

**Council on Social Work Education  
Commission on Accreditation**

**Site Visit Report**

**Program Visited:** California State University, Chico

**Program Visited, State:** California

**Program Levels visited:** MSW/BSW

**Date of Site Visit:** October 10-12, 2016

**Site Visitors Names:** Michael Daley (MSW)

**JoDee Keller (BSW)**

1. Include a copy of site visit schedule or a list of people who met with the site visitors during the visit (schedule and list attached)  
I met with the following groups: Social Work Administrators, Social Work Faculty, BSW & MSW Students, Community Partners (combination of Field Instructors, Alumni, Field Advisory Committee Members), University Administration, Social Work Program Assessment Committee.
2. Write a brief summary of the conversation on general questions regarding: program mission and goals (AS 1.0), diversity (AS 3.1), and assessment (AS 4.0)

**Mission (AS 1.0)**

The Social Work Program has a clear mission which is viewed as being quite consistent with the mission of the University. The administration wants to see social work continue to be a strong program, describing it as “the best of what the university is doing.” They noted that students and alumni, alike, rave about the program. They recognized recent growth in the program, and see that as benefitting the northern region of the state, though also noted that growth should not exceed the faculty and space constraints. At the same time, they would like to see Social Work have an even broader reach and serve more of the community and region through continued use of technology. They are pleased with the Title IV-E funding, making the program more accessible to students.

The faculty see an important aspect of their mission as serving northern California as well as preparing students to serve in a rural setting. They highlight issues that are prevalent in the area and discuss these in classes. Faculty discussed how the Distributed Learning (DL) program is an attempt to better serve this population, with a hybrid of face-to-face and online courses. Regional mental health directors strongly support the program and pushed for state funds to endow and expand the DL program. Faculty also noted that the mission is reviewed periodically to ensure that it still guides the curriculum and to determine if it needs modification. Within the BSW framework, strengths and resiliency are stressed, as well as micro, mezzo, and macro practice.

Students were very positive about the program and, like the faculty and administration, see the program as serving northern California and underserved rural areas. Many of the students

are returning adults, and noted that the return to school is a difficult transition. They appreciate the supportive faculty and the summer orientation that put them at ease as they enter the program. They also stressed the accessibility of faculty, stating that the social work program “feels like a family.” They valued the fact that the faculty are still practicing, so they are learning from people who are “not just professors.” Students also commented on the good rapport with the field instructors. The students in the DL program stated that they receive strong support from faculty, even though they may not see them as frequently face-to-face. They feel that many opportunities are provided through the DL program to serve the rural part of the state.

In discussing the mission, community members noted that northern California faces challenges in maintaining a professional workforce. They discussed how mental health providers partnered with Humboldt State and Chico State to address this issue. A large number of professional staff in the region now are graduates of Chico State. They also described a collaborative relationship with faculty, who often serve as resources to community agencies. They see the university administration as possessing the desire to meld with and meet needs of the communities they serve, seeing Chico State as a leader in this regard. Providers within the community appreciate their invitations to trainings, and recognize CSU-Chico as a resource in what they sometimes feel is a neglected area of the state.

### **Diversity (AS 3.1)**

The university administrators reported that the faculty in the Social Work Program are diverse and that students “see themselves in the faculty”, which helps with recruitment and retention. They identified Hmong, Latino, and LGBTQ as among some of the populations represented in the student body. To promote valuing of diversity at the university level, there is a Diversity Action Plan, developed in 2010-2011. Administrators noted that demographics in northern California are changing, and have set as a goal, serving increasing numbers of the Latino community, now 31 to 32% of the student body. They are working on increasing the ratio of underrepresented to majority population. Administrators view social work students as being more reflective of the region and more diverse, representing this ratio more proportionately. Recognizing the importance of social work students’ comfort in working effectively with diverse populations, administrators noted that students are exposed, through field experience, to a range of populations. They also mentioned the countless diversity celebrations on campus, including Pride Week; teach-ins about diversity, fighting racism, sexism; “Celebrate Diversity” events; trainings on such topics as anti-bullying, unconscious bias; a diversity page on the university’s website; as well as a summer diversity academy for faculty and staff.

Faculty note that they teach diversity classes that can also meet general education requirements across campus, with roughly 1/3 of the students in the introductory diversity class enrolling to meet the general education requirement. Diversity content is incorporated throughout the social work curriculum. The course on social work legislative history explores such issues as ability, ageism, and other aspects of diversity. The program encourages participation in events outside classroom, as well, to encourage comfort with diverse populations. They bring in speakers (e.g. a recent speaker from the Gender Health Center, with more than 70 people in attendance, including students & field instructors; a speaker from the Housing First program in Utah; presentations by the Center on Aging). Typically, there is one presentation per semester.

The faculty also work with student organizations to sponsor activities (as an example, in CA, there are 17 initiatives on ballot this year, so they sponsored a panel presentation to provide information for students). They also encourage students to attend events off campus, including NASW Legislative Days. At an international level, they have taken students to South Korea and Thailand. Students have participated in community events such as a Stand Down event for homeless veterans or participating in the NAMI Walk. Within the Title IV-E program, there is a student day on justice and diversity. Two social work students represent the school on the committee; Chico State sends 8-10 students to the event.

Faculty also described the atmosphere created in the classroom, where students are exposed to challenging material about bias and discuss how this applies to them. They are encouraged to look critically at their own families and communities. Students are diverse by age and do bring different demographics together, based upon religious and political backgrounds and sexual orientation. Additionally, the DL classes can create a forum where every student responds and there are rich online conversations.

Community members felt that students are comfortable with diverse populations; they also recognize the diversity of the students, themselves. They also noted the program's emphasis on self-awareness, self-reflection. They said that students had a high level of awareness and sometimes "call us out on stuff," raising important questions at their internship sites. They described good classroom-agency collaboration; and value the participation and good communication promoted by the social work program.

Students note that diversity is integrated into every course; they said that they "deal with heavy stuff" and can have good conversations in the classroom, as they recognize that confidentiality is enforced. Students valued the opportunity to talk with faculty when they are stressed or confused or simply want to explore something. They noted that group projects give exposure to diversity and also noted a team-taught course that was "amazing, challenging, interactive."

### **Assessment (AS 4.0)**

The Social Work Program has an assessment coordinator and assessment committee made up of faculty assuming particular roles (representing MSW, BSW, and field). The committee meets at least three times per year to review assessment data, present the data to faculty, and look for patterns of data. They identify areas for growth and also explore what questions faculty have about the data. Questions may include: Are any patterns due to instruction? Are students grasping content? Are they applying what they have learned? The program has made changes in response to assessment data. For example, they added a lab creating more opportunities for students to explore and apply concepts in classes. They added content to the field training so field instructors and students can understand the language of generalist practice and incorporate applications of generalist activities within field settings. They share data with field instructors, work with curriculum committees, discuss assessment with the advisory board.

3. List each accreditation standard and question raised by the COA in its letter of Instruction

**Accreditation Standard 2.1.1:** *The program discusses how its field education program connects the theoretical and conceptual contribution of the classroom with the practice setting, fostering the implementation of evidence-informed practice.*

**Instructions:** The site visitor is asked to have the program discuss how its field education connects theoretical contributions of the classroom with the practice setting, fostering the implementation of evidence-informed practice.

### **Site Visit Findings**

The faculty identified a number of ways in which theoretical contributions are connected to the practice settings. They teach models that are used in practice and work hard to bridge classroom instruction with field. Agenda for field visits is intentional, with discussion of theoretical concepts and their connection to student experiences. The field journal prompts are based upon competencies and are another way that students are able to make connections between class and field. During the field orientation, attended by both field instructors and students, there are small group discussions about the learning contract including discussions of how students are exposed to theories in the classroom and the field. In class, students reflect on fidelity to the model they are discussing, so they recognize whether models are implemented as intended. They explore data bases that include evidence-based interventions – SAMHSA, ChildWelfare.gov. In addition, there are classroom poster presentations on activities related to field settings. During their senior year, in one of the practice classes, students facilitate groups talking about relevant issues as they head into their professional career, integrating field, theories, diversity, ethics, and self-awareness. To complete this assignment, students research an issue, with a summary of the relevant literature. Additionally, in the field seminar, students present a case from their field seminar, where they discuss relevant theoretical perspectives as related to evidence-informed practice. They also research a topic relevant to the agency, completing a literature review on what interventions may be effective in which settings.

Students also reported that everything that they learn in the classroom is applied in the field. They discussed the process of developing a learning contract, noting how challenging that process was. They were familiar with the concept of evidence-informed practice.

**Accreditation Standard B2.1.2:** *The program discusses how its field education program provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate the core competencies.*

**Instructions:** The site visitor is asked to have the program discuss how the field education program provides generalist practice opportunities at all levels of generalist practice.

### **Site Visit Findings**

As described, students and field instructors attend field trainings together, at which, the field coordinator discusses generalist practice. This leads to conversation about the learning contract and types of opportunities for generalist practice within particular settings. Then, at field visits, faculty liaisons again discuss what is in the learning contract as it relates to generalist

practice. Faculty note that once language is clarified about generalist practice that students and field instructors readily identify ways that they function in different roles and intervene at different system levels.

Faculty and community members both discussed how a strong generalist foundation is essential, as no matter what students anticipate doing in their careers, in a rural setting, they may be asked to intervene at micro, mezzo, and macro levels. They also may move into leadership roles in agencies, and the curriculum provides opportunities to develop such skills.

Students report that the weekly seminar class is a good way of integrating classroom and field. They are able to apply policy and practice and make connections between class and the “real world.” Some students, particularly those who chose macro placements, would like more macro-level experience, but noted the macro opportunities, such as grant writing, in their field placements. They felt that most internships are more micro-focused but that they do have adequate opportunities for macro. They also stated that there are strong faculty who advocate for macro content. Similar to the faculty, the students mentioned the importance of the learning contract as a way of guiding the experiences in their internships.

Community members affirmed what faculty stated, that students are well-rounded and trained in generalist practice, an essential aspect of work in rural settings. They described how interns are exposed to all aspects of practice, from the beginning to end, seeing the entire process at their agencies.

**Accreditation Standard 2.1.6:** *The program discusses 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 competencies. Field instructors for baccalaureate students hold a baccalaureate or master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. Field instructors for master’s students hold a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. For cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited social work degree, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.*

**Instructions:** The site visitor is asked to have the program discuss how the credentials and practice experience of field instructors and off-site instructors enables them to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program competencies.

### **Site Visit Findings**

The social work program and field coordinator are conscientious about who supervises students in their field sites. They make sure that all students have an experienced, high-quality field task supervisor. Because they are in an area with an MSW shortage, sometimes faculty members will serve as the degreed field instructor. When faculty members are providing supervision, they also are in the role of educating agency staff about the social work perspective, building connections with agency staff, and they may even do trainings at the agency.

**Accreditation Standard 3.2.2:** *The program describes the process and procedures for evaluating applications and notifying applicants of the decision and any contingent conditions associated with admission.*

**Instructions:** The site visitor is asked to have the program describe how applicants are notified of decisions regarding admission.

### Site Visit Findings

The faculty and program directors indicated that all applicants are notified of decisions regarding admission by letter, sent by email. Decisions include acceptance, conditional admission, and denial of admission. Students confirmed that they were informed of decisions by email letter.

**Accreditation Standard 3.3.2:** *The program discusses how faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; class size; number of students; and the faculty's teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities. To carry out the ongoing functions of the program, the full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio is usually 1:25 for baccalaureate programs and 1:12 for master's programs.*

**Instructions:** The site visitor is asked to have the program discuss how faculty size is commensurate with scholarly and service responsibilities.

### Site Visit Findings

Faculty members noted that they have the traditional responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, and service. The faculty in the CSU system have heavy teaching loads. The social work teaching load is consistent with the other units in the university. The faculty reported that they use strategies to allow adequate time for their many responsibilities. For example, they may be able to buy themselves out of a course to pursue research. The university takes teaching load into consideration when making decisions about tenure and promotion. Faculty also are able to do collaborative research and can include conference presentations as well as refereed publications. They also find ways to integrate the three traditional responsibility areas, for example, weaving together teaching and research or service and teaching. The department chair also advocates for the faculty. They work diligently, but are able to complete teaching, scholarship, and service activities.

**Accreditation Standard B3.4.5 (c):** *The program describes the procedures for determining the field director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education. To carry out the administrative functions of the field at least 25% assigned time is required for baccalaureate programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.*

**Instructions:** The site visitor is asked to have the program demonstrate whether the assigned time is sufficient to carry out the administrative functions of the field.

### Site Visit Findings

As noted in the self-study, the Field Coordinator has a 25% load for BSW field duties, as well as 50% for MSW field responsibilities. In addition, the program has an assistant for field who carries out a number of tasks in support of field. She facilitates the field orientation with students during their junior year, works to develop new field sites, and “trouble shoots” if any problems arise in the field. Besides the assistant, there is a half-time staff person who provides administrative support, including data entry, contract follow-ups, and end of year evaluations. The Field Coordinator facilitates placements for the DL program. Field Instructor trainings are co-facilitated by the Field Coordinator and assistant. The Field Coordinator is busy, but with the additional support, the assigned time is sufficient to carry out the responsibilities for the BSW field program.

**Accreditation Standard 4.0.2:** *The program provides summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of its competencies, identifying the percentage of students achieving each benchmark.*

**Instructions:** The site visitor is asked to have the program provide narrative discussing the summary data presented.

### **Site Visit Findings**

The BSW program provided a written report (“Responses to COA Concerns” - sent to CSWE separately and attached to this report) which includes a narrative describing each of the practice competencies, the scores, the benchmark, and an interpretation of overall student progress for each competency.

### **Conclusion**

In summary, the faculty at Chico State are dedicated and hard-working and appear to be well-supported in the university and in the community. Students and community members also noted the dedicated and professional faculty. The faculty have used the reaffirmation process to intentionally reflect upon mission, make changes as needed to the curriculum, and maintain a strong social work program that meets important needs in the community and in this region of the state.

**School of Social Work  
Accreditation Site Visit  
October 10-12, 2016  
Itinerary**

<b>Day/Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Host</b>
Monday 10/10	Afternoon 7:00 PM	Arrive in Sacramento Dinner with Director and Program Directors		David David Jean Vince
Tuesday 10/11	8:45	Meet and escort to Kendall Hall	Hotel Diamond	David
	9:00	Meet with President, Provost's Designee, and Associate Dean	Kendall Hall	David
	10:00	Meet with Faculty	Butte 703	Vincent
	12:15	Lunch with Students	Butte 509	David
	1:45	Meet with Assessment Committee	Butte 509	Sue
	3:00	Meet with Community Reps	Butte 509	Patty
	3:45	Adjourn		
Wednesday 10/12	8:45	Pick up and escort	Hotel Diamond	David
	9:00	Exit meeting with School Administrators	Butte 703	David
	10:00	Exit meeting with faculty	Butte 703	David
	11:30	Exit Meeting President, Provost's Designee, and Associate Dean	Kendall	David
	12:30	Adjourn		
	1:00	Depart for Sacramento	Hotel Diamond	David

## **Persons with whom the Site Visitors Met During the Campus Visit**

### **Administrators:**

Dr. Gayle E. Hutchinson, President  
 Dr. Arno Rethans, Provost's Designee  
 Dr. Ryan Patten, Associate Dean

### **Faculty:**

David Bassett, Director  
 Chelsea Cornell, IV-E Coordinator  
 Sue Steiner, Professor  
 Patty Hunter, Director of Field  
 Celeste A. Jones, Professor, Director of the Interdisciplinary Center on Aging  
 Pam Johansen, Professor  
 Meka Klungtvet-Morano, Title IV-E Coordinator  
 Vincent Ornelas, BSW Director  
 Kathy Cox, Associate Professor  
 Kui-Hee Song, Associate Professor  
 Jean Schulberg, Professor

### **Community Partners:**

Glenna Akers, Passages/Prog. Director  
 January Giles, NUCSS/AFI/ Program Manager  
 Jennifer Barzey, Youth for Change/AFI/Alumni  
 Melody Robinson, BC Behavioral Health/AFI/ Alumni  
 Ken Crandall, Superior Region Workforce Education and Training  
 Patrick Borell, Butte County Dept. of Behavioral Health/Clinical Supv.  
 Patty Hunter, CSU Chico  
 Shelby Boston, Butte County DESS/ Assistant Director  
 Emma Black, Glenn Co. Child Welfare/Social Work Supervisor/ Intern Coord.

### **Students:**

7 MSW students (both years included).  
 17 BSW students.

California State University, Chico

Chico, California 95929-0550

School of Social Work

530-898-6204

Fax: 530-898-5574



## Responses to COA Concerns – BSW Program

BSW

**1) Accreditation Standard 2.1.1:** *[The program discusses how its field education program] connects the theoretical and conceptual contribution of the classroom with the practice setting, fostering the implementation of evidence-informed practice.*

The program discussed how its field education connects the conceptual contributions of the classroom with the practice settings. However, the program did not discuss how its field education connects theoretical contributions of the classroom with the practice setting.

The site visitor is asked to have the program discuss how its field education connects theoretical contributions of the classroom with the practice setting, fostering the implementation of evidence-informed practice.

The BSW Program focuses primarily on ecological, empowerment, and strengths-based theory. Students connect these and other theories learned in the classroom with the practice setting in several ways. These include:

- In required Field Seminars students prepare and give case presentations. In the presentations they are asked to discuss the theoretical approach they are using with the client system and discuss the theories used in the agency setting. This mirrors what students are learning in their HBSE and practice classes.
- Students are asked to address how theory is applied to practice in at least one journal entry for their Field Seminar class.
- Faculty Field Liaisons meet with students and Agency Field Instructor at least once per semester. During the first visit Field Liaisons are asked to discuss what types of theories are utilized in the agency and how that shapes practice.

**2) Accreditation Standard B2.1.2:** *[The program discusses how its field education program] provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate the core competencies.*

The program discusses how the field learning contract helps students demonstrate the core competencies. However, the program did not discuss how those opportunities are provided at all levels of generalist practice.

The site visitor is asked to have the program discuss how the field education program provides generalist practice opportunities at all levels of generalist practice.

All agencies where students complete senior year field practicum agree to provide learning opportunities at all levels of generalist practice. This is put into practice in the Field Learning Contract, which is based on the program's competencies. Students must work with their Agency

Field Instructor and Faculty Field Liaison to develop learning activities where they will gain exposure to and experience with practice at all levels of generalist practice. To ensure that students are engaging in generalist practice at all levels, students and Agency Field Instructors review students' work and complete a Final Field Evaluation that assesses student learning at all practice levels.

To reinforce the importance of gaining practice experience at all levels, when Faculty Field Liaisons do field visits each semester they ask students and Agency Field Instructors to discuss how all practice levels are being covered. Finally, in Field Seminar courses, students are required to present a micro level case from their internship one semester, and to give a macro-level assessment of their agency the other semester. This supports student learning at both levels.

**3) Accreditation Standard 2.1.6:** *[The program discusses 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 competencies. Field instructors for baccalaureate students hold a baccalaureate or master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. Field instructors for master's students hold a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. For cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited social work degree, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.*

The program specifies the credential and practice experience of its field instructors. However, the program did not discuss how the credentials and practice experience of field instructors and off-site instructors enables them to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program competencies.

The site visitor is asked to have the program discuss how the credentials and practice experience of field instructors and off-site instructors enables them design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program competencies.

The School of Social Work only uses Agency Field Instructors who are from CSWE accredited programs. We believe this means that these Field Instructors have the skills and knowledge to design learning opportunities to demonstrate the program competencies. To further ensure that learning opportunities will allow for students to demonstrate program competencies, the Field Contract and how it is used as a tool in designing competency-based learning is a primary conversation at the mandatory Field Orientation for Field Instructors and students. Field staff review the program competencies and the Learning Contract and AFIs and students have the opportunity to meet in small groups and discuss ideas for developing appropriate learning opportunities. Agency Field Instructors and student also meet with Faculty Field Liaisons at the beginning of the fall semester to support development of the Learning Contract. Finally, Faculty Field Liaisons review all Learning Contracts to ensure that all of the competencies are effectively being addressed learning activities.

**4) Accreditation Standard 3.2.2:** *The program describes the process and procedures for evaluating applications and notifying applicants of the decision and any contingent conditions associated with admission.*

The program described the process and procedures for evaluating applications and the process for notifying applicants who do not meet the criteria. However, the program did not describe how applicants are notified of decisions regarding admission when they meet the criteria.

The site visitor is asked to have the program describe how applicants are notified of decisions regarding admission.

California State University is an open-access university. This means that when students enter they can declare any major. Even though students may declare social work as their major, they must still apply to the professional sequence during the fall semester of their junior year. After applications are reviewed by the faculty and decisions have been made, all students, those who are admitted and those who are not, are informed of the decision by a letter sent via email.

**5) Accreditation Standard 3.3.2:** *The program discusses how faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; class size; number of students; and the faculty's teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities. To carry out the ongoing functions of the program, the full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio is usually 1:25 for baccalaureate programs and 1:12 for master's programs.*

The program provided a faculty-to-student ratio and discussed how faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field, class size, and number students and faculty teaching. However, the program did not discuss how faculty size is commensurate with scholarly and service responsibilities.

The site visitor is asked to have the program discuss how faculty size is commensurate with scholarly and service responsibilities.

The size of the faculty in the School of Social work is commensurate with both scholarly and service responsibilities. Our size has allowed us to develop a committee structure in which needed program work can be divided among various committees to evenly spread work among the faculty. Our size means that not all faculty must serve on all committees. We are able to complete all the work that needs to be done internally at the School, while providing needed service for the College and University as well. Faculty still have time to, and do, engage in service in the broader community.

California State University is not a research one university. Both the University and the School of Social Work have reasonable expectations for scholarly productivity that fit with our teaching and service expectations. These expectations are documented in the current School of Social Work Faculty Manual and in the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP) and are in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) that exists between the CSU Administration and the California Faculty Association, the collective bargaining agent for all CSU faculty members. The size of our faculty allows us to have enough faculty members to adequately cover classes and do the work needed in the program, and still allow faculty members to take sabbaticals and get grants to buy out of teaching to focus on research.

**6) Accreditation Standard B3.4.5(c):** *The program describes the procedures for determining the field director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education. To carry out the administrative functions of the field at least 25% assigned time is required for baccalaureate programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.*

The program described the field director's assigned time and explained that the program director meets the minimum requirement of 25% assigned time to carry out administrative functions. However, the program did not demonstrate that this time is sufficient.

The site visitor is asked to have the program demonstrate whether the assigned time is sufficient to carry out the administrative functions of the field.

The School of Social Work's Field Director Patty Hunter has assigned time that far exceeds the minimum of 25%. She is assigned 1.0 in the fall semester, .8 in the spring semester, and 1.0 in the summer. Additionally the School has a half-time administrative staff member and a .6 time professional staff member assigned to assist the Field Director. This allows Ms. Hunter sufficient time to find and evaluate new placements, support existing placements, and work with students who are going into and are already in the field. The Field Director's assigned time allows her to not only do the minimum necessary for an effective field component, but also do additional work with agencies and in the community. Ms. Hunter has been able to provide trainings to agencies on a variety of topics, most recently including secondary trauma. She also has time to expand field placements for the School's BHS TAY Program.

**7) Accreditation Standard 4.0.2:** *The program provides summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of its competencies, identifying the percentage of students achieving each benchmark.*

The program provided summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of its competencies. However, the program did not provide a narrative describing the summary data presented.

The site visitor is asked to have the program provide narrative discussing the summary data presented.

The following data and narrative were provided in the document we submitted. The Accreditation Specialist we spoke with at CSWE recommended that we discuss each competency individually and expand discussion including the practice behaviors, rather than noting that students met all except those we note. That expanded discussion follows the material we included in our original report.

**Table 4.3 Average Scores for Foundation Competencies**

Average Score of all Foundation Practice Behaviors on All Measures of Competencies AY 2014/2015		
Competency	Competency Benchmark	Percent of students meeting benchmark
Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly	75% score "4" or above	88
Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice	75% score "4" or above	87
Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments	75% score "4" or above	82
Engage diversity and difference in practice	75% score "4" or above	87

Advance human rights and social and economic justice	75% score "4" or above	78
Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research	75% score "4" or above	84
Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment	75% score "4" or above	77
Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services	75% score "4" or above	87
Respond to contexts that shape practice	75% score "4" or above	74
Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	75% score "4" or above	77
Engagement	75% score "4" or above	82
Assessment	75% score "4" or above	78
Intervention	75% score "4" or above	74
Evaluation	75% score "4" or above	70

### Outcome Results for Competencies and Practice Behaviors Using All Measures

BSW Core Competencies and Practice Behaviors	Benchmark	% of Students Meeting Benchmark Measure 1 Field Instructor Evaluation Or Embedded Assignment	% of Students Meeting Benchmark Measure 2 Student Field Evaluation	% of Students Meeting Benchmark Measure 3 Embedded Assignment	Average of Practice Behaviors
1. Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly	75% score "4" or above				<b>88</b>
A. advocate for client access to the services of social work		80	78	91	83
B. practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development		78	85	82	82
C. attend to professional roles and boundaries		91	87	85	88
D. demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication		88	89	100	92
E. engage in career-long learning		100		85	93
F. use supervision and consultation		91	87	97	92
2. Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice	75% score "4" or above				<b>87</b>
A. recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice		87	78	100	88

B. make ethical decisions by applying standards of the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics and, as applicable, of the International Federation of Social Workers/International Association of Schools of Social Work Ethics in Social Work, Statement of Principles		91	85	100	92
C. tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts		80	74	94	83
D. apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions		77	76	100	84
3. Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgements	75% score "4" or above				<b>82</b>
A. distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom		78	74	87	80
B. analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation		74	74	91	80
C. demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues		84	81	91	85
4. Engage diversity and difference in practice	75% score "4" or above				<b>87</b>
A. recognize the extent to which a culture's structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create or enhance privilege and power		80	78	87	82
B. gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups		89	93	87	90
C. recognize and communicate their understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences		89	93	87	90
D. view themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants		85	81	87	84
5. Advance human rights and social and economic justice	75% score "4" or above				<b>78</b>
A. understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination		74	76	93	81
B. advocate for human rights and social and economic justice		70	69	87	75
C. engage in practices that advance social and economic justice		74	75	87	79
6. Engage in research-informed practice and practice informed research	75% score "4" or above				<b>84</b>

A. use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry		93		89	91
B. use research evidence to inform practice		69	71	91	77
7. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment	75% score "4" or above				<b>77</b>
A. utilize conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation		65	63	93	74
B. critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment		74	72	94	80
8. Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services	75% score "4" or above				<b>87</b>
A. analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being		94		94	94
B. collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action		71	73	96	80
9. Respond to contexts that shape practice	75% score "4" or above				<b>74</b>
A. continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services		80	67	91	79
B. provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services		57	58	93	69
10. Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	75% score "4" or above				<b>77</b>
A. Engagement					82
1. substantively and affectively prepare for action with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities		74	65	85	75
2. use empathy and other interpersonal skills		87	89	94	90
3. develop a mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes		76	76	94	82
B. Assessment					78
1. collect, organize, and interpret client data		63	61	100	75
2. assess client strengths and limitations		78	72	100	83
3. develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives		70	65	100	78
4. select appropriate intervention strategies		70	61	100	77
C. Intervention					78

1. initiate actions to achieve organizational goals		65	56	89	70
2. implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities		63	56	100	73
3. help clients resolve problems		74	69	100	81
4. negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients		70	61	93	75
5. facilitate transitions and endings		63	59	97	73
D. Evaluation					70
1. Social workers critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions		63	57	89	70

The data indicate that students are meeting the benchmarks set by the faculty. The one area where the benchmark was not met was Competency 9, “Respond to contexts that shape practice.” On the three measures for the practice behavior, 74% of students achieved the benchmark, just shy of the 75% benchmark. Additionally, while overall students achieved the benchmark for Competency 10 “Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families groups, organizations, and communities,” in the specific practice areas of “Intervention” and “Evaluation,” students were below the 75% benchmark. As will be discussed in AS 4.0.3 below, the assessment results have been discussed and examined by the School of Social Work faculty. The School has been working to address the issues the data raise, and we appear to be making progress on it.

#### **Expanded Narrative**

For Competency 1, “Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly” 88% of students met the benchmark. In terms of the practice behaviors that comprise Competency 1, the scores ranged from 82% - 93%, all well above the 75% benchmark. Students seem to be effectively mastering the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to identify as professional social workers and to act accordingly.

For Competency 2, “Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice” 87% of students met the benchmark. In terms of the practice behaviors that comprise Competency 2, the scores ranged from 83% - 92%, all well above the 75% benchmark. Students seem to be effectively mastering the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to apply ethical principles to guide their professional practice.

For Competency 3, “Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments” 82% of students met the benchmark. In terms of the practice behaviors that comprise Competency 3, the scores ranged from 80% - 85%, all above the 75% benchmark. Students seem to be effectively mastering the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.

For Competency 4, “Engage diversity and difference in practice” 87% of students met the benchmark. In terms of the practice behaviors that comprise Competency 4, the scores ranged from 82% - 90%, all well above the 75% benchmark. Students seem to be effectively mastering the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to engage diversity and difference in practice.

For Competency 5, “Advance human rights and social and economic justice” 78% of students met the benchmark. In terms of the practice behaviors that comprise Competency 5, the scores ranged from 75% - 81%, just at or above the 75% benchmark. Though lower than scores in other areas, students seem to be mastering the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to advance human rights and social and economic justice. Because the scores are lower than in some other areas, we have been focusing on strengthening our curriculum and supporting students in this area.

For Competency 6, “Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research,” 84% of students met the benchmark. In terms of the practice behaviors that comprise Competency 6, the scores on the two practice behaviors were 77% and 91%, both above the 75% benchmark. The large difference in the two scores has encouraged us to focus more attention on the behavior where students scored lower, “use research evidence to inform practice.”

For Competency 7, “Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment,” 77% of students met the benchmark. In terms of the practice behaviors that comprise Competency 7, the scores ranged on the two practice behaviors were 74% and 80%. One score, for the practice behavior “utilize conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation” was just below the 75% benchmark. We continue to explore ways to help students learn to utilize theory and conceptual frameworks in our curriculum and in the field.

For Competency 8, “Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services,” 87% of students met the benchmark. In terms of the practice behaviors that comprise Competency 8, the scores on the two practice behaviors were 94% and 80%, both above the 75% benchmark. Students seem to be effectively mastering the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to engage in policy practice to advance well-being and deliver effective services.

For Competency 9, “Respond to contexts that shape practice,” 74% of students met the benchmark, just below the 75% mark. The scores on the related practice behaviors were 79% and 69%. One of these is just above the 75% benchmark, and one is well below it. The low score was on the behavior “provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services.” We have been concerned that compared with other scores, both are low, but particularly concerned with the 69% score as it was the lowest of any score on our assessment. We have been exploring ways to address this, as was discussed in the following section of our document.

The overall score for Competency 10, “Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities”, was 77% of students meeting the 75% benchmark. Breaking that down, for Competency 10A, Engagement, 82% of students met the benchmark, with scores on the practice behaviors ranging from 75% to 90%. For Competency 10B, Assessment, 78% met the benchmark with practice behavior scores ranging from 75% to 83%. For Competency 10C, Intervention, 78% of students met the benchmark with practice scores ranging from 70% to 81%. The score of 70% for the practice behavior “initiate actions to achieve organizational goals” and the score of 73% for practice behaviors “implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities” and “facilitate transitions and endings” are all below the 75% benchmark and have been a part of our focus for curricular change. For Competency 10D, Evaluation, the score for the only practice behavior, “Social workers critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions” was 70%, again below our benchmark. There are a number of practice behaviors in Competency 10 that concern us. We have been and continue to address them in a variety of ways, many discussed in the following section.