Frequently Cited Standards

What Accreditation Standards are most commonly cited?
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Pop Quiz

How many of the most frequently cited standards (excluding assessment) can you guess?
Pop Quiz

1. 3.2.3
2. B/M2.0.3
3. B/M2.2.9
4. 3.3.6
5. 2.2.7
6. 3.0.2
7. B/M3.3.4(c)
8. B/M3.3.5(c)
9. 3.1.7
10. 3.4.1

How many did you get right?
Quality Assurance

- Three Commission on Accreditation meetings a year
  - February
  - June
  - October
- Programs are reviewed for Reaffirmation and Candidacy processes at these three meetings.
- The citations are tracked after each meeting and calculated for an end-of-year report that is presented to the Commission on Accreditation.
Program Options

• Defined on page 21 of the EPAS Glossary as:

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

• Includes: main campus, branch campus, satellite site, online program, etc.

• Program options are not plans of study such as advanced standing, 16-month, 24-months, part-time, etc.

• A substantive change report is required when adding a new program option per policy 1.2.4 in the EPAS Handbook

• Self-study: Each program option should be explicitly addressed in response to each standard.
Writing to an Accreditation Standard

- Write succinctly and clearly
- Write to each element/component of the standard
- Many citations occur because information was missing or unclear
- Use the Accreditation review brief to structure your response to each element of each standard
- COA cannot make any assumptions; describe how the programs complies with each standard
- Explicitly address each program option in response to each standard
Effective June 10, 2019: The COA is paperless! Zero physical copies of accreditation documents are required. E-copies only will be accepted per the policy 1.2.11 Document Formatting & Submission in the EPAS Handbook.
October 2019 COA Meeting Statistics

• 157 programs were reviewed at the October meeting
  • 752 citations
  • 56 programs were reviewed for a Reaffirmation Decision
  • 54 programs were reviewed for a Letter of Instruction
  • 21 programs were reviewed for Candidacy Decisions
  • 21 programs were reviewed for Progress Reports
Accreditation Standard 3.2.3: The program documents a full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio not greater than 1:25 for baccalaureate programs and not greater than 1:12 for master’s programs and explains how this ratio is calculated. In addition, the program explains how faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; number of program options; class size; number of students; advising; and the faculty’s teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities.
Main Reasons for Citation

• The program does not provide a numerical ratio.
• The program does not clearly explain the calculation, include the formula, or show the math.
• The provided math is unclear or inconsistent with content presented elsewhere in the self-study (such as workload policy).
• Number of faculty included in ratio is inconsistent with number of faculty included in faculty summary form.
• The program documents a ratio greater than 1:25 (baccalaureate) or 1:12 (master’s).
• Program double-counted faculty for both the baccalaureate and master’s programs.
Main Reasons for Citation (continued)

• The program does not explain how the faculty size is commensurate with each element of the standard (number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; number of program options; class size; number of students; advising; and the faculty’s teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities).

• The faculty-to-student ratio presented by the program was inconsistent with the workload policy presented in the self-study
  • E.g.: The program reported that its workload policy is teaching 10 courses per year, but reported the FTE of part-time faculty as something other than .1 FTE per class taught

• Program includes staff in its faculty-to-student ratio.

• The program’s response was unclear or confusing
  • Avoid this by including subheadings and clear notes
Curriculum Matrices

**Accreditation Standard B2.0.3:** The program provides a matrix that illustrates how its curriculum content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program.
Curriculum Matrices

Accreditation Standard M2.0.3: The program provides a matrix that illustrates how its generalist practice content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program.

Accreditation Standard M2.1.4: For each area of specialized practice, the program provides a matrix that illustrates how its curriculum content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program.
Main Reasons for Citation

• Program does not incorporate the dimensions into its curriculum matrix.
• All four dimensions are not specified for each competency.
• Program does not provide content related to all five systems levels for competencies 6-9.
• The description of identified course content is vague or unclear.
• Program does not provide syllabi for all courses on the curriculum matrix.
• Program added a competency(ies), but does not include it/them in the curriculum matrix.
• Content in the curriculum matrix could not be located in the referenced syllabus.
• Curriculum matrix does not reference specific course content.
• Program focuses on assessment measures, rather than specific course content.
• Program includes electives or non-required content in its curriculum matrix.
• Program does not either include a statement that matrix applies to all program options or provide a separate matrix for each program option.
Field Instructor Credentials & Practice Experience

Accreditation Standard B2.2.9: The program describes how its field education program specifies the credentials and practice experience of its field instructors necessary to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program social work competencies. Field instructors for baccalaureate students hold a baccalaureate or master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-social work degree practice experience in social work. For cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited social work degree or does not have the required experience, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.
Accreditation Standard M2.2.9: The program describes how its field education program specifies the credentials and practice experience of its field instructors necessary to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program social work competencies. Field instructors for master’s students hold a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-master’s social work practice experience. For cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited social work degree or does not have the required experience, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.
Main Reasons for Citation

• Program does not specify that field instructors must hold a degree from a CSWE-accredited program and two-years post-degree practice experience in order to design field learning opportunities for students.

• Program specifies that they must hold a social work degree, but does not specify that the degree must be from a CSWE-accredited program.

• Program does not provide a specific written policy for how it reinforces the social work perspective for students who are not supervised by someone with the requisite credentials.
  o This policy is required, even if it is reported that all students are placed with a field instructor with the requisite credentials.

• Social work perspective is not reinforced above and beyond what all students already receive for students supervised by individuals without the requisite credentials.

• Social work perspective is not reinforced at the student-level.

• Description of how social work perspective is reinforced is vague.

• Program does not include a statement that response applies to all program options or provide a separate response for each program option.
Accreditation Standard 3.3.6: The program describes its administrative structure for field education and explains how its resources (personnel, time and technological support) are sufficient to administer its field education program to meet its mission and goals.
Main Reasons for Citation

• Program describes the field director’s role, but does not specify who is responsible for conducting field visits, leading field seminars, serving as field liaison, or other roles related to administering field (as applicable).

• Program does not describe personnel, time, and technological support available for field education.

• Program does not explicitly state that these resources are sufficient to administer the field education program to meet its mission and goals and why.

• Program does not describe the administrative structure for field education for all program options.

• Program does not describe the sufficiency of personnel, time, and technological support available for field education for all program options.
Accreditation Standard 2.2.7: The program describes how its field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for selecting field settings; placing and monitoring students; supporting student safety; and evaluating student learning and field-setting effectiveness congruent with the social work competencies.
Main Reasons for Citation

• Program does not provide clear policies, criteria, *and* procedures for each component of the standard.

• Program does not provide criteria (or policies, or procedures) for one of the sub-components of this standard.

• Program does not clearly differentiate between policies, criteria, and procedures, so it is unclear that all three are provided for each component of the standard.

• Program does not differentiate between evaluating student learning and evaluating field-setting effectiveness.

• Program provides vague policies, but not clear policies for one or more of the components of the standard.

• Provided policies are inconsistent with the policies in the student handbook.

• Program does not specify policies, criteria, and procedures for each program option.
Diversity in the Implicit Curriculum

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

• Linked to AS 3.0.1: The program describes the specific and continuous efforts it makes to provide a learning environment that models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference.

• Consistent with Educational Policy 3.0 - The program’s expectation for diversity is reflected in its learning environment, which provides the context through which students learn about differences, to value and respect diversity, and develop a commitment to cultural humility. The dimensions of diversity are understood as the intersectionality of multiple factors including but not limited to age, class, color, culture, disability and ability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, marital status, political ideology, race, religion/spirituality, sex, sexual orientation, and tribal sovereign status. The learning environment consists of the program’s institutional setting; selection of field education settings and their clientele; composition of program advisory or field committees; educational and social resources; resource allocation; program leadership; speaker series, seminars, and special programs; support groups; research and other initiatives; and the demographic make-up of its faculty, staff, and student body.
Main Reasons for Citation

• Program does not reference specifically how efforts described in AS 3.0.1 provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment.

• The narrative provided in AS 3.0.1 does not clearly describe the efforts the program makes, which directly impacts this standard.
  • E.g.: AS 3.0.1 does not discuss multiple components of both diversity and the learning environment.

• The program does not describe the full learning environment, as described in the Educational Policy.

• Discussion focuses only on numerical diversity.

• The program does not explain how these efforts provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment for all program options.
Assigned Time for the Program Director

**Accreditation Standard B3.3.4(c):** The program describes the procedures for calculating the program director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program. To carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the social work program, a minimum of 25% assigned time is required at the baccalaureate level. The program discusses that this time is sufficient.

**Accreditation Standard M3.3.4(c):** The program describes the procedures for determining the program director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program. To carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the social work program, a minimum of 50% assigned time is required at the master’s level. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.
Main Reasons for Citation

• Program does not describe specifically how assigned time is calculated.
• Description of how assigned time is calculated is unclear.
• Description of how assigned time is calculated is inconsistent with program’s workload policy as stated elsewhere in the self-study.
• Program does not state that assigned time is sufficient.
• Program does not explain why assigned time is sufficient.
• Assigned time for administering program also includes assigned time for other duties, such as serving as dean or chair.
• Program does not specify that this assigned time is sufficient to serve as program director for all program options.
Assigned Time for the Field Director

Accreditation Standard B3.3.5(c): The program describes the procedures for calculating the field director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education. To carry out the administrative functions of the field education program, at least 25% assigned time is required for baccalaureate programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.

Accreditation Standard M3.3.5(c): The program describes the procedures for calculating the field director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education. To carry out the administrative functions of the field education program at least 50% assigned time is required for master’s programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.
Main Reasons for Citation

• Program does not describe specifically how assigned time is calculated.
• Description of how assigned time is calculated is unclear.
• Description of how assigned time is calculated is inconsistent with program’s workload policy as stated elsewhere in the self-study.
• Program does not state that assigned time is sufficient.
• Program does not explain why assigned time is sufficient.
• Assigned time for administering field education also includes assigned time for other duties, such as teaching field seminar or conducting regular visits to students in their field seminars (above and beyond visiting field settings to establish them as field settings)
• Field director is both BSW and MSW field director, but does not differentiate that at least 25 percent assigned time is to BSW field plus at least 50 percent assigned time is to MSW field.
• Program does not specify that this assigned time is sufficient to serve as program director for all program options.
Evaluation of Students’ Academic and Professional Performance

Accreditation Standard 3.1.7: The program submits its policies and procedures for evaluating student’s academic and professional performance, including grievance policies and procedures. The program describes how it informs students of its criteria for evaluating their academic and professional performance and its policies and procedures for grievance.
Main Reasons for Citation

• Program does not provide specific written policies in addition to a description of the procedures followed in implementing the policies.

• Program does not clearly discuss both academic and professional performance policies and procedures.

• Discussion of professional performance policies and procedures focus on field, but not the broader learning environment.

• Program provides grievance procedures, but not written policies.

• Program does not clearly describe how it informs students of these policies and procedures.

• Policies and procedures in Volume I differ from those in the student handbook.

• Program does not specify that these policies and procedures apply to all program options (or differentiate between program options, if applicable).
Accreditation Standard 3.4.1: The program describes the procedures for budget development and administration it uses to achieve its mission and goals. The program submits a completed budget form and explains how its financial resources are sufficient and stable to achieve its mission and goals.
Main Reasons for Citation

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

• Accreditations Standards 4.0.1, 4.0.2, and 4.0.3 are all connected to each other
  • If there are issues with one standard, there is a “cascade effect”, where it then created challenges with the other assessment standards.
  • Accreditation Standard 4.0.1 requests multiple components of the program’s assessment plan.

• For more detailed information on assessment, come to an information session on Saturday, October 26th | 10:30-11:30AM Plaza Building, Governor’s Square 15 (this room).
2022 EPAS Feedback Opportunities

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

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

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

• Online survey open now through December 13, 2019
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