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Program Visited Name: Inter American University of Puerto Rico Metropolitan Campus
Program Visited State: Puerto Rico
Program Level(s) visited: BSW, MSW
Site Visitor(s) Names: Santos H. Hernández, Ph.D., Merydawilda Colón, Ph.D.

1. Include copy of the site visit schedule or a list of people who met with the site visitor(s) during the visit (e.g.: groups and individuals from the program and institution).

A copy of the site visit schedule which includes a list of people meeting with the site visitors is attached. A signature list of attendees for each of the meetings will be included in the mailed hardcopy of this report as well.

2. Write a brief summary of the conversation on general questions regarding: program mission and goals (AS 1.0), diversity (3.1), and assessment (AS 4.0).

Site Visit Findings
Regarding General discussion of Program Mission and Goals, Diversity and Assessment, the Site Team met with the Chancellor and fourteen (14) deans and other Senior Administration of the University, the Program Director and BSW Coordinator, twenty-four (24) faculty, 20 masters students, 10 BSW students and 19 Field Instructors, Alumni and Practice Representatives at various times as indicated on the Site Visit Schedule.

First, it was evident that the Senior Administration of the University was clear that the Social Work Program’s Mission and Goals were a very close fit with the mission and goals of the university. Chancellor Marilina Lucca Wayland stated that the Social Work Program, especially through its faculty has been a major contributor to the leadership of the university throughout its existence. She highlighted social work faculty accomplishments and praised them for their continued leadership within the university and the community. She verbalized that the university places a very high value on the Social Work Program, and referred to it as “the flag of the institution.”

The university was founded in 1912 and the Metropolitan Campus was founded in 1962. In 2008, it revised its mission and goals to pursue the development of leadership and entrepreneurial skills of students. Mastery of English and Spanish as well as other languages is important as well as development of interpersonal sensitivity and empathy to individual needs and core values of the Christian ecumenical tradition of Inter American University. The university’s commitment to diversity is evident in its Research Centers: Interdisciplinary Center for Gender Studies, Center for the Study and Research of Puerto Rico and the Caribbean Music, Inter American Center for the Study of Political Dynamics, Center for Multicultural Dialog, and Center for the Research and Study of the Christian Faith in Puerto Rico. It is also evident in the practices of the Senior Administration. For example, Chancellor Marilina Lucca Wayland secured a permanent exhibition of world religious anthropology from over 40 countries. Furthermore, the university has an active student exchange program in which the Social Work
Program has been participating since 2005, when it began an exchange program with Boston University.

Further, it should be noted that the student body within the university encompasses all Puerto Rico and the following Caribbean Countries: British Virgin Island, Curaçao, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Tortola, and US Virgin Islands.

The Social Work Program reflects commitment to diversity in terms of student and faculty recruitment, admissions, explicit and implicit curricular elements. Students in the Baccalaureate Program indicated that they feel respected and that they belong in the university, regardless of their diverse identities, they feel that the program affirms who they are. Students provided an example of how in their student organization, Asociación the Futuros Trabajadores Sociales they have a diverse body of members including one who is blind, and they all support and affirm one another.

Senior Administration, Students, Field Instructors, Alumni and Practice Representatives all described the University’s and Program’s commitment to diversity within the Implicit and Explicit Curriculums. Students, Field Instructors, Alumni and Practice Representatives expressed enthusiastic support for the School and its programs.

The University has made a significant investment into the assessment of all programs and the dissemination of this information. The Senior Administration indicated that the University has brought assessment consultant experts to assist with assessment efforts. The Chancellor indicated that assessment is very important in the university. Students and Field Instructors also alluded to the importance of program assessment and that they participate in it.

3. List each accreditation standard and question raised by the COA in its letter of instructions with a thorough discussion of findings for each.

**BSW**

*Accreditation Standard B2.0—Curriculum*

The 10 core competencies are used to design the professional curriculum.

*B2.0.4* The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field (EP2.0).

*Instructions*

The site team is asked to clarify the role of SOWK 4912 Practice Experience in Generalist Social Work II in integrating the class and field curriculum. The site team is also asked to clarify whether the seminar is connected to both “Experience” courses.

*Site Visit Findings*

The course SOWK 4912 Practice Experience in Generalist Social Work II integrates the class and field curriculum. This course requires the completion of a 200 hour supervised internship in a social service agency; and weekly participation in a three-hour field seminar. This required field seminar provides a forum for students to discuss field experiences with the faculty member who supervises the field experience. The courses SOWK 4911 and SOWK 4912 are experience courses and each course requires the completion of a 200 hour supervised internship in a social service agency; and weekly participation in a three-hour field seminar with the faculty member who supervises the field experience.
**B2.0.5** Describes and explains how its curriculum content (knowledge, values, and skills) implements the operational definition of each of its competencies.

**Instructions**
The site team is asked to clarify how knowledge, values, and skills are linked to each practice behavior. The chart (pp.15-17) and text (pp. 17-25) explicate the link between the curriculum and the ten competencies, but they do not provide information on where the knowledge, values, and skills related to the practice behaviors that operationalize each competency can be found. In other words, the analysis is presented at the level of the competencies, not the practice behaviors as required by the standard.

**Site Visit Findings**
Conversations with faculty members supported that this connection between the knowledge, values and skills that make up the operational definition for each competency is an organizing principle in course and curriculum development and assessment. During the site visit Dr. Avilés provided a chart, *Contenido Curricular y Sus Respectivas Competencias y Conductas Prácticas Programa de Bachillerato*, which shows the link between the curriculum the ten competencies and the practice behaviors. The program was asked to send 3 copies of this chart to the CSWE COA.

Faculty members were able to provide numerous examples of this connection in the courses that they are currently teaching, and others from ongoing classes this term. Specific connections included engaging students in an Education Fair (Mesa de Educación) held at the university in which students network with colleagues from community organizations and learn about their services, so that they can refer clients to those services as part of the learning activities that operationalize EP 2.1.1 and EP 2.1.5. Faculty members also provided an example of an activity in which students assess a community. This assignment requires that students interview community members and then prepare a report of findings with recommendations to strengthen the community. Students present their community report to a community representative who liaises between the community and the city’s mayor. The community assignment is part of the learning activities that operationalize EP 2.1.7 and 2.1.6. It is noteworthy that in conversation with students about the mission of the program they mentioned the community assignment and stated it is very meaningful to them, because they find that they are helping a community.

In another activity students are shown a photo that depicts dimensions of diversity such as skin color, age, class, gender, and race and are asked to reflect on the implications of these diversity dimensions in the life of the person depicted in the photo as part of learning activities that operationalize EP 2.1.4. Numerous examples of learning activities to operationalize EP 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.8, 2.1.9, and 2.1.10 (a)-(d) were provided from both field and classroom coursework.

It should be noted that during the site visit, faculty members showed the site visit team revised course syllabi that include practice behaviors. The program was asked to send three copies of a sample of revised syllabi to the CSWE COA.
**Accreditation Standard 2.1—Field Education**

The program discusses how its field education program

**Accreditation Standard B2.1.2 provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate the core competencies.**

**Instructions**

The site team is asked to clarify how all students are provided opportunities for skill development across the range of target systems from individuals to communities, especially in regard to organizations. Also, it is not clear if the Seminar is concurrent with the first or second semester of field, or both.

**Site Visit Findings**

Professor Nazario, Field Education Coordinator, and faculty members who supervise the field experience provided the list of field placements. Field settings encompass child welfare, hospitals, schools, homeless services, domestic violence services, and older adult services. Professor Nazario and faculty members who supervise the field experience described in detail how these placements provide learning experiences for students to develop skills across the range of target systems from individuals to communities and organizations. For example, students placed at the Centro de Desarrollo Integrar (CEDIN) the pre K through 12 laboratory school of the Inter American University Recinto Metro, develop programs and coordinate activities at an organizational level. The most recent initiative created by social work students who are completing field placement hours at CEDIN is an anti bullying campaign. Other examples included fund raising events to enhance services provided by community organizations that serve as field settings.

The courses SOWK 4911 Practice Experience in Generalist Social Work I and SOWK 4912 Practice Experience in Generalist Social Work II integrate the class and field curriculum. Both courses require the completion of a 200 hour supervised internship in a social service agency; and weekly participation in a three-hour field seminar with the faculty member who supervises the field experience.

2.1.4 Admits only those students who have met the program’s specified criteria for field education.

**Instructions**

The site team is asked to clarify how all of the activities described in the narrative (p.29) can occur in the one month period between the end of the two courses listed as required (end of 3rd year, first trimester, in October) and the beginning of the first field placement the very next trimester (3rd year, second trimester beginning in November).

**Site Visit Findings**

Professor Nazario, Field Education Coordinator, indicated that 10 to 15 students per trimester require field placement and the process begins while students are completing prerequisites, therefore all activities described in the narrative are achievable. She also indicated that the Coordinator of the Program assists in the process.
Accreditation Standard 2.1.5 Specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for selecting field settings; placing and monitoring students; maintaining field liaison contacts with field education settings; and evaluating student learning and field setting effectiveness congruent with the program’s competencies.

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify how agencies meet the requirements for generalist practice because the narrative (p.29) only discusses the need to provide “opportunities...working with individuals and groups,” with no mention of families, organizations, or communities. Also it is not clear exactly how the field education coordinator evaluates field setting effectiveness since no specific procedures or instruments are described.

Site Visit Findings
Professor Nazario, Field Education Coordinator, and faculty members who supervise the field experience provided the list of field placements. Field settings encompass child welfare, hospitals, schools, homeless services, domestic violence services, and older adult services. Professor Nazario and faculty members who supervise the field experience described in detail how these placements provide learning experiences for students to develop social work practice skills with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. The Field Manual was updated during the site visit and page 13, under criteria for selection of field placements, states: “The field placement must provide diverse experiences with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities....”

Pertaining to how the Field Education Coordinator evaluates field setting effectiveness, Professor Nazario showed the instrument, “Cuestionario de Evaluación de los Centros de Práctica,” which is an instrument she uses to assess field setting effectiveness. Professor Nazario also administers a survey for students to evaluate their field supervision experience. The program was asked to send three copies of these instruments to the CSWE COA.

Accreditation Standard 3.1—Diversity

3.1.1 The program describes the specific and continuous efforts it makes to provide a learning environment in which respect for all persons and understanding of diversity and difference are practiced.

Instructions
The site team is asked to gather adequate information to confirm that the standard has been met. Many of the dimensions listed in EP3.1 are not discussed in the narrative, including the demographic make-up of the student body.

Site Visit Findings
Conversations with the Senior Administration, faculty and students supported that the Accreditation Standard 3.1—Diversity has been met. The Social Work Program reflects commitment to diversity in terms of student, faculty and staff recruitment, admissions, explicit and implicit curricular elements. The students in the program come from diverse geographical backgrounds within the island and six students are from foreign countries. These students are diverse by age and gender as seen in the Perfil del Estudiante (Student Demographic Make-Up) that Dr. Avilés provided the site team during the visit. Faculty members also related that the student body represents other dimensions of diversity as well. In conversations with the faculty, it is clear that the dimensions of diversity are covered in all courses. Faculty members presented clear examples of how on they operationalize EP 2.1.4 in the explicit curriculum.
3.1.2 The program describes how its learning environment models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference.

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify how the environment models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference.

Site Visit Findings
Faculty members related that the environment models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference in its non-discriminatory policies, the demographic make up of its faculty, staff and student body, composition of the community advisory committee and field settings, and supports that are in place for students with disabilities. Furthermore, the artwork displayed throughout the campus, which shows themes of religion, class, age, color, gender, culture, ethnicity and race also model affirmation and respect for diversity and difference. It is noteworthy that in conversations with students, they indicated that they feel the program affirms who they are.

3.1.3 The program discusses specific plans to improve the learning environment to affirm and support persons with diverse identities.

Instructions
The site team is asked for additional evidence of plans for improvement.

Site Visit Findings
Faculty members discussed that they will continue to support the University’s efforts to affirm and support persons with diverse identities. Faculty members also indicated that they will continue to strengthen the explicit curriculum, adding more hypothetical cases reflecting diversity dimensions for students to further develop practice behaviors related EP 2.1.4-- engaging diversity and difference in practice.

Accreditation Standard 3.2—Student Development: Admissions; Advisement, Retention, and Termination; and Student Participation

3.2.4 The program describes its policies and procedures concerning the transfer of credits.

Instructions
The site team is asked to determine if there are policies and procedures for transferring credits from CSWE-accredited programs.

Site Visit Findings
The program has policies and procedures for transferring credits from CSWE-accredited programs. Faculty members discussed the policy and procedures for transferring credits from CSWE-accredited programs. The policy and procedures are found in Volume III of the undergraduate self-study-- Student Handbook, page 14.
3.2.8 The program submits its policies and procedures for terminating a student’s enrollment in the social work program for reasons of academic and professional performance.

**Instructions**
The site team is asked to clarify policies and procedures for terminating a student’s enrollment for professional performance (e.g., in field placement).

**Site Visit Findings**
Faculty members clarified policies and procedures for terminating a student’s enrollment for professional performance. These policies and procedures are found in the Volume III of the undergraduate self-study--Student Handbook, pages 16–23. These policies apply to field placement as well and are found in Volume III of the undergraduate self-study--Field Manual, pages 26-27.

**Accreditation Standard 3.3—Faculty**

**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 team is asked to determine the student faculty-ratio. The narrative provides no evidence to support the statement that the ratio is 1:24. For example, the number of students in the program is not reported. Also, there is no discussion of the impact on this ratio resulting from the retirement of Prof. Rivera.

**Site Visit Findings**
Faculty members indicated that the program has five FTE faculty members and 12 part-time faculty members, and with 203 declared majors, their student faculty ratio is 1:26. Professor Rivera was immediately replaced by Professor Nazario, therefore the retirement of Professor Rivera did not impact workload.

**3.3.4** The program describes its faculty workload policy and discusses how the policy supports the achievement of institutional priorities and the program’s mission and goals.

**Instructions**
The site team is asked to clarify how workload supports achievement of mission and goals. No examples are given to illustrate how the policy is implemented.

**Site Visit Findings**
The basic academic year teaching load for full-time faculty is 30 teaching credit hours. According to faculty members, the program’s 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.
**Accreditation Standard 3.5—Resources**

3.5.2 The program describes how it uses resources to continuously improve the program and address challenges in the program’s context.

**Instructions**
The site team is asked to clarify challenges identified by the program and how resources are used to continuously improve and address challenges.

**Site Visit Findings**
Faculty reported that five years ago the institution implemented a vision to support accredited programs and provide what these programs need to address any challenges. The University supports program assessment efforts, the efforts of faculty to conduct scholarship and engage in professional development activities. For example, faculty members receive financial support to attend CSWE’s APM and other professional development conferences.

**Accreditation Standard 4.0—Assessment**

4.0.1 The program presents its plan to assess the attainment of its competencies. The plan specifies procedures, multiple measures, and benchmarks to assess the attainment of each of the program’s competencies (AS B2.0.3; AS M2.0.4)

**Instructions**
The program reports that they use a “performance domain level of the program competencies through learning at the classroom assessment level.” However, the plan or procedures for this measure are not clearly described. The site team is asked to have the program explain the measurement plan, and procedures. In addition, the current evaluation plan seems to be organized at the level of measuring competencies, not practice behaviors that operationalize the competencies. This is true of the Performance Domain Level Instrument, the Student Opinion Survey, and the Practicum Scale Scores. There do not appear to be any measurements for individual courses linking content with practice behaviors.

**Site Visit Findings**
Faculty members discussed their assessment measures and procedures and indicated that the assessment plan is organized at the level of measuring competencies and practice behaviors that operationalize the competencies. Faculty members clarified assessment procedures and measures as follows.

The “Performance Domain Level of Program Competencies through Learning at the Classroom,” entails a rubric used by the professor in his/her course(s) to assess students’ achievement of competencies and practice behaviors taught in the course(s). Throughout the trimester, the professor evaluates students’ performance in classroom assignments such as exams, papers, oral presentations, and role-plays, among others, using a rubric that links course content with practice behaviors that operationalize competencies. At the end of the trimester, the professor submits summarized data results to the assessment committee. The benchmark is that 80% of students or higher achieve the competency(s) and practice behaviors taught in the respective course. In the Appendix of Volume I of the self-study of the undergraduate program appears a summary of results obtained from the “Performance Domain Level of Program Competencies through Learning at the Classroom” the first and second trimesters. Faculty acknowledged that not all competencies and practice behaviors were
assessed using the instrument in the first and second trimesters. For example, EP 2.1.8 and respective practice behaviors were not assessed during the first or second trimesters.

During the site visit faculty members provided results obtained in the third trimester from the “Performance Domain Level of Program Competencies through Learning at the Classroom,” and results showed that not all competencies and practice behaviors were assessed. For example, EP 2.1.6 and associated practice behaviors were not assessed, EP 2.1.10 (a), (c), and (d) were not assessed. Three of the four practice behaviors that operationalize EP 2.1.10 (b) were assessed, but select appropriate intervention strategies was not assessed. The program was asked to send three copies of results obtained the third trimester from the “Performance Domain Level of Program Competencies through Learning at the Classroom” instrument to the CSWE COA.

The “Practicum Scale Scores” is the field performance evaluation. Together, the field supervisor and student rate competency-associated practice behaviors at the end of the courses SOWO 4911 and SOWO 4912, respectively. For competencies that have more than one practice behavior, an aggregate mean of each item is computed to determine the mean score for each competency. The benchmark is a mean score of 3.0 or greater. The “Practicum Scale Scores” is found in the Field Manual in Volume III of the undergraduate self-study.

It is important to mention that Table III (p. 89) of the Volume I of the self-study shows aggregate results of “Practicum Scale Scores” for the first and second trimesters. During the site visit, the program showed results of students’ achievement of competencies and practice behaviors measured by the “Practicum Scale Scores” instrument the second and third trimesters. The program was asked to send three copies of these results to the CSWE COA.

The Student Opinion Survey is administered to seniors at least three weeks prior to completion of their last trimester and it measures students’ opinion of how well the program prepared them to carry out competencies and practice behaviors that operationalize the competencies. The instrument includes all competencies and most practice behaviors. For example, two of the practice behaviors that operationalize EP 2.1.1: advocate for client access to services and use supervision and consultation are not included. The practice behaviors that operationalize EP 2.1.10 (c) and EP 2.1.10 (d) are not included either. During the site visit the program showed results obtained by using the Student Opinion Survey instrument the third trimester. The program was asked to send three copies of these results to the CSWE COA.

The “Student Satisfaction Survey” is administered to juniors at least three weeks prior to completion of all coursework to assess their satisfaction with the program and support services. The survey is described on page 77 of the Volume I of the self-study. This survey does not measure competencies and practice behaviors.

4.0.2 The program provides evidence of ongoing data collection and analysis and discusses how it uses assessment data to affirm and/or make changes in the explicit and implicit curriculum to enhance student performance.

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify how the data are used to drive program development and change. The discussion in the narrative could not address possible changes at the practice behavior or individual course level because of the data that were collected. It was noted on p. 81 that “the Program will refine the instruments of assessment to measure behavior practices (sic)” which is an acknowledgment of this deficit.
Site Visit Findings
Faculty discussed that based on data findings; they are strengthening delivery of curriculum content addressing competencies EP 2.1.7, 2.1.8, 2.1.9 and practice behaviors that operationalize these competencies to enhance students’ achievement of these competencies and practice behaviors that operationalize the competencies. In addition, they clarified that they will continue to strengthen assessment efforts.

Accreditation Standard 4.0.5 The program appends the summary data for each measure used to assess the attainment of each competency for at least one academic year prior to the submission of the self-study.

Instructions
Given the apparent pattern of three trimesters in each student’s academic year, the Program has failed to meet this standard because data are presented for only two trimesters. The site team is asked to verify that assessment data were collected for the Third Trimester, and to ask the program to: 1) report these data; and 2) incorporate the implications of the data for any changes in the explicit and implicit curricula.

Site Visit Findings
Faculty members verified that assessment data were collected for the Third Trimester and provided a summary of data findings during the site visit. The faculty explained that based on assessment findings, they are strengthening delivery of content addressing competencies: EP 2.1.7, 2.1.8, 2.1.9 and respective practice behaviors throughout the curriculum to enhance students’ achievement of these competencies and practice behaviors that operationalize the competencies. The program was asked to send three copies of data collected for the Third Trimester to the CSWE COA, and any additional implications of the data for changes in the explicit and implicit curricula not addressed during the site visit.

MSW

Accreditation Standard M2.0-Curriculum

The 10 core competencies are used to design the foundation and advanced curriculum. The advanced curriculum builds on and applies the core competencies in an area(s) of concentration. The program

M2.0.2 Discusses how its mission and goals are consistent with advanced practice (EP M2.2).

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify how the program's mission and goals are consistent with advanced practice, as operationalized by the advanced practice behaviors. The narrative includes only a discussion of the 10 competencies, with no mention of the knowledge and practice behaviors specific to the concentration(s).

Site Visit Findings
Faculty discussed the relationship between mission and goals and presented practice behaviors for foundation curriculum as well as competencies and practice behaviors for each
concentration. Faculty also presented a graphic of the curriculum theoretical framework showing relationship between mission, goals, competencies, field and concentrations. Program also submitted a revised narrative describing the relationship between mission, goals, foundation competency practice behaviors and competency practice behaviors for each concentration (revised Table 1). They explained that “Practice behaviors in the area of Foundation respond to the generalist perspective. Practice behaviors required for the concentration of direct service are based on theoretical frameworks for families and corresponding social work intervention models. The learning experiences of each concentration respond to work in behalf of a variety of types of families. The concentration of administration in social work is directed towards the implementation of the organizational theoretical approaches and processes that apply to a diversity of organizations serving populations that include various types of families.”

The program was asked to submit three copies of these materials to CSWE COA.

**M2.0.4** Provides an operational definition for each of the competencies used in its curriculum design and its assessment [EP 2.1 through 2.1.10(d); EP M2.2].

**Instructions**
The narrative makes no distinctions among the practice behaviors that operationalize foundation and two concentrations.

**Site Visit Findings**
As noted above, the program developed practice behaviors for each competency for foundation and each concentration and discusses the distinctions in a revised narrative. Practice behaviors by competency for foundation and each concentration are listed in Revised Table 1 in narrative entitled “AS M2.0.2. Generalist and Both Concentration Adv Practice”. Additionally, concentration competencies are further operationalized by practice behavior in revised narrative “Direct Practice Behaviors” and “Social Work Administration Concentration REVISED”.

The program was asked to provide three copies of these materials to CSWE COA.

**M2.0.5** Provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design (foundation and advanced), demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field (EP 2.0).

**Instructions**
The site team is asked to clarify how the rationale for curriculum design is used to develop a coherent and integrated class and field curriculum. There is no discussion of how the rationale for the foundation curriculum is used “to develop a coherent and integrated class and field curriculum.” The discussion of the integration between class and field in the two concentrations does not provide adequate detail to judge.

**Site Visit Findings**
The graphic entitled “Theoretical Framework” previously discussed, presents a representation of the curriculum, practice competencies and field education. The revised narrative “AS M2.02 Generalist and Both Concentration Adv Practice” also differentiates between foundation, Direct Practice Concentration and Social Work Administration competencies and practice behaviors. This narrative was revised to include a description of advanced competency practice behaviors for each concentration. Three copies of these materials will be provided to CSWE COA by the program.
Practice courses for both the foundation and concentrations are taught concurrently with Practicum thus enhancing the integration of class and field curriculum. Each practicum is also taught by a Faculty-Based Field Instructor further facilitating this integration.

**M2.0.6** Describes and explains how its curriculum content (relevant theories and conceptual frameworks, values, and skills) implements the operational definition of each of its competencies.

**Instructions**
The narrative is focused exclusively on the practice behaviors of the foundation curriculum. No curriculum content is presented in relation to the behaviors identified in the narrative for advanced concentrations (pp. 13-18). In addition, curriculum content is presented at the competency level, not for individual practice behaviors.

**Site Visit Findings**
As discussed above, the program has revised this section of the self-study and included discussion of advanced concentration competencies operationalized by practice behavior. These competency practice behaviors have also been included in course syllabi. The program provided copies of foundation and concentration syllabi to the Site Team as exemplars. These will be included in the copies the program will provide CSWE COA.

**Accreditation Standard 2.1-Field Education**

*The program discusses how its field education program*

2.1.1 Connects the theoretical and conceptual contribution of the classroom with the practice setting, fostering the implementation of evidence-informed practice.

**Instructions**
The site team is asked to clarify how the connections between class and field fosters the implementation of advanced practice in the two distinct concentrations.

**Site Visit Finding**
Field practicum for concentrations is concurrent with practice courses and supervised by a Faculty-Based Field Instructor which facilitates the connection between class and field. Each practicum is evaluated using the Practicum Scale used to assess practice behaviors as part of the overall program assessment plan. The structure and expectations of the advanced practicum by concentration are described in pp 20-22 of the Practicum Manual (Manual de Practica) included in Volume 3 of the Self Study.
M2.1.2 Provides advanced practice opportunities for students to demonstrate the program’s competencies.

Instructions
The site team is asked to explore the advanced concentrations. The narrative does not discuss how students are provided with advanced practice opportunities in the two concentrations.

Site Visit Findings
Faculty elaborated on discussion of this found on p 59 of Volume 1. Students are assigned to agencies that have been selected based on their ability to advance the development of competencies as identified by the program. Students are supervised by a Faculty-Based Field Instructor who, in coordination with agency personnel, develops a project that the student carries out over the course of the practicum. Project activities are negotiated based on the capacity and need of the agency, the learning interests of the student, and consistency with theoretical framework and competencies of the program as described in the Practicum Manual. Student practicum experiences are consistent with their respective concentration.

2.1.5 Specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for selecting field settings; placing and monitoring students; maintaining field liaison contacts with field education settings; and evaluating student learning and field setting effectiveness congruent with the program’s competencies.

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify several issues related to field. 1) In regard to selecting field settings, the narrative does not specify the criteria agencies have to meet for generalist and the two advanced concentrations. 2) The narrative does not discuss the placement process and does not describe the routine monitoring process - for example, what happens on a regular schedule. 3) Evaluation of student learning is tied to competencies not to practice behaviors as required.

Site Visit Findings
Criteria for agency selection is found on p 61 of Volume 1 and p 35 of Practicum Manual. Among the list of criteria that must be met, both state that agencies must be able to “assign situations, cases, groups, tasks and other activities related to generalist and advanced practices, respectively.”

The placement and student monitoring process is found on p 62 of Volume 1. The routine monitoring process with regard to the Field Instructor is further discussed on pp 38-39 of the Practicum Manual and for students on pp 40-43.

The faculty provided the Site Team with copies of the Practicum Scale which assesses student performance by practice behavior as part of the overall program assessment plan. The program was asked to provide three copies of these instruments to CSWE COA.
2.1.7 Provides orientation, field instruction training, and continuing dialog with field education settings and field instructors.

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify the training process for field instructors. The narrative does not make clear how training in the use of the syllabus and assessment instruments occurs, how absences from training are handled, etc. There may be confusion caused by different terminology - the "field instructor" role here appears to be what other programs call liaisons, and vice versa.

Site Visit Findings
Some of the confusion over the role of the Field Instructor and Liaison is due to differential use of terminology. All Field Instructors are Faculty-Based, that is they are hired by the program and hold faculty status. They are assigned to supervise student units in field agencies. Liaisons are agency-based personnel that coordinate field activities with the Field Instructor. Both Field Instructor and Liaison work as a team in directing practicum activities for students.

Similarly, the Field Instructor training process needs clarification in that the narrative describes Field Instructor training as Faculty Development. This applies to Field Instructors in that they are considered faculty. Some field instructors also teach practice courses. Training in the use of the syllabus and assessment instruments occurs through such faculty development trainings as well as through participation in field curriculum committee discussions and corresponding curriculum development. A sample faculty development training outline relative to Field was presented to the Site Team. The program was asked to provide three copies of this sample to CSWE COA.

2.1.8 Develops policies regarding field placements in an organization in which the student is also employed. To ensure the role of student as learner, student assignments and field education supervision are not the same as those of the student's employment.

Instructions
The site team is asked to verify policy related to employment-based placements. The narrative does not make clear the way in which it ensures that assignments and field instruction differ from those responsibilities and supervision associated with the student's employment.

Site Visit Findings
A copy of the program's policy related to employment-based placements was presented to the Site Team. The policy requires approval from the Field Coordinator, makes appropriate differentiation between practicum related activities and employment activities and requires that the field instructor be separate from the employment supervisor. The program was asked to send three copies of this policy to CSWE COA.
**Accreditation Standard 3.1-Diversity**

3.1.2 The program describes how its learning environment models affirmation and respect for diversify and difference.

**Instructions**  
The site team is asked to clarify how the learning environment models affirmation and respect.

**Site Visit Findings**

As with the BSW program, conversations with Senior Administration, faculty and students supported that the Accreditation Standard 3.1—Diversity has been met. The Social Work Program reflects commitment to diversity in terms of student, faculty and staff recruitment, admissions, explicit and implicit curricular elements. The students in the program come from diverse geographical backgrounds within the island and from foreign countries. Faculty members also related that the student body represents other dimensions of diversity as well. In conversations with the faculty, it is clear that the dimensions of diversity are covered in all courses.

Faculty members related that the environment models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference in its non discriminatory policies, the demographic make up of its faculty, staff and student body, composition of the community advisory committee and field settings, and supports that are in place for students with disabilities. Furthermore, the artwork displayed throughout the campus, which shows themes of religion, class, age, color, gender, culture, ethnicity and race also model affirmation and respect for diversity and difference. It is noteworthy that in conversations with students, they indicated that they feel the program affirms who they are.

3.1.3 The program discusses specific plans to improve the learning environment to affirm and support persons with diverse identities.

**Instructions**  
The site team is asked to explore future plans related to diversity.

**Site Visit Findings**

Faculty members discussed that they will continue to support the University’s efforts to affirm and support persons with diverse identities. Faculty members also indicated that they will continue to strengthen the explicit curriculum, adding more hypothetical cases reflecting diversity dimensions for students to further develop practice behaviors related EP 2.1.4--engaging diversity and difference in practice. The program will also explore more opportunities for exchange and foreign study opportunities with the Center for International Study as a way of exposing students to other cultures. The program will also develop more opportunities for service learning opportunities for students with public service agencies.
Accreditation Standard 3.2-Student Development: Admissions; Advisement, Retention, and Termination; and Student Participation Admissions

3.2.4 The program describes its policies and procedures concerning the transfer of credits.

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify criteria for transfer credits. The narrative does not specify that credits transferred into the MSW program must come from another MSW program accredited by CSWE.

Site Visit Findings
Transfer policy on p 14 of the Student Manual refers to university accreditation, not social work accreditation. Faculty however clarified that only courses from another MSW program accredited by CSWE are accepted in transfer and must have been completed within the past five years. This statement requiring CSWE accreditation appears in a program brochure and will be revised into the Student Manual. The program was asked to send three copies of this brochure to CSWE COA.

3.2.8 The program submits its policies and procedures for terminating a student's enrollment in the social work program for reasons of academic and professional performance.

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify termination procedures. There is no clear discussion of termination of a student for professional performance - e.g., in field.

Site Visit Findings
Termination procedures discussed on pp 17-21 of Student Manual included in Volume 3 includes termination for unethical behavior and references field. The termination policy, also referencing unethical behavior is discussed on pp 44-47 of Practicum Manual included in Volume 3.

Accreditation Standard 3.3-Faculty

3.3.1 The program identifies each full and part-time social work faculty member and discusses her/his qualifications, competence, expertise in social work education and practice, and years of service to the program. Faculty who teach social work practice courses have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least two years of social work practice experience.

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify who teaches practice classes. While the narrative states that part-time faculty members who supervise students have accredited MSWs and adequate experience, there is no clear statement about faculty who teach practice courses.

Site Visit Findings
As shown in Appendix A: M3.3.3 Master Faculty Summary Form in Volume 3, all faculty, full-time as well as part-time, have a masters degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least two (2) years of social work practice experience. The program director
The site team is asked to clarify the workload approach. The narrative does not describe how the workload supports the achievement of the five program missions.

The program is asked to explain how its workload supports the achievement of institutional priorities and program mission and goals.

Site Visit Findings
The basic academic year teaching load for full-time faculty is 30 teaching credit hours which typically translate to 6.6 course equivalents over 3 trimesters for graduate faculty. According to faculty members, the program’s 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. With 155 students in the graduate program, the faculty feels the workload is sufficient to achieve program mission and goals.

Reference to the “five” program missions is an error. The program only has one mission.

Faculty deems their workload as adequate to support the achievement of institutional priorities and program mission and goals as evidenced by faculty and program productivity.

Accreditation Standard 3.4-Administrative Structure

M3.4.4(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 of the program, a minimum of 50% assigned time is required at the master's level. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify the role of the program director. The narrative did not discuss if the director's assigned time is sufficient.

Site Visit Findings
The Program Director is also the School Director and receives 100% time assigned for administrative responsibilities, 50% for school administration and 50% for program administration. The director reports directly to the Dean of the Faculty of Education and Behavioral Professions (FEBP) and serves on the Chancellor’s Strategic Council. She is responsible for the general leadership and development of the School and it’s faculty including: budget development and management, faculty recruitment and evaluation, staff supervision, curriculum oversight, work with external relations, etc. The BSW Field Coordinator, BSW Coordinator, MSW Field Coordinator and Community Advisory Committee report to the director. The director attested that the amount of assigned time is sufficient and adequate for carrying out the duties and responsibilities of these roles.
M3.4.5(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 50% assigned time is required for masters programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify the role of the field director. The narrative did not discuss if the field director's assigned time is sufficient.

Site Visit Findings
The duties and responsibilities of the Field Coordinator are listed on pp 37-38 of the Practicum Manual included in Volume 3. The Field Coordinator is provided 18 units of assigned time annually for administrative responsibilities related to field coordination. Based on an annual teaching load of 30 units over three trimesters, this represents 60% assigned time for administrative duties. The Field Coordinator and Program Director attest that his assigned time is sufficient.

Accreditation Standard 4.0-Assessment
4.0.1 The program presents its plan to assess the attainment of its competencies. The plan specifies procedures, multiple measures, and benchmarks to assess the attainment of each of the program's competencies (AS 82.0.3, AS M2.0.4).

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify the assessment plan. Specifically, the evaluation plan is organized at the level of measuring competencies, not the practice behaviors that operationalize the competencies. This is true of the Performance Domain Level instrument, the Student Opinion survey, and the Practicum Scale Scores. There do not appear to be any measurements for individual courses linking course content with practice behaviors. The program reports that they use a "performance domain level of the program competencies through learning at the classroom assessment level." However, the plan or procedures for this measure are not clearly described. The site team is asked to have the program explain the measurement plan, and procedures.

Site Visit Findings
Faculty members discussed their assessment measures and procedures and indicated that the assessment plan is organized at the level of measuring competencies and practice behaviors that operationalize the competencies. A complete discussion of the full assessment plan including data presentations is included as Appendix D in Volume 3.

Faculty members clarified assessment procedures and measures as follows.

The “Performance Domain Level of Program Competencies through Learning at the Classroom,” entails a rubric used by the professor in his/her course(s) to assess students’ achievement of competencies and practice behaviors taught in the course(s). Throughout the trimester, the professor evaluates students' performance in classroom assignments such as exams, papers, oral presentations, and role-plays, among others, using a rubric that links course content with practice behaviors that operationalize competencies. At the end of the trimester, the professor submits summarized data results to the assessment committee. The benchmark is that 80% of students or higher achieve the competency(s) and practice behaviors taught in the respective course. In the Appendix of Volume I of the self-study of the graduate program appears a summary of results obtained from the “Performance Domain Level of
Program Competencies of Learning Assessment at the Classroom – August 2010 to February 2011” the first and second trimesters. Faculty explained that competencies and practice behaviors were assessed using the instrument but data was only reported out in aggregated form by Competency due to space considerations. They have revised these data tables to report data based on practice behaviors. Additionally, the Site Team was provided a graphic entitled “Grafica – Procedimientos Medicion” which presents the procedures and process of administering the Performance Domain. Faculty also provided the Site Team copies of foundation and concentration syllabi to demonstrate how the Performance Domain assessment was reflected in course syllabi. The program was asked to provide three copies of this graphic, sample syllabi, and assessment data to the CSWE COA.

The “Practicum Scale Scores” is the field performance evaluation. The instrument assesses competencies at the practice behavior level. Together, the field supervisor and student rate competency-associated practice behaviors at the end of the foundation and concentration practicum courses, respectively. The benchmark is a mean score of 3.0 or greater. The “Practicum Scale Scores” is found on page 143-146 of Appendix C in Volume 1 and pp 6-7 of Appendix D of Volume 3 of the graduate self-study.

The Student Opinion Survey Regarding Program’s Competence and Practice Behaviors is administered to students during the last two weeks prior to completing all course work in their respective concentration and measures students’ opinion of how well the program prepared them to carry out competencies and practice behaviors that operationalize the competencies. The survey is described on page 124 and data presented as Appendix B starting on page 140 of the Volume I of the self-study. This survey is self report of satisfaction and does not directly measure competencies and practice behaviors. Competencies and practice behaviors are measured by the Performance Domain instrument and Practicum Scale.

4.0.2 The program provides evidence of ongoing data collection and analysis and discusses how it uses assessment data to affirm and/or make changes in the explicit and implicit curriculum to enhance student performance.

Instructions
The site team is asked to clarify how data are used. The discussion in the narrative could not address possible changes at the practice behavior or individual course level because of the nature of the data that were collected. In addition, the analysis done at the competency level was not used to identify areas for improvement even where the benchmark (minimum) had not been reached.

Site Visit Findings
Faculty discussed that based on data findings they are strengthening delivery of content addressing competencies and practice behaviors that operationalize these competencies including greater standardization of course rubrics assessing course competencies and practice behaviors. In addition, they clarified that they will continue to strengthen assessment efforts.

4.0.3 The program identifies any changes in the explicit and implicit curriculum based on the analysis of the assessment data.

Instructions
The site team is asked to determine the strategy for change. One planned change is the preparation of instruments "to measure the learning competencies and their practice behaviors
Site Visit Findings
All assessment instruments were presented to Site Team. The Performance Domain instrument and Practicum Scale demonstrate assessment of practice behaviors. Faculty members verified that based on assessment findings, they are strengthening delivery of content addressing competencies and respective practice behaviors throughout the curriculum to enhance students’ achievement of these competencies and practice behaviors that operationalize the competencies. The program was asked to send three copies of assessment instruments to the CSWE COA.

4.0.5 The program appends the summary data for each measure used to assess the attainment of each competency for at least one academic year prior to the submission of the self-study.

Instructions
The site team is asked to collect required outcome data. Given the apparent pattern of three trimesters in each student’s academic year, the program has failed to meet this standard because data are presented for only two trimesters. The third trimester of data is supposed to be ready for the site visit.

Site Visit Findings
Faculty members verified that assessment data were collected for the Third Trimester and provided a summary of data findings during the site visit. The faculty explained that based on assessment findings, they are strengthening delivery of content addressing competencies and respective practice behaviors throughout the curriculum to enhance students’ achievement of these competencies and practice behaviors that operationalize the competencies.

The program was asked to send three copies of data collected for the Third Trimester to the CSWE COA.

Closing Observations: Program Strengths
While it was not part of its charge, the site team observed several areas of program strengths that it would be remiss in not acknowledging. Among these are included:

- An engaged, supportive Chancellor and Senior Administration that are well informed of the programs’ mission and how it is consistent with University mission and priorities.
- A program administration that is held in high regard by the faculty and University administration.
- A dedicated and committed faculty that is held in high regard within the University and the professional community.
- Engaged and involved students.
- Strong involvement and investment by alumni, field instructors, and advisory committee members.
- A strong commitment to diversity, multiculturalism and social justice.
- With appropriate additional resources, the program is poised to play an exemplary role in preparing students to address emerging needs of the area.
- Program faculty enjoys a strong reputation for community leadership and exemplifies the distinctiveness of professional education on an academic campus.