assessment measures, rather than specific course content.
- Program includes electives or non-required content in its curriculum matrix.
- Program does not either include a statement that matrix applies to all program options or provide a separate matrix for each program option.

FTE Faculty-to-Student Ratio

Accreditation Standard 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.*

Main Reasons for Citation

- The program does not provide a numerical ratio.
- The program does not clearly explain the calculation, include the formula, or show the math.
- The provided math is unclear or inconsistent with content presented elsewhere in the self-study (such as workload policy).
- Number of faculty included in ratio is inconsistent with number of faculty included in faculty summary form.

Main Reasons for Citation (continued)

- The program documents a ratio greater than 1:25 (baccalaureate) or 1:12 (master's).
- Program double-counted faculty for both the baccalaureate and master's programs.
- The program does not explain how the faculty size is commensurate with each element of the standard (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).

Main Reasons for Citation (continued)

- The faculty-to-student ratio presented by the program was inconsistent with the workload policy presented in the self-study
 - E.g.: The program reported that its workload policy is teaching 10 courses per year, but reported the FTE of part-time faculty as something other than .1 FTE per class taught
- Program includes staff in its faculty-to-student ratio.
- The program's response was unclear or confusing
 - Avoid this by including subheadings and clear notes

Assigned Time for the Field Director

Accreditation Standard 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.*

Accreditation 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.*

Assigned Time for the Program Director

Accreditation Standard B3.3.4(c): *The program describes the procedures for calculating 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 25% assigned time is required at the baccalaureate level. The program discusses that this time is sufficient.*

Accreditation Standard 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.*

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program does not identify one individual program director and one individual field director for whom the minimum required assigned time for this role is designated. Programs may have additional individuals in their administrative structure, but must have one primary person in each of these roles.
- Release time is granted to serve as both director and another role (e.g.: chair or dean) without differentiating what percent of release time is dedicated to serve in each administrative role or verify that at least 25%/50% of that release time is dedicated to serving as director.
- Program does not describe specifically how assigned time is calculated.
 - E.g.: Full-time workload is teaching eight courses per year; individual receives four courses release that are dedicated to serving as program director (50%); has two credit releases for research and other duties (25%); and teaches two courses per year (25%)

Main Reasons for Citation (continued)

- Description of how assigned time is calculated is unclear.
- Description of how assigned time is calculated is inconsistent with program's workload policy as stated elsewhere in the self-study.
- Program does not state that assigned time is sufficient and explain why time is sufficient.
- Program does not specify that this assigned time is sufficient to serve as program director/field director over all program options.

Main Reasons for Citation Specific to Field Director

- Assigned time for administering field education also includes assigned time for other duties, such as teaching field seminar or other field courses.
- Field director is both BSW and MSW field director, but does not differentiate that at least 25 percent assigned time is to BSW field *plus* at least 50 percent assigned time is to MSW field.

Field Education Program

Accreditation Standard 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.

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program does not provide clear policies, criteria, *and* procedures for each component of the standard.
- Program does not provide criteria (or policies, or procedures) for one of the sub-components of this standard.
- Program does not clearly differentiate between policies, criteria, and procedures, so it is unclear that all three are provided for each component of the standard.

Main Reasons for Citation (continued)

- Program does not differentiate between evaluating student learning and evaluating field-setting effectiveness.
- Program provides vague policies, but not clear policies for one or more of the components of the standard.
- Provided policies are inconsistent with the policies in the student handbook or field manual.
- Program does not specify policies, criteria, and procedures for each program option.

Evaluation of Students' Academic & Professional Performance

Accreditation Standard 3.1.7: The program submits its policies and procedures for evaluating student's 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.

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program does not provide specific written policies in addition to a description of the procedures followed in implementing the policies.
- Program does not clearly discuss both academic *and* professional performance policies and procedures.
- Discussion of professional performance policies and procedures focus on field, but not the broader learning environment.
- Program provides grievance procedures, but not written policies.

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program does not clearly describe how it informs students of these policies and procedures.
- Policies and procedures in Volume I differ from those in the student handbook.
- Program does not specify that these policies and procedures apply to all program options (or differentiate between program options, if applicable).

Diversity in the Implicit Curriculum

Accreditation Standard 3.0.2: *The program explains how these efforts provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment.*

Accreditation Standard 3.0.3: *The program describes specific plans to continually improve the learning environment to affirm and support persons with diverse identities.*

- Linked to **AS 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.*
- **Consistent with Educational Policy 3.0** -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.

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program does not reference specifically how efforts described in AS 3.0.1 provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment.
 - E.g.: The program does not describe what the learning environment looks like or the impact of the efforts in AS 3.0.1.
- The narrative provided in AS 3.0.1 does not clearly describe the efforts the program makes, which directly impacts this standard.
 - E.g.: AS 3.0.1 does not discuss specific and continuous efforts it makes to provide a learning environment that models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference, **therefore this standard is also cited**

Main Reasons for Citation (continued)

- The program does not describe the learning environment, as described in the Educational Policy.
- Discussion focuses only on demographic and statistical diversity.
- The program focuses on courses and field (explicit curriculum) rather than the implicit curriculum.
- For AS 3.0.3, program does not provide specific future plans in which the program is not already engaging.
- The program does not explain how these efforts provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment for **all program options**.

Program Director Appointment

Accreditation Standard B/M3.3.4(b): The program provides documentation that the director has a full-time appointment to the social work baccalaureate/master's program.

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program does not provide a personnel letter.
- Personnel letter does not include a specific statement that appointment is full-time.
- Personnel letter does not state that the full-time appointment is specifically to the social work program.
- Personnel letter does not specifically identify the program director by name.

Admissions Policies & Procedures

Accreditation 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.

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program does not describe both clear written policies and the procedures followed to implement those policies (helpful to separate with subtitles)
- Policy and procedures are missing details such as who conducts the evaluation, timelines for evaluation, and how judgments are made in determining decision status
- Program does not specify how notification is made (letter, email, etc.)

Main Reasons for Citation (continued)

- Program does not describe possible contingent conditions and how those contingent conditions might be removed once admitted
 - E.g.: An applicant that hasn't completed a prerequisite can be admitted with a contingent condition that the prerequisite be completed in the first semester of enrollment
- Provided policies are inconsistent with the policies in the student handbook.
- Program does not specify policies, criteria, and procedures for each program option.

Personnel & Technological Resources

Accreditation Standard 3.4.3: The program demonstrates that it has sufficient support staff, other personnel, and technological resources to support all of its educational activities, mission and goals.

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program describes faculty, but not other program personnel
 - This standard only requires a discussion of non-faculty personnel
- Program does not describe technological resources available
- Program does not include a statement that these resources are sufficient to support all of its educational activities, mission and goals and why
- A program with more than one program option does not clearly differentiate between personnel and technological resources available to each option

Rationale for Curriculum Design

Accreditation Standard B2.0.2/M2.0.2: *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.*

Accreditation 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.*

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program does not describe how the courses interact with each other or reference specific concepts and theories
- Program does not describe how students progress through the program, including how courses taken concurrently supplement each other, and how courses build upon earlier courses
- Program does not describe how field education is incorporated into the curriculum and how the courses interact with field experience to integrate theory and practice ?

Main Reasons for Citation (continued)

- Program describes the curriculum, but does not provide a rationale for why it designed the curriculum that way
- Program has electives, certificates, dual degree options, focus areas, or any other special options, but does not describe how they are incorporated into the curriculum or why
- Program has more than one program option, but does not either state that the curriculum is the same for both/all program options or describe how the curriculum differs for each program option

Assessment Standards

- *Accreditations Standards 4.0.1, 4.0.2, and 4.0.3 are all connected to each other*
 - *If there are issues with one standard, there is a “cascade effect”, where it then created challenges with the other assessment standards.*
 - *Accreditation Standard 4.0.1 requests multiple components of the program’s assessment plan.*
- *For more detailed information on assessment, please watch our Assessment Overview presentation tomorrow:*

Saturday, November 6, 10:45am

Dolphin Americans Seminar Room/Fifth Level.

2022 Draft 2 Update & Feedback Sessions @ APM 2021

Session #1: Saturday, November 6, 2021 | 1:00pm – 2:00pm

Room: Dolphin Building, 5th Level, Southern Hemisphere 5
Walt Disney World Swan and Dolphin Resort | Orlando, FL

Session #2: Saturday, November 6, 2021 | 5:00pm – 6:00pm

Room: Dolphin Building, 5th Level, Southern Hemisphere 5
Walt Disney World Swan and Dolphin Resort | Orlando, FL

We're recruiting!

Interested in becoming a CSWE site visitor?

- *Must be a full- or part-time faculty member at a CSWE-accredited program with at least three (3) years of faculty experience.*
- Contact Anna Holster, Associate Director of Operations and Technology, at aholster@cswe.org to begin the process.

Are you a current site visitor? Interested in applying for the Commission on Accreditation?

- *Must be a full- or part-time faculty member at a CSWE-accredited program with at least three (3) years of faculty experience.*
- Contact Anna Holster, Associate Director of Operations and Technology, at aholster@cswe.org to begin the process.

Accreditation Team

Megan Fujita, PhD, MSW

Executive Director

703.519.2078 (office)

mfujita@cswe.org

Monica Wylie

Department Manager

Assistant to the Executive Director

703.519.2073

mwylie@cswe.org

Anna R. Holster, MSW, MPhil

Associate Director of Accreditation

Operations & Technology

703.519.2044 (office)

aholster@cswe.org

<https://annaholster.youcanbook.me>

Katie “Kat” Gibson-Ledl, LLMSW-Macro

Associate Director of Accreditation Services

703.519.2073

kgibson@cswe.org

<https://katgibson-ledl.youcanbook.me>

Accreditation Team

Katie Benson, MSW

Accreditation Specialist

571.527.3483 | kbenson@cswe.org
<https://katiebenson.youcanbook.me>

Marilyn Gentner, LMSW, LICSW

Accreditation Specialist

703.519.2040 | mgentner@cswe.org
<https://mgentner.youcanbook.me>

Stephanie McNally

*Manager, Practice Doctorate and Fellowship
Accreditation*

[703.519.2062](tel:703.519.2062) | smcnally@cswe.org

Karen Chapman, MSW, MPA

Accreditation Specialist

703.936.8344 | kchapman@cswe.org
<https://karen-chapman.youcanbook.me/>

Michael Leff, JD, MSW

Accreditation Specialist

703.519.2054 | mleff@cswe.org
<https://michaelleff.youcanbook.me>



Thank you for attending this customized APM session. We wish you well on your continuous quality improvement efforts! Please be in touch with Anna Holster at aholster@cswe.org if you have additional questions.

Questions?

- **Honorable Mention Standards**

These standards were in the most frequently cited standards in previous years, but didn't make the Top Ten this year. The following slides aren't included in this year's presentation.

Field Instructor Credentials & Practice Experience

Accreditation Standard B2.2.9: *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 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.*

Field Instructor Credentials & Practice Experience

Accreditation 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.*

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program does not specify that field instructors must hold a degree from a CSWE-accredited program and two-years post-degree practice experience in order to design field learning opportunities for students.
- Program specifies that they must hold a social work degree, but does not specify that the degree must be from a CSWE-accredited program.
- Program does not provide a specific mechanism for how it reinforces the social work perspective for students who are not supervised by someone with the requisite credentials.
 - This policy is required, even if it is reported that all students are placed with a field instructor with the requisite credentials.
- Social work perspective is not reinforced above and beyond what all students already receive for students supervised by individuals without the requisite credentials.
- Social work perspective is not reinforced at the student-level.
- Description of how social work perspective is reinforced is vague.
- Program does not include a statement that response applies to all program options or provide a separate response for each program option.

Field Education Program Resources

Accreditation Standard 3.3.6: The program describes its administrative structure for field education and explains how its resources (personnel, time, and technological support) are sufficient to administer its field education program to meet its mission and goals.

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program describes the field director's role, but does not specify who is responsible for conducting field visits, leading field seminars, serving as field liaison, or other roles related to administering field (as applicable)
- Program does not describe personnel, time, and technological support available for field education.
- Program does not explicitly state that these resources are sufficient to administer the field education program to meet its mission and goals and why.
- Program does not describe the administrative structure for field education for all program options.
- Program does not describe the sufficiency of personnel, time, and technological support available for field education for all program options.

Social Work Program Budget

Accreditation Standard 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.

Main Reasons for Citation

- Program does not describe procedures provided for developing the program budget.
- Program provides a budget for the BSW and MSW programs combined, but does not provide a budget differentiated by program level.
- Budget identifies clear reductions in the budget without an explanation for that reduction (a reduction isn't an automatic citation, as long as it is clearly explained).
- Budget form is not complete, with missing fields (such as % hard money)
- Program does not have funds identified for some items on the budget form without an explanation of why those areas are blank.
- Program does not state that the budget is both sufficient and stable to achieve the program's mission and goals and specify why it is sufficient and stable.
- Program does not describe the sufficiency and stability of the budget for all program options.