



COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Board of Accreditation
Department of Social Work Accreditation

Interpretation Guide for Professional Practice Doctoral Program Standards

(Version April 2023)

This is a companion document to the [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#), approved and adopted in June 2020, for use in the piloting of the accreditation of professional practice doctoral programs. This interpretation guide is based heavily on the [2015 EPAS Interpretation Guide](#) and provides programs with information for navigating the accreditation process and understanding the **Board of Accreditation's (BOA)** meaning, intent, and interpretation of the [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#). Interpretations further clarify the **BOA's** expectations for each standard and provides guidance for developing clear and concise written compliance narratives in accreditation documents.

The interpretation guide is being developed as the pilot is conducted and, like other pilot accreditation materials and requirements, is subject to change. This document is being provided publicly for informational purposes only.

Information regarding the professional practice doctoral program pilot can be found [here](#). Questions concerning the Interpretation Guide, or the piloting of the accreditation of professional practice doctoral programs in general, may be directed to practicedoc@cswe.org.

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 **BOA** to ensure each component of the standards is clearly addressed by the program. The primary reason for a citation is that 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 **BOA's** expectations for each standard.

Select a section below to review the information:

- [Accreditation Framework](#)
- [Navigating the Accreditation Process](#)
- [Standard-by-Standard Interpretations & Tips](#)

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.

Recent changes highlighted in yellow

The purposes of accreditation are:

- quality assurance;
- academic improvement;
- professional preparation; 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; and
- improvement

The **Board of Accreditation (BOA)** 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.

A pilot is a required step before CSWE's **BOA** can request an expansion in scope of accreditation from CHEA. Programs participating in the professional practice doctoral program accreditation pilot should know that the **BOA** intends to pursue a change in scope and proceed with accreditation of professional practice doctoral programs at the end of the pilot. CSWE's **BOA** cannot guarantee that CHEA will approve a request for change in scope.

The professional judgments of the **BOA** are based on the [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#).

As a CHEA-recognized programmatic accrediting body, the **BOA**, and their partnership with COEP, are responsible for revising the accreditation standards at periodic intervals.

The **BOA** is composed of fellow social work educators, practitioners, and one public member.

BOA members:

- serve as volunteers;
- have background in social work education and practice (or [public member](#));
- possess active CSWE members with a minimum of 2-years site visitor experience; and
- are appointed for three-year terms by the Chair of the CSWE Board of Directors.

The **BOA** convenes three (3) times per year: February; June; and October/November.

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

The **BOA** is the sole and final arbiter of compliance. Social work programs are solely responsible for implementing, demonstrating, and maintaining compliance with the accreditation standards.

The accreditation process utilizes a minimum compliance framework.

Recent changes highlighted in yellow

- The BOA reviews programs through a “minimum compliance” lens.
- DOSWA staff also train programs to set goals for minimum compliance requirements using the [*Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work*](#), this Interpretation Guide, and other BOA-sanctioned materials.
- 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.
- Programs have the flexibility to craft educational experiences that exceed the [*Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work*](#) minimum requirements.
- The BOA sets the floor; programs set the ceiling.

NAVIGATING THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

Preparation

Please refer to the [Professional Practice Doctoral Program Accreditation Pilot Handbook](#) for information regarding policies, procedures, due dates, and fees. The handbook will be periodically updated.

1. Pilot Timetables 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.
2. The timetable specifies the fees schedule ([select Fees](#)). For more information regarding fees or invoicing, please contact feesaccred@cswe.org.

Writing an Accreditation Document

1. [Policy 1.2.11 Document Submission Policy in the EPAS Handbook](#) provides formatting and submission requirements for each type of accreditation document.
2. 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. Web-based hyperlinks to content that substantiates compliance with a standard will not be accepted. BOA members/staff will not search websites for requested information. All required compliance information must be documented via a narrative response to the standard. Narrative included in a table is acceptable, unless a separate narrative is required.
3. Programs with multiple program options are expected to explicitly address each program option in response to *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 for one or more standards, the program must explicitly state this under the relevant accreditation standard. Be cognizant of the standards for 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 in the [Professional Practice Doctoral Program Accreditation Pilot Handbook](#) glossary and [2015 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." This includes branch/satellite campuses, online delivery method, etc. Please refer to policy [1.2.4 Program Changes in the EPAS Handbook](#) for complete definitions.
 - 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. Accreditation is paperless! Zero physical copies of accreditation documents are required. E-copies only will be accepted.
 - i. Submit all documents in Microsoft Word or searchable PDF Format (unless otherwise noted in policy [1.2.11 Document Submission Policy in the EPAS Handbook](#)). Scanned documents are **not** accepted.

Recent changes highlighted in yellow

- ii. Submissions are solely accepted by email. Documents sent via the cloud (e.g., OneDrive, SharePoint, Google Drive, Dropbox, etc.), CD, SD, or DVD will not be accepted.
- e. **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.
 - i. While the **BOA** may use their discretion to accept information that is misplaced within the document, for example if it is not placed under the correct / relevant standard, **BOA members** will not search through the document for requested information.
 - ii. All relevant compliance information should be included directly in response to the corresponding standard.
 - iii. 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.
- 4. 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 three-year period leading to a four-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 BOA and do **not** determine compliance; they are information gatherers. There are two (2) types of visitors:
 - i. Site Visitor = Reaffirmation
 - ii. **BOA Member** Visitor = Candidacy
 - d. **Program Response to a Visit Report:** A program's formal written response to the visitor's report documenting compliance with all items raised in the (1) Letter of Instruction and (2) Site Visit Report (Reaffirmation) or 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 **BOA**.
 - e. **Program Response to a Deferral:** A program's formal written response to the **BOA's** request for clarifying information upon which they make an informed decision about the program's compliance with the standards. 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 program's 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 program's formal written response to all outstanding noncompliance issues for which the program did not demonstrate compliance during an accreditation review process. Restoration reports require

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, the program should update their accreditation documents regarding any changes that strengthen compliance.
 - i. The most frequent changes include composition of faculty, students, staff, other personnel, removal of program options (addition of program options goes through the substantive change proposal process), updated assessment data, updates to policies or procedures, or enhancements made to the program operations to strengthen compliance with the [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#).
 - ii. 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/benchmark documents are current, accurate, and aligned with the [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#). Review policy [1.2.4 Program Changes 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/benchmark documents to the best of their ability. This ensures the visitor has access to current faculty and personnel information reflecting those with whom they will meet during their visit.
 - d. In the self-study/benchmark documents, programs should capture all components they wish to have accredited/reaffirmed for compliance with the [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#). Remember that programs are requesting the **BOA** to accredit/reaffirm these operations for four years at initial accreditation or eight years at reaffirmation. So, the self-study/benchmark should capture the program's best compliance plan that reflects current operations now and moving forward.
 - i. Review policy [1.2.4 Program Changes in the EPAS Handbook](#) for more information on program changes between review cycles and their required respective processes.
 - e. Submitting outdated information in the self-study, benchmark, or other accreditation documents may result in a citation or other action by the **BOA** in order to request the most current and accurate program materials.
11. Self-study/benchmark document writing tips & framing:
- a. The self-study or benchmark is your opportunity to tell the program's story to the **BOA!**
 - 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 complies with the standards.
 - c. **BOA readers** appreciate clear and concise narrative. Information provided should *a/ways* directly relate to the standard to which the program is responding. Do **not** include information beyond what the standard is requesting.

- d. Since **BOA members** read for minimum compliance with the EPAS, verbose and elaborate writing styles are discouraged.
 - e. The **BOA** cannot make any assumptions; describe how the programs complies with *each component* of the standard.
 - f. When the standard requires written policies and procedures, they must be copied/pasted directly into the accreditation document and the location cited (e.g., handbook or manual). Do not provide a link or a summary of the process in lieu of full policies and procedures.
 - g. **BOA members** trust that programs are disclosing complete and accurate information.
 - h. [Policy 1.2.11. Document Submission Policy in the EPAS Handbook](#) provides formatting and submission requirements for each type of accreditation document.
12. If major changes are planned or experienced during the candidacy process, it is important to contact the Pilot Manager 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.*”

Understanding the BOA Review Process

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

DOSWA Consultation Services

Review the [CSWE Accreditation Scope, Services, & Resources](#) document to understand how best to collaborate with DOSWA accreditation staff throughout the accreditation process and between review cycles. For the pilot, the Pilot Manager, with support from the **Associate Director**

of Accreditation Operations and Technology & Associate Director of Accreditation Services, will accomplish each of the accreditation specialist duties listed.

While accreditation staff may provide consultative services regarding the accreditation process and [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#), the BOA has sole and complete authority as the final arbiter of compliance with the [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#). The program is solely responsible for implementing, demonstrating, and maintaining compliance with the [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#).

The Pilot Manager, with support from the Associate Director of Accreditation Operations and Technology & Associate Director of Accreditation Services:

- Provides customized consultation on the accreditation process, [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#), and BOA interpretations, via phone, e-mail, video, and/or in-person at CSWE's Annual Program Meeting (APM)
 - 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 Information Sharing and Release of BOA Decision Letter in the EPAS Handbook](#))
 - For public inquires, call CSWE headquarters at (703) 683-8080 to locate the staff member who can best respond to your question(s) or review our DOSWA's [Whom to Contact](#) info sheet
 - Consultations services are available year-round!
- Develop and maintain accreditation templates, forms, and resources
- Communicate BOA 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 to the public
- Assist in understanding accreditation policies and procedures
- Train and support site visitors and BOA volunteers
- Collaborate in individualized and group settings with programs in their efforts to reach their accreditation goals
- Manage the BOA document review process
- Liaise between the BOA 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 Information Sharing and Release of BOA Decision Letter in the EPAS Handbook](#)) and designees authorized by the primary contact
- Does **not** conduct document reviews, provide written feedback, nor offer live or on-demand reviews of written materials beyond staff review of Draft Benchmark 1.
- Does **not** determine compliance/noncompliance as the BOA has sole and final authority as the arbiter of compliance in regulation decision-making

Always confirm accuracy of accreditation-related information with the Pilot Manager!

Communications with DOSWA & BOA

Recent changes highlighted in yellow

Per [policy 1.2.7. Primary Contact, Information Sharing, and Release of BOA 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 BOA meetings. An [Accreditation News Archive](#) is also publicly available on the [accreditation webpages](#) of the 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 BOA review. Changes may take place within the program prior to its next scheduled accreditation review; however, some program changes impact compliance with [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#) and require reporting to the BOA or DOSWA per [policy 1.2.4 Program Changes 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 [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#) during and in-between review cycles.

STANDARD-BY-STANDARD INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS

Profession's Purpose

"The purpose of the social work profession is to promote human and community well-being. Guided by a person-in-environment framework, a global perspective, respect for human diversity, and knowledge based on scientific inquiry, the purpose of social work is actualized through its quest for social and economic justice, the prevention of conditions that limit human rights, the elimination of poverty, and the enhancement of the quality of life for all persons, locally and globally." (Glossary in [Professional Practice Doctoral Program Accreditation Pilot Handbook](#) & pg. 5, [2015 EPAS](#))

Profession's Values

"The core values of the profession are service, social justice, the dignity and worth of the person, the importance of human relationships, integrity, competence, human rights, and scientific inquiry. These values underpin the explicit and implicit curricula and frame the profession's commitment to respect for all people and the quest for social and economic justice." (pg. 2, [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#))

Program's Context

"The program context encompasses the mission of the institution in which the program is located and the needs and opportunities associated with the setting. 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 how 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." (pg. 2, [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#))

Core Expertise and Skills for Doctoral Practitioners

"Social work education at the baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral levels shapes the profession's future through the education of competent professionals, the generation of knowledge, the promotion of research-informed practice through scientific inquiry, and the exercise of leadership within the professional community. Social work education is advanced by the scholarship of teaching and learning and scientific inquiry into its multifaceted dimensions, processes, and outcomes (Council on Social Work Education, 2015). Professional doctoral programs, regardless of focus, should prepare doctoral practitioners to:

- *engage in systematic inquiry that adheres to scholarly conventions;*
- *use and evaluate research-informed practice critically and at an advanced level;*
- *develop and disseminate practice-relevant knowledge through a variety of channels, such as teaching, scholarship, professional presentations, mentoring, and administration;*
- *demonstrate leadership in social work practice and education; and*
- *develop and maintain substantive expertise in one or more areas of social work practice."*

(pg. 1, [Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work](#))

Accreditation Standard 1— Program Mission and Goals

The mission and goals of a professional doctoral social work program address social work’s purpose, are grounded in core professional values, and are informed by program context. The core values of the profession are service, social justice, the dignity and worth of the person, the importance of human relationships, integrity, competence, human rights, and scientific inquiry. These values underpin the explicit and implicit curricula and frame the profession’s commitment to respect for all people and the quest for social and economic justice.

The program context encompasses the mission of the institution in which the program is located and the needs and opportunities associated with the setting. 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 how 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.

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENTS	BOA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE <i>This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!</i>
<p>1.0.1: The program submits its mission statement, which includes the program focus, and explains how it is consistent with the profession’s purpose and values.</p>	<p>Narrative provides the program’s mission statement, which includes the program’s area(s) of focus as identified in AS 2.0.3.</p> <p>Narrative explains how the program’s mission statement is consistent with the profession’s purpose and values.</p> <p>Narrative discusses any ways in which the program option mission differs from the on-campus program (if applicable).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS 1 focuses less upon curricular offerings and more on the program’s mission statement. • The mission statement is specific to professional practice doctoral program-level rather than school/department-level. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Institutions with both a professional practice doctoral program and another social work program must have distinct mission statements with language unique to each program level. • The mission statement includes the program’s area(s) of focus as identified in AS 2.0.3. • Explain how there is consistency with the program’s mission statement, profession’s purpose, and values. The linkages should be clear and explicit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The profession’s purpose is defined on pg. 10 of this guide. ○ Values is defined on page 10 of this guide. • Discuss each component of the profession’s purpose and values using subheadings. 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1 and 3</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>how</i> 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 <i>how</i> 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. 	
<p>1.0.2: The program explains how its mission is consistent with the institutional mission and the program’s context.</p>	<p>Narrative explains how the program’s mission is consistent with the institutional mission.</p> <p>Narrative explains how the program’s mission is consistent with the program’s context.</p> <p>Narrative discusses any ways in which the program option mission differs from</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS 1 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. The linkages should be clear and explicit. • Discuss the mission statement’s consistency, rather than programmatic components’ consistency. • Context is defined on pg. 10 of this guide • 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. 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1 and 3</p>

	<p>the on-campus program (if applicable).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The context component is important in this standard, as programs will develop the discussion around <i>how</i> 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? • 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 BOA 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 <i>how</i> 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. 	
<p>1.0.3: The program identifies its program goals and how they are derived from the program’s mission. The program explains how</p>	<p>Narrative identifies the program’s goals. Narrative demonstrates how the program’s goals are</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS 1 focuses less upon curricular offerings and more on the program’s mission statement. • Goals represent the elements or component parts of the mission. 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1 and 3</p>

<p>program goals are consistent with the core expertise and skills for professional doctoral-level practitioners.</p>	<p>derived from the program's mission.</p> <p>Narrative explains how program goals are consistent with the core expertise and skills for professional doctoral-level practitioners.</p> <p>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 are consistent with the core expertise and skills for professional doctoral-level practitioners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a brief narrative describing <i>how</i> 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 specific to professional practice doctoral program-level rather than school/department-level. • There should be a brief narrative describing <i>how</i> the goals are consistent with each of the core expertise and skills for doctoral practitioners. • There is no required number of goals. • The program is typically the subject of the goal (i.e., the program will...). • 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, core expertise and skills-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, goals, and core expertise and skills for doctoral practitioners, to visually demonstrate the relationship. • Tables help clarify alignment and visually separate text, however, a narrative discussion of <i>how</i> 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. 	
---	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. 	
<p>Accreditation Standard 2 — Explicit Curriculum</p> <p>The explicit curriculum constitutes the program’s formal educational structure and includes the courses and academic product(s) required for the program. Programs identify a specific focus for the professional doctorate curriculum that prepares students for substantive expertise beyond the baccalaureate and master’s level in one or more areas of social work practice. The academic product(s) should be defined by the program and utilize a form that best incorporates the requirements of the program focus and the institution that is awarding the degree. Whatever form the final academic product(s) takes, it will serve as a foundation for future scholarly practice.</p> <p>*Diversity and difference: the intersectionality of multiple factors including, but not limited to race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, marital status, political belief, religion, immigration status, and mental or physical ability.</p>			
STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	BOA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE <i>This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!</i>
<p>2.0.1: The program identifies its curriculum content and required academic product(s) and provides a rationale for the logical structure, timeframe, and progression of the curriculum.</p>	<p>For each area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3, narrative identifies its curriculum content and required academic product(s).</p> <p>For each area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3, narrative provides rationale for the logical structure, timeframe, and progression of the curriculum.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum is all planned educational experiences under the direction of the social work program that facilitates student attainment of core expertise and skills. • This is a discussion of the concepts, theories, pedagogical ideas, and precepts that inform the formal curriculum design for <i>each</i> area of focus as identified in AS 2.0.3 (e.g., plan of study). • What content is engaged before what? What content is engaged concurrently? Why? 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? 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1 and 3</p>

	<p>Narrative discusses any ways in which the program option curriculum content, required academic product(s), logical structure, timeframe, or progression of the curriculum differs from the on-campus program (if applicable).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) and required academic products but may include summary information regarding electives, general education requirements, certificate programs, dual degree programs, and other optional curricular offerings. • The required academic products are defined by the program and utilize a form that best incorporates the requirements of the program focus and the institution that is awarding the degree. • Rather than provide a list of courses and descriptions (e.g., course catalog), programs are expected to provide a narrative describing <i>how</i> 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ 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 BOA does not address 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>credit hour requirements. Programs are advised to inquire with their state’s licensing board regarding any post-degree practice implications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. 	
<p>2.0.2: The program explains how its curriculum is consistent with the program’s mission and goals.</p>	<p>Narrative explains how the program’s curriculum is consistent with the program’s mission and goals.</p> <p>If mission, goals, or curriculum differ for each program option, narrative discusses how each program option differs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This standard asks for a brief discussion of <i>how</i> the curricular offerings are consistent with the program’s mission and goals detailed in AS 1.0. • Consider including a table identifying the components of the program’s mission, program’s goals, and curricular offerings to visually demonstrate the relationship. • Tables help clarify consistency and visually separate text, however, a narrative discussion of <i>how</i> the program’s mission and goals are consistent with the curricular offerings 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 curricular offerings 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. 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1 and 3</p>
<p>2.0.3: The program identifies its area(s) of focus in social work practice and scholarship and explains how the curriculum prepares students for</p>	<p>Narrative identifies the program’s area(s) of focus in social work practice and scholarship.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List the name of each area of focus in social work practice and scholarship offered by the program. • Discuss <i>how</i> the curriculum prepares students with substantive expertise in these area(s) of focus. 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1</p> <p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 2 and 3</p>

<p>substantive expertise in these area(s). The program describes how the program prepares doctoral level practitioner-scholars who demonstrate leadership in addressing diversity and difference;* scholarship; professional behavior and ethics; and human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.</p> <p>*Diversity and difference: the intersectionality of multiple factors including, but not limited to race, ethnicity, national origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, marital status, political belief, religion, immigration status, and mental or physical ability</p>	<p>Narrative describes how the program prepares students for substantive expertise in these area(s).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Though “area of focus” is an umbrella term, a program may use language such as concentration, track, 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. 	
<p>2.0.4: The program defines doctoral leadership in social work practice and explains how its curriculum prepares students to be doctoral leaders in the areas identified in AS 2.0.3.</p>	<p>Narrative provides the program’s definition of doctoral leadership in social work practice.</p> <p>Narrative explains how its curriculum prepares students to be doctoral</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the program’s definition of doctoral leadership in social work practice. • Discuss <i>how</i> the curriculum prepares students to be doctoral leaders in diversity and difference; scholarship; professional behavior and ethics; and human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1</p> <p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 2 and 3</p>

	<p>leaders in the areas identified in AS 2.0.3 (diversity and difference;* scholarship; professional behavior and ethics; and human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice) for each area of focus, across all program options.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3 and each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to the standard. 	
<p>2.0.5: The program explains how its curriculum content implements the core expertise and skills for professional doctoral level scholar-practitioners.</p>	<p>Narrative describes any core expertise and skills above those specified in the Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work which have been added by the program for each area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3. If the added core expertise and skills vary by program option, provide added core expertise and skills by program option as well.</p> <p>For each area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3, narrative provides a matrix illustrating how the curriculum content implements the core expertise and skills for professional doctoral level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The core expertise and skills for doctoral practitioners are articulated in the Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work pg. 1. • The curriculum matrix maps specific curriculum course content to each of the core expertise and skills (and any other core expertise and skills added by the program, if applicable). • A separate curriculum matrix is submitted for each area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3. • At a minimum, each curriculum matrix should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The core expertise and skills (and any other core expertise and skills added by the program, if applicable), ○ the course call number and full course titles where each core expertise and skills are implemented, ○ specific course content (e.g., readings, modules, assignments, in-class activities, etc.) where each core expertise and skills are implemented, and ○ Page Number in Volume 2 (Syllabi) and/or direct link to page of syllabi. • The matrix (or matrices) should be in a table format. 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1 (Including Syllabi)</p> <p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 2 and 3 (Including Syllabi)</p>

	<p>scholar-practitioners and additional core expertise and skills added by the program as identified in AS 2.0.5, if applicable. If the curriculum content varies by program option, a separate matrix is also provided for each program option.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intent and purpose of the curriculum matrix (or matrices) is different than the assessment plan matrix. The curriculum matrix is snapshot featuring specific required course content strongly relating to each core expertise and skills which all students are learning in the classroom. The assessment plan matrix details how the program is capturing core expertise and skills-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 each core expertise and skills through specific course content. This is not where/how the program is assessing student learning outcomes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The curriculum matrix purpose = the strongest teaching/learning touchpoints (via specific course content) for each core expertise and skills. ○ The assessment plan purpose = measure(s) used to assess core expertise and skills-based student learning outcomes. • Required courses, or content all students are receiving, should be included in the matrix (or matrices). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 core expertise and skills required for all students. ○ Elective courses are not included on the matrix. 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 one (1) of three (3) courses; then the same piece of content must be consistent across all three (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. ● Matrix content should complete the question: “The program is confident that we are preparing competent social work practitioners because they learn (this core expertise or skill) via (specific course content) in (class # and title).” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For example, “The program is confident that we are preparing competent social work practitioners because they demonstrate leadership in social work practice and education via a multimedia project defining their social work leadership identity and plan in SW 805: Organizational Leadership”. ● Programs are permitted to include cross-listed or interdisciplinary course content that is required for all students. Content should be clearly linked to each of the core expertise and skills. ● The curriculum matrix (or matrices) is not intended to serve as a comprehensive curricular map. Instead, it should include the strongest / best examples of core expertise and skills-based learning in the curriculum, not every instance of core expertise and skills-based learning in the curriculum. ● In the matrix (or matrices), include a <i>brief</i> description of the course content, explaining what the specific content entails rather than only listing the content title. 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A program may choose to add one (1) or more core expertise and skills unique to the program’s context. If the program elects to add additional core expertise and skills for any area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3, the program should describe these additional core expertise and skills and they should be included in the matrix (or matrices).• Include page numbers in matrix, referring readers to Volume 2 (syllabi), and continuously paginate Volume 2 so that BOA readers may easily crosscheck the specific course content within the respective syllabi.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 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 core expertise and skills. If one or more components of the core expertise or skills is not addressed clearly in the matrix and syllabi, the BOA may cite the standard.○ If the curriculum matrix is cited by the BOA, the program will be asked to resubmit the syllabi.• Use labels to clearly address each component of the compliance statement within the matrix (or matrices).• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
--	--	--	--

Accreditation Standard 3 — Implicit Curriculum

The implicit curriculum refers to the learning environment in which the explicit curriculum is presented and includes areas such as the program's commitment to diversity, admissions policies and procedures, advisement and mentoring policies, student participation in governance, faculty, administrative structure, and resources.

Diversity

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	BOA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE <i>This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!</i>
<p>3.0.1: The program describes how it creates a diverse and inclusive environment that promotes respectful discourse.</p>	<p>Narrative describes how the program creates a diverse and inclusive environment that promotes respectful discourse across all program options.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 within and <i>beyond</i> the classroom that maximize attention to diversity and inclusion throughout the entire program learning environment. • The focus of this standard is on how every component of program operations, inside and <i>outside</i> of formal class, reflect attention and commitment to diversity and inclusion. • Include examples of the specific efforts the program makes to provide a learning environment that models affirmation and respect for diversity and inclusion. 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 collaborations with the broader institution and/or other departments; however, the program must explicitly explain their active role in those efforts. 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1</p> <p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 2 and 3</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus of this standard is on the efforts specific to the professional practice doctoral program-level 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 inclusion efforts in the implicit curriculum (inside and <i>outside</i> of the classroom) that contribute to and shape the learning environment. • This discussion should demonstrate that attention to diversity and inclusion is a high priority. • The program should describe how efforts described in response to AS 3.0.1, promote respectful discourse. • 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. • Include relevant policies. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. 	
Admissions Policies and Procedures			
<p>3.0.2: The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission to the professional doctoral program. The criteria for admission to the program must include an earned master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and a minimum of 3 years of practice experience beyond</p>	<p>Narrative identifies the criteria the program uses for admission to the professional practice doctoral program. If admissions criteria vary by program option, provide criteria for each program option.</p> <p>Narrative demonstrates the criteria for admission to the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • The 2015 EPAS glossary includes a definition of what constitutes post-master’s social work degree practice experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Programs determine which experiences are considered post-degree practice in accordance with the EPAS definition. Accreditation staff cannot evaluate nor 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1 and 3</p>

<p>the master's degree in social work.</p>	<p>program includes an earned master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program* and a minimum of 3 years of practice experience beyond the master's degree in social work, across all program options.</p> <p>*This includes degrees recognized through CSWE's International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Service, or covered under a memorandum of understanding with international social work accreditors.</p>	<p>determine if specific experience(s) count towards the 3-year minimum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It is within the purview of the program to calculate the total hours of full-time / equivalent post-degree practice experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include relevant policies. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. 	
<p>3.0.3: The program describes the policies and procedures for evaluating applications and notifying applicants about decisions and any contingent conditions associated with admission.</p>	<p>Narrative describes the policies and procedures for evaluating admission applications. If policies and procedures vary by program option, provide policies and procedures for each program option.</p> <p>Narrative describes the policies and procedures for notifying applicants of the admission decision. If policies and procedures vary by program option, provide policies and procedures for each program option.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide relevant policies <i>and</i> 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. • Address all admission decision types. • 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. 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1 and 3</p>

	<p>Narrative describes the policies and procedures for notifying applicants of any contingent conditions associated with admission. If policies and procedures vary by program option, provide policies and procedures for each program option.</p>		
Advisement and Mentoring			
<p>3.0.4: The program describes its academic advising and mentoring policies and procedures and demonstrates they are sufficient.</p>	<p>Narrative describes the program’s academic advising and mentoring policies and procedures across all program options.</p> <p>Narrative discusses that the academic advising and mentoring policies and procedures are sufficient to meet the needs of students in all program options.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide relevant policies <i>and</i> procedures. • The focus of this standard is on professional practice doctoral program-level specific information rather than the school/department-level. • Address <i>both</i> academic advising <i>and</i> mentoring. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Absence of mentoring policies and procedures is insufficient. • Mentorship examples include professional coaching, career development services, career advising, counseling, or guidance, 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, employment placement assistance, etc. • Programs frequently discuss academic advising and mentoring together, however, for the purposes of this standard it is important to discuss how academic advising and mentoring are differentiated. 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1</p> <p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 2 and 3</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify who provides both academic advising and mentoring to students (i.e. faculty, staff, etc.). 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. 	
Student Participation in Governance			
<p>3.0.5: The program submits its policies and procedures specifying students' rights and opportunities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and professional doctoral student affairs.</p>	<p>Narrative describes the program's policies and procedures specifying students' rights and opportunities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and professional doctoral student affairs for each program option.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide relevant policies <i>and</i> procedures. The focus of this standard is on professional practice doctoral program-level 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. 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1</p> <p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 2 and 3</p>
<p>3.0.6: The program describes how it provides opportunities for and encourages professional doctoral students to organize in their interests.</p>	<p>Narrative demonstrates how the program provides opportunities for and encourages professional doctoral students to organize in their interests for each program option.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focus of this standard is on professional practice doctoral program-level 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. 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1 (Including Student Handbook in Volume 3)</p> <p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 2 and 3 (Including Student Handbook in Volume 3)</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include relevant policies. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. 	
Faculty			
<p>3.0.7: The program identifies each full- and part-time faculty member and discusses the qualifications, scholarship, expertise in social work education and practice, and years of service to the professional doctoral program of each.</p>	<p>Narrative provides a complete Professional Practice Doctoral Program Faculty Summary Form and Professional Practice Doctoral Program Faculty Data Form (CVs) for each full- or part-time faculty member employed in the current academic year inclusive of faculty across all program options.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REQUIRED FORM (Professional Practice Doctoral Program Faculty Summary Form): embedded in the Benchmark Volume 1 Templates (there is a separate template for Benchmark 1, Benchmark 2, and Benchmark 3). If you are not using the Benchmark Volume 1 Templates, please contact the Pilot Manager to obtain the stand-alone required form. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For institutions that also have a baccalaureate and/or master’s in social work program, the final columns 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/benchmark document must be specific to the professional practice doctoral program. • REQUIRED FORM (Professional Practice Doctoral Program Faculty Data Form): embedded in the Benchmark Volume 1 Templates (there is a separate template for Benchmark 1, Benchmark 2, and Benchmark 3). If you are not using the Benchmark Volume 1 Templates, please contact the Pilot Manager to obtain the stand-alone required form. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1, 2, and 3</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 3.0.8 and other accreditation standards. • Information provided for each faculty member should be consistent on the required faculty summary form and faculty data forms (CVs). • Include current faculty who are employed in the program at the time of the submission of the accreditation document. • A narrative or autobiographical sketch is not required for each faculty member. • The COA does not address licensing of social work faculty. Such criteria is 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. 	
<p>3.0.8: The program identifies no fewer than two full-time social work faculty members with principal appointment to the professional doctoral program. The program documents that all faculty members who teach in the program have doctoral degrees and the majority have master's degrees in social work from a CSWE-</p>	<p>Narrative identifies the program has no fewer than two full-time social work faculty members with principal appointment to the professional practice doctoral program, across all program options.</p> <p>Narrative identifies and documents that all faculty who teach in the program</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative should affirm that faculty who teach in the program have the requisite credentials. • The list of faculty that teach in the program should be consistent with the information reported on the faculty summary form. • 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. • Two social work faculty members 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 professional practice doctoral 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1, 2, and 3</p> <p><i>Note #1 for Candidacy programs:</i></p> <p>At Benchmark 1, programs must have 2 faculty formally hired, with a start date no later than 30 days before the visit date (i.e. the date the Benchmark document is sent to the visitor and Pilot Manager), in order to</p>

<p>accredited program with a minimum of 3 years of practice experience beyond the master's degree in social work.</p>	<p>have a doctoral degree, across all program options.</p> <p>Narrative demonstrates the majority of the faculty who teach in the program have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program* and at least 3 years of practice experience beyond the master's degree in social work, across all program options.</p> <p>*This includes degrees recognized through CSWE's International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Service or covered under a memorandum of understanding with international social work accreditors.</p>	<p>program. The remainder of the identified faculty's time may be dedicated to teaching, administration, research, service, or other workload policy roles outside of the professional practice doctoral social work program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional faculty identified in response to this standard may have an appointment outside of social work (e.g., chairing a multi-disciplinary department, teaching, etc.). • 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. • All faculty members who teach in the program must have doctoral degrees. While a doctoral degree in social work is preferred, the doctoral degree may be in any discipline. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. • The majority (51% or more) of the total professional practice doctoral program faculty who teach in the program must have master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and 3 years of practice experience beyond the master's degree in social work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For example: 2 out of 2; 3 out of 5; 6 out of 10, etc. ○ "master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program" includes degrees recognized through CSWE's International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Service or covered under a memorandum of 	<p>approve the Draft Benchmark 1.</p> <p>At least 2 faculty must be hired, formally assigned to the program with 51% or more of their time dedicated to that program level, and actively working within the program 30 days before the visit even if students are not enrolled or the program is not fully operational.</p> <p><i>Note #2 for Candidacy programs:</i></p> <p>The program must ensure the majority of faculty who teach in the program meet the requirement (eg, have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program* and at least 3 years of practice experience beyond the master's degree in social work) and report this in their Benchmark 3/Initial Accreditation document. This is not a requirement at Benchmark 1 nor Benchmark 2).</p>
---	---	---	--

		<p>understanding with international social work accreditors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If faculty members relevant to this standard have an internationally earned degree, submit a copy of the ISWDRES evaluation letter in accreditation documents. <p>○ The 2015 EPAS glossary includes a definition of what constitutes post-master's social work degree practice experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 3-year minimum. ▪ It is within the purview of the program to calculate the total hours of full-time / equivalent post-degree practice experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified full-time faculty can be any rank or title (e.g., tenured, tenure track, non-tenure track, clinical professor, visiting professor, adjunct). • 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. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. 	
<p>3.0.9: The professional doctoral program explains</p>	<p>Narrative documents a full-time equivalent faculty-to-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide numerical FTE ratio (X:X). 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1</p>

<p>how faculty size is sufficient in number for the type of curricular offerings, class size, program options, number of students, advising and supervising of students' academic products, and the faculty's teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities.</p>	<p>student ratio inclusive of all program options.</p> <p>Narrative explains how this ratio is calculated inclusive of all program options.</p> <p>Narrative explains how faculty size is sufficient in number for the type of curricular offerings, class size, program options, number of students, advising and supervising of students' academic products, and the faculty's teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities across all program options.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ratio submitted must be current. Programs may calculate their ratio per academic year, or per semester. At a minimum the ratio submitted must include the current semester upon submission of the accreditation document. • 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At the program's discretion, the FTE faculty calculation on the Professional Practice Doctoral Program Faculty Summary Form may be used to support compliance with AS 3.0.9. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 2 and 3</p>
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 3.12) 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. • The program director 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 AS 3.11 and AS 3.12 standards. • Programs must count students formally admitted to the social work program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. ○ It is advisable to count students for whom the social work program is primarily responsible for their education (courses, advising, services, etc.). 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff, teaching assistants, graduate student assistants, research assistants, and doctoral students may not be included in the FTE ratio <i>unless</i> 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. • Programs must make the case for the faculty size being sufficient for each of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Type of curricular offerings, ○ Class size ○ Program options, ○ Number of students, ○ Advising and supervising of students' academic product, and ○ Teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities • The BOA does not require a minimum FTE ratio for professional practice doctoral programs. • 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. 	
--	--	--	--

<p>3.10: The program describes how the professional doctoral-level social work faculty has responsibility for defining the program's mission, goals, and curriculum consistent with the institution's policies.</p>	<p>Narrative describes how the professional doctoral-level social work faculty has responsibility for defining the program's mission, goals, and curriculum consistent with the institution's policies across all program options.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work? • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1</p> <p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 2 and 3</p>
<p>Administrative Structure</p>			
<p>3.11: The program describes the professional doctoral 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 professional doctoral program director has a doctoral degree, preferably in social work, and a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program with a minimum of 3 years of practice experience beyond</p>	<p>Narrative identifies the social work program director inclusive of all program options.</p> <p>Narrative describes the professional practice doctoral program director's leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in social work.</p> <p>Narrative documents that the program director has a doctoral degree, preferably in social work.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicitly state that the director has a doctoral degree and refer to the location of the director's faculty data form (CV) submitted for AS 3.0.7. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ While a doctoral degree in social work is preferred, the doctoral degree may be in any discipline. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. • Explicitly state that the program director has 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ This includes degrees recognized through CSWE's International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Service or covered under a memorandum of understanding with international social work accreditors. 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1, 2, and 3</p>

<p>the master's degree in social work.</p>	<p>Narrative documents that the program director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program* and a minimum of 3 years of practice experience beyond the master's degree in social work.</p> <p>*This includes degrees recognized through CSWE's International Social Work Degree Recognition and Evaluation Service or covered under a memorandum of understanding with international social work accreditors.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the director has an internationally earned degree, submit a copy of the ISWDRES evaluation letter in accreditation documents. • Explicitly state that the program director has 3 years of practice experience beyond the master's degree in social work and refer to the location of the director's CV within the self-study. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The 2015 EPAS glossary includes a definition of what constitutes post-master's social work degree practice experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Through documentation on the CV, 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 experience(s) count towards the 3-year minimum. ▪ It is within the purview of the program to calculate the total hours of full-time / equivalent post-degree practice experience. • Only one (1) program director is identified for all program options. • Faculty data form (CV) submitted for AS 3.0.7 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. 	
--	---	---	--

<p>3.12: The program describes the procedures for determining the professional doctoral program director's minimum assigned time of 50% to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program. The program demonstrates that this time is sufficient to provide core supports for students: mentorship, advising, recruitment, admissions, administration, and program evaluation and renewal.</p>	<p>Narrative describes the procedures for calculating the program director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program inclusive of all program options.</p> <p>Narrative demonstrates a minimum of 50% of the program director's assigned time is provided to carry out educational and administrative leadership to the program inclusive of all program options.</p> <p>Narrative discusses that this time is sufficient to provide core supports for students: mentorship, advising, recruitment, admissions, administration, and program evaluation and renewal, across all program options.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <i>Why?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. • Professional practice doctoral program directors may cross-teach (or have other workload policy-related responsibilities) in the baccalaureate or master's social work program, or outside of social work, as long as they meet the requirements of the program director standards. At least 50% of their assigned time should be dedicated solely to educational and administrative leadership of the professional practice doctoral level program. • The program may include all workload policy roles (e.g., teaching, administration, research, service, etc.) in the calculation of assigned time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 	<p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1, 2, and 3</p>
---	---	---	--

		<p>(1) course per semester (equating 25%) to fulfill the 50%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 for all program options. Assigned time for administrative leadership cannot be distributed across multiple individuals. • 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. 	
Resources			
3.13: The program describes the procedures for budget development and administration it uses	Narrative describes the procedures for budget development and administration the program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REQUIRED FORM (Professional Practice Doctoral Program Expense Budget Form): embedded in the Benchmark Volume 1 Templates (there is a separate template for Benchmark 1, Benchmark 2, and 	COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1 and 3

<p>to achieve its mission and goals. The program submits a completed budget and explains how its financial resources are stable and sufficient to achieve its mission/goals and continuously improve the program.</p>	<p>uses to achieve its mission and goals across all program options.</p> <p>Narrative includes a completed Professional Practice Doctoral Program Expense Budget Form inclusive of all program options.</p> <p>Narrative explains how the program's financial resources are stable and sufficient to achieve its mission/goals and continuously improve the program, for each program option.</p>	<p>Benchmark 3). If you are not using the Benchmark Volume 1 Templates, please contact the Pilot Manager to obtain the stand-alone required form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All budget line items, including financial aid, should be professional practice doctoral program-level specific. Not at the institutional or school/department-levels. • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Fringe</i>: 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.). ○ <i>Technological resources</i>: Any technology expensed by the social work program including machinery, equipment, platforms, applications, etc. ○ <i>Student financial aid</i>: Any student financial support expensed by the social work program which may include scholarships, grants, stipends, work-study, loans, funds, etc., that help make education more affordable. • Hard money is reliable, stable, scheduled, and/or continuous stream of funds. Grants and other contingent funds are not hard money. • Discuss sufficiency. <i>How</i> are resources sufficient? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If financial resources are insufficient, address this in the narrative. ○ Make an explicit statement/professional judgement about the sufficiency of the financial resources. 	
---	---	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss stability. <i>How</i> are resources stable? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 support 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. 	
<p>3.14: The program describes and demonstrates sufficient office and classroom space and/or computer-mediated access to achieve its professional doctoral program mission and goals.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Addressing computer-mediated access is important for online program options. • Discuss sufficiency. <i>How</i> are resources sufficient? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. 	<p style="text-align: center;">COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 1 and 3</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
--	--	--	--

Accreditation Standard 4 — Assessment

Assessment is an integral component of any quality educational social work program. Assessment involves the systematic gathering of data about student performance and other quality benchmarks. Assessment information is used to guide student learning, assess student outcomes, assess and improve effectiveness of the curriculum, and strengthen the assessment methods used. Given that social work practice and scholarship is complex and multidimensional, the assessment methods used by professional doctoral programs and the data collected may vary by context.

Assessment also involves gathering data regarding the implicit curriculum areas such as the program’s commitment to diversity, admissions policies and procedures, advisement and mentoring policies, student participation in governance, faculty, administrative structure, and resources. Data from assessment continuously inform and promote change in the explicit and implicit curriculum of the professional doctoral program.

STANDARD	COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	BOA INTERPRETATIONS & TIPS	DRAFT/COMPLIANCE <i>This column is applicable to candidacy programs only!</i>
<p>4.0.1: The program presents its plan and rationale for the assessment of the core expertise, knowledge base, and skills of its professional doctoral graduates as defined in AS 2.0.3. At a minimum, the plan should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures and benchmarks related to when, where, and how each core expertise, knowledge base, and skills are assessed, including assessment measures; and • A description of how the program uses these data for 	<p>Narrative provides program’s assessment plan using the Presenting the Professional Practice Doctoral Program’s Assessment Plan Form for each area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3. Narrative includes benchmarks for each core expertise and skills, including those added by the program, and a description of how it is determined that benchmarks have been met. If assessment procedures vary by program option, a separate assessment plan is also provided for each program option.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REQUIRED FORM (Form: Presenting the Professional Practice Doctoral Program’s Assessment Plan): embedded in the Benchmark Volume 1 Templates (there is a separate template for Benchmark 1, Benchmark 2, and Benchmark 3). If you are not using the Benchmark Volume 1 Templates, please contact the Pilot Manager to obtain the stand-alone required form. • This standard explores: <i>How competent are students on the basis of receiving your curriculum?</i> • An assessment plan matrix is required for each area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3. • A narrative thoroughly describing the assessment plan in response to each bullet point under AS 4.0.1 is required for each area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3. • The intent and purpose of the curriculum matrix (AS 2.0.5) is different than the assessment plan matrix. The curriculum matrix is snapshot featuring specific required course content strongly relating to each core expertise and skills which all students are learning in the 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1</p> <p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARKS 2 and 3</p>

<p>continuous quality improvement.</p>	<p>Narrative identifies that assessment of competence is conducted by program designated faculty for all program options.</p> <p>Narrative provides procedures related to when, where, and how each core expertise and skills are assessed, including those added by the program, for each area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3. Narrative includes separate tables for each program option if the assessment plan differs for each program option.</p> <p>Narrative provides copies of all assessment measures used to assess each of the core expertise and skills for all program options.</p> <p>Narrative describes how the program uses assessment data for continuous quality improvement.</p>	<p>classroom. The assessment plan matrix details how the program is capturing core expertise and skills-based student learning outcomes. These matrices do not need to match even if the program is using a course-embedded measure assessment model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Curriculum Matrix = assuring / delivering content ○ Assessment Plan = demonstrating / assessing competence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Each core expertise and skills, including those added by the program as identified in AS 2.0.5, if applicable, must be assessed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Examples include course-embedded measures, end-of-year exams, capstone and senior seminar assignments (e.g., papers, presentations, etc.), portfolios, comprehensive exit exams, etc. ● It is completely within the purview of the program to select the measure(s). ● The BOA does not endorse third-party, commercial, standardized, or customized assessment instruments and packages. Although the BOA 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 <i>Accreditation Standards for Professional Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work</i>. ● It is within the purview of the program to select the placement of the data collection point(s) during the students' course of study. ● Programs should assess all students and present data for all students, sampling students is not permitted. 	
--	---	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student self-assessment measures are not permitted for assessment of core expertise and skills-based student learning outcomes. • If the program elects to add additional core expertise and skills, they should be assessed and included in the matrices. • There are two distinct types of benchmarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Outcome measure benchmark</i> 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. ○ <i>Core expertise and skills benchmark</i> 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 capstone project measure and 12 out of 15 correct on the exam questions related to core expertise and skills 1. This is an example only and should be tailored to the program's chosen measures and benchmarks. • The outcome measure benchmarks and core expertise and skills benchmarks are within the purview of the program to select. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The program must be able to provide a rationale for each outcome measures and core expertise and skills benchmarks. Why did you choose those benchmarks? ○ The rationale for each benchmark must be clearly described. Why did you choose those benchmarks? What information did you base the benchmarks on? What does the benchmark 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>represent? Explain why the number is meaningful or significant to measuring student learning and program outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Benchmarks may be realistic, yet aspirational. ● Programs can choose to weigh 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A copy of the assignment and a copy of the scoring rubric used to assess core expertise and skills 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 the table, chart, or scoring sheet explaining to the students how they will be scored on each core expertise and skills-based criterion demonstrated by completing the assignment components. ○ Course-embedded measures should not include items that do not directly assess the core expertise and skills (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 core expertise and skills each rubric line item is capturing. 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assessment must be conducted consistently for all students via a consistent rubric. • Programs must provide specific criteria for the basis of core expertise and skills-based assessment (e.g., behaviors, rubric line items, demonstratable components of the core expertise and skills, etc.). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Criteria clarifies: What is being observed? What are students performing? What are faculty scoring to determine student’s competence? What exactly must the student show the assessor to indicate competence? ○ Measures assessing more than one core expertise and skills must have distinct criteria to uniquely assess each of the core expertise and skills. • For exams, programs must submit an answer key and include a clear delineation of which questions relate to each core expertise and skills. • 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 core expertise and skills. • For portfolios, programs must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students may select their own portfolio artifacts, similar to how a student may select their own 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>topic for a paper or assignment. Alternatively, the program may require specific artifacts be input into the portfolio.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. ○ Assessment must be conducted consistently for all students via a consistent rubric. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • The information provided here (assessment plan in AS 4.0.1) should match the information provided in required form AS 4(D) (see AS 4.0.4). • 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. 	
<p>4.0.2: The program provides data on retention and graduation rates, time to complete the degree, and employment and demonstrates how these data are used for continuous quality program improvement.</p>	<p>Narrative describes how the program collects and calculates data on retention and graduation rates, time to complete the degree, and employment.</p> <p>Narrative provides the program's most recent year of summary data on retention and graduation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs should submit their most recent year of data for each metric. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. • Retention rates, graduation rates, and time to complete the degree, and employment rates are all calculated based on the institution's policy. 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2</p> <p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3</p>

	<p>rates, time to complete the degree, and employment.</p> <p>Narrative describes how these data are used for continuous quality improvement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When presenting data programs should only include social work students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 core expertise and skills-based outcomes reviewed to inform the program's efficacy/continuous improvement. • Programs must present all levels of data by the BOA's final decision phase. If data is incomplete, partial, the BOA may choose a variety of decision types including but not limited to deferral, progress report, etc. • <i>For programs under review for an Initial Accreditation decision:</i> 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 data. • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard, including how these data are calculated and used for continuous quality improvement. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. 	
--	---	---	--

<p>4.0.3: The program provides its plan and summary data for the assessment of the implicit curriculum as defined in Educational Policy 3.0 from program-defined stakeholders. The program discusses implications for program renewal and specific changes it has made based on these assessment outcomes.</p>	<p>For each program option, narrative provides the program’s plan for assessing the implicit curriculum, including program-defined stakeholders.</p> <p>For each program option, narrative provides summary data for the assessment of the implicit curriculum, as defined in EP 3.0, including program-defined stakeholders.</p> <p>For each program option, narrative discusses the implications for program renewal and specific changes it has made based on these assessment outcomes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must assess a minimum of one (1) aspect of the implicit curriculum (e.g., diversity, admissions policies and procedures, advisement and mentoring policies, student participation in governance, faculty, administrative structure, resources, etc.). • Programs may assess how well they are implementing one or more standards in AS 3 (implicit curriculum). • Explicitly state the implicit curriculum area(s) assessed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The implicit curriculum area(s) assessed must be clearly connected to the implicit curriculum definition • If a program is using a measure that features both implicit and explicit assessments questions, the program must clearly identify the specific questions that 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, core expertise and skills, student learning outcomes, etc.). • Different from the assessment of core expertise and skills-based student learning outcomes, program may utilize student self-assessment measures based on aspects of the implicit curriculum. Student self-assessment of core expertise and skills 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. • Qualitative and / or quantitative summary data must be provided. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is insufficient to only provide an executive summary without data. • Any social work program stakeholders may participate in the assessment. For example, students, staff, faculty, 	<p>(Plan Only) DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 1</p> <p>(Plan Only) COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 2</p> <p>(Complete) DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2</p> <p>(Complete) COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3</p>
---	---	--	---

		<p>administrators, alumni, committees, community advisory board, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling is permitted. • Programs may choose to assess a different aspect of the implicit curriculum each year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If a program assesses a different component of the implicit curriculum each year, it is sufficient to include its most recent summary data rather than data spanning multiple years. • Example measures include exit surveys, interviews, focus groups, alumni surveys, culture/climate surveys, strategic planning process data collection, etc. • It is helpful to include the implicit curriculum instrument(s). • When describing the implicit curriculum assessment plan, it is helpful to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What area of the implicit curriculum is being assessed? ○ When, where, and how is it assessed? ○ Who (which stakeholder group) is providing feedback? ○ Who (which program personnel) administers the assessment? ○ Which instrument is used? • 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, etc.) explicitly linked to specific findings. If 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>no changes are reported, provide a rationale for that decision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard. • Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard. • Separate summary data are presented for each program option. 	
<p>4.0.4: The professional doctoral program reports its most recent assessment outcomes to constituents and the public on its website and routinely updates its findings (minimally every 2 years).</p>	<p>Narrative identifies that the program uses Form AS 4(D) to report its most recent assessment outcomes for each program option to constituents and the public.</p> <p>Narrative identifies that the program updates Form AS 4(D) on its website with the most recent assessment outcomes for each program option.</p> <p>Narrative identifies that the program updates the Form AS 4(D) minimally every 2 years for each program option.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REQUIRED FORM (Form AS 4(D)): embedded in the Benchmark Volume 1 Templates (there is a separate template for Benchmark 1, Benchmark 2, and Benchmark 3). If you are not using the Benchmark Volume 1 Templates, please contact the Pilot Manager to obtain the stand-alone required form. • The information provided here (assessment outcomes in AS 4.0.4) should align with the assessment plan reported in AS 4.0.1. • For assessment data, programs should submit their most current set of outcomes/data (which may reflect prior, yet still recent, data points). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 	<p>DRAFT AT BENCHMARK 2</p> <p>COMPLIANCE AT BENCHMARK 3</p>

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 core expertise and skills-based outcomes reviewed to inform the program's efficacy/continuous improvement.

- The number of students assessed (i.e., n=#) must be published for programs of all sizes.

- Programs must embed a copy of Form AS 4(D) directly in the accreditation document and submit an active hyperlink to verify that the 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.
 - The **BOA** and accreditation staff must be able to easily verify the public-facing location where the form is posted and will not search websites for this 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 **BOA** as

		<p>the sole accreditor for social work education in the U.S. and its territories.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On this required form, the percentage of students attaining the core expertise and skills benchmark is inclusive of all identified measures for that core expertise and skill (e.g., Measure 1 + Measure 2 (optional) / 2 = Total % of Students Achieving Core Expertise and Skills, etc.). • Programs must present all levels of data by the BOA's final decision phase. If data is incomplete, partial, or missing for one or more program options, the BOA 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 form/updates their website. The frequency should not exceed two (2) years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use subheadings to clearly address each component of the standard.• Each program option and each area of focus identified in AS 2.0.3 should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.	
--	--	---	--