



# COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

STRENGTHENING THE PROFESSION OF SOCIAL WORK

*Leadership in Research, Career Advancement, and Education*

333 John Carlyle Street, Suite 400, Alexandria, VA 22314

TEL 703.683.8080

FAX 703.683.8099

www.cswe.org

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK ACCREDITATION (DOSWA)**

**COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION (COA)**

**CHAIR**

Deana F. Morrow, PhD, LICSW, ACSW  
West Virginia University

**VICE CHAIR**

Francis X. R. Origanti, PhD  
Sacred Heart University

**COMMISSIONERS**

George Ashley, PhD, LMSW  
Oakwood University

Needha Boutté-Queen, PhD  
Texas Southern University

Christina Bruhn, MSW, PhD  
Aurora University

Terry Cluse-Tolar, PhD  
Ohio University

Michael R. Daley, PhD, MSW  
Texas A&M University - Central Texas

Kim S. Downing, PhD, LCSW, ACSW  
Elizabeth City State University

Humberto E. Fabelo, PhD, LCSW  
Virginia Commonwealth University

Debra Fromm Faria, LCSW  
College at Brockport, State University of New York

Thomas K. Gregoire PhD, MSW  
Ohio State University

Maria A. Gurrola, MSW, PhD  
California State University, Monterey Bay

Michele D. Hanna, PhD, MSW  
University of Denver

Daria V. Hanssen, PhD, LCSW  
Marist College

William A. Heiss, MSSW  
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Lihua Huang, MSW, PhD  
Grand Valley State University

Ji Seon Lee, PhD, MSSW, MPA  
Fordham University

Randy Magen, PhD  
Boise State University

Isiah Marshall, Jr., PhD, MSW  
Norfolk State University

Cheryl A. McAuliffe PhD, LMSW  
Grand Canyon University

Christopher Mitchell, PhD  
University of Illinois Chicago

Lisa B. Moon, PhD, LCSW  
Walden University

Megan H. Morrissey, MSW, PhD  
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities

Larry P. Ortiz, MSW, PhD  
Loma Linda University

Helen E. Petracchi, PhD, MSSW, ACSW  
University of Pittsburgh

Clifford J. Rosenbohm, PhD, LCSW  
King University

Thomas C. Walsh, BA, MSW, PhD  
Boston College

Ruth Weinzettle, PhD, LCSW-BACS  
Northwestern State Univ. of Louisiana

Shelly A. Wiechelt, BA, MSW, PhD  
University of Maryland, Baltimore County

James H. Williams, PhD, MSW, MPA  
Arizona State University

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DOSWA**  
Megan Fujita, PhD, MSW

**PRESIDENT & CEO, CSWE**  
Darla Spence Coffey, PhD, MSW

**CHAIR, BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
Saundra H. Starks, MSSW, EdD, LCSW  
Western Kentucky University

July 27, 2022

Rebecca Maldonado Moore, PhD, LMSW  
Professor  
New Mexico Highlands University  
[rmmoore@nmhu.edu](mailto:rmmoore@nmhu.edu)

**RE:** *Letter of Instruction*  
California State University, Fullerton (CA)  
Master's Social Work Program (MSW)  
*2015 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS)*

Dear Dr. Moore:

At its meeting, the June 2022 Commission on Accreditation (COA) reviewed the self-study submitted by the social work program and issued this *Letter of Instruction (LOI)* to the site visitor.

### Instructions for General Questions

Discuss general questions related to these three standards with the program: program mission and goals (**AS 1.0**), diversity (**AS 3.0**), and assessment (**AS 4.0**). Ask broad questions about how the program's mission and goals relate to the level of practice it prepares students for and find out if it gained any insight from the assessment of student outcomes. In addition, explore the challenges and achievements the program has experienced in making specific and continuous efforts to provide a learning context in which respect for all persons and understanding of diversity are practiced.

### Instructions for Specific Questions

**Accreditation Standard 1.0.1:** *The program submits its mission statement and explains how it is consistent with the profession's purpose and values.*

The program submitted its mission statement and a table to illustrate connections between the program's mission and the profession's purpose and values. However, the program did not explain specifically *how* the mission statement is consistent with the profession's purpose and values.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program its mission statement and how it is consistent with the profession's purpose and values.

**Accreditation Standard 1.0.2:** *The program explains how its mission is consistent with institutional mission and the program's context across all program options.*

The program explained how its mission is consistent with the institutional mission. The program also identified its program context. However, the program did not describe specifically *how* the master's-level mission statement is consistent with the program's context.

The site visitor is asked to discuss with the program how its mission statement is consistent with the program's context.

**Accreditation Standard M2.0.2:** *The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.*

The program provided a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice. However, one course (i.e., MSW 521) is inconsistently identified in the self-study as either a practice course or a policy course. Additionally, while the program discussed course sequencing, the narrative did not clearly explain the integration of classroom and field.

The site visitor is asked to clarify with the program how the MSW 521 course is identified (i.e., practice course or a policy course). The site visitor is also asked to discuss with the program how their formal curriculum design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

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

The program provided a curriculum matrix with generalist curriculum content. However, the matrix did not clearly illustrate content related to the organizational and community systems levels for competencies 6-9.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program an updated generalist practice curriculum matrix that illustrates how its curriculum content implements competencies 6-9, as well as review with the program updated syllabi to verify consistency between the matrix and syllabi.

**Accreditation Standard M2.1.2:** *The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for specialized practice demonstrating how the design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.*

The program provided a rationale for its formal curriculum design for specialized practice. However, the narrative did not clearly explain the integration of classroom and field.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program how its formal curriculum design for specialized practice is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for classroom and field.

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

The program provided a detailed description of demographics. However, the program did not explain how its efforts described in response to **Accreditation Standard 3.0.1** provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment across all program options.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program how its efforts described in response to **Accreditation Standard 3.0.1** provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment.

**Accreditation Standard M3.1.1:** *The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program. The criteria for admission to the master's program must include an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association. Baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs are not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.*

The program identified the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program, which includes an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association. However, the program did not clearly explain how it ensures baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs do not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program how it ensures that baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs do not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

**Accreditation Standard 3.1.9:** *The program describes its policies and procedures specifying students' rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs.*

The program described university-level student involvement and briefly described some program-level student involvement. However, the program did not provide specific policies and procedures specifying students' rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program its policies and procedures specifying students' rights and opportunities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs for students across all program options.

**Accreditation Standard 3.4.2:** *The program describes how it uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program.*

The program described its budget and how it has changed over time. However, the narrative did not clearly describe specific examples of how the program uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program.

The site visitor is asked to discuss with the program specific examples of how it uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program.

### **Arranging the Site Visit**

Using this letter as a guide, work with the program director to plan the site visit schedule, including the names and positions of those with whom you will meet.

The program director is provided a copy of this *LOI* for informational purposes and guidance in working with you to plan the visit.

During the site visit, you are expected to give the program the opportunity to provide you with information that clarifies, corrects, or supplements those parts of its self-study about which the COA has questions. Any additional materials the program provides during the site visit must be included by the program in its program response. Please note, the site visitor is not responsible for sending any supplemental materials provided during the visit. Additionally, the program is not required nor encouraged to provide a written response to this *LOI*.

### **Site Visit Report**

Within 2 weeks of the last day of the site visit, send one (1) electronic copy of the report with your findings to the program's accreditation specialist at CSWE. The report should summarize the conversation on general questions regarding: program mission and goals (**AS 1.0**), diversity (**AS 3.0**), and assessment (**AS 4.0**) as well as cite each **accreditation standard** and corresponding questions raised by the COA in its *Letter of Instruction* and thorough discussion of your findings for each standard. The *Site Visit Report* template is enclosed for your convenience.

### **Program Response to the Site Visit Report**

The COA does not expect the program to take formal action on the *LOI*, nor to submit a response to it. Instead, within 2 weeks of receipt of the *Site Visit Report* from CSWE, the program should submit a formal written response, one (1) electronic copy to Karen Chapman, MPA, MSW, Accreditation Specialist, in the Department of Social Work Accreditation.

The COA will review the *Site Visit Report* and the program response at its February 2023 meeting to determine if the program's accreditation should be reaffirmed. COA reaffirmation decision types are described in [policy 2.6 in the EPAS Handbook](#).

Sincerely,



Deana F. Morrow, PhD, LICSW, ACSW  
Chair, Commission on Accreditation

DFM/KYC

Cc: Mikyong Kim-Goh, PhD, MSW, LCSW  
Professor, MSW Program Director, and Department Chair  
California State University, Fullerton  
Social Work Program  
[mkimgoh@fullerton.edu](mailto:mkimgoh@fullerton.edu)

**Enclosure:** *Site Visit Report* Template

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

### **Site Visit Information**

***Instructions:*** Please review this information in preparation for each site visit assigned and conducted. Complete the required Site Visit Report Template and return it to the program's accreditation specialist at CSWE within 2 weeks of the visit. Do not alter nor edit this template.

#### *Role, Scope, and Boundaries of the Site Visitor*

The site visit is an important step in the peer-review reaffirmation process. Qualified site visitors operate under the authority and jurisdiction of the Commission on Accreditation (COA). The visitor's role is that of information gatherer; visitors do not determine compliance nor select a decision type. The COA is the sole arbiter of compliance. Visitors do not provide feedback, opinions, advice, recommendations, nor instructions to the program. Visitors may not share program-specific information, LOI information, self-study content, or material discussed onsite with parties outside of the reaffirmation process (e.g., accreditation specialist, COA, etc.).

The content of the visit and report are structured around collecting clarifying information pertaining to general and specific questions raised in the COA-issued Letter of Instruction (LOI). The LOI includes both general and specific questions. If the program's self-study narrative was unclear, incomplete, or missing information, the standard is cited by the COA in the LOI and instructions are provided to the visitor to collect clarifying information from the program. While the visitor reviews the self-study in its entirety in advance of the visit, only standards itemized in the LOI may be discussed onsite with the program. Information beyond the boundaries of the LOI should not be discussed, requested, nor reported. Visitors must use the required report template provided on the final page of the LOI.

#### *Developing the Agenda*

The agenda is collaboratively developed by the visitor and program. Onsite meetings are conducted with program faculty, students, and administrators; which includes a meeting with the institution's president/chancellor or their designee (e.g., provost). Additional program stakeholders, groups or individuals, with whom the visitor elects to meet with is driven by the standards identified in the LOI. The visitor may not meet with additional constituent groups beyond the agreed upon agenda without the program's consent.

#### *Self-study & Supplemental Materials*

No later than 30 days prior to the visit, the program send the visitor one (1) electronic copy of the exact self-study submitted to the COA. Programs do not submit formal written responses to the LOI nor furnish the visitor with supplemental materials (beyond the self-study) in advance of the visit. Programs are permitted share documentation, visuals, or materials explicitly requested in the LOI with the visitor onsite. However, the visitor does not collect nor submit these materials with their report. The program is solely responsible for documenting compliance and submitting evidence in their formal written response to the site visit report. The visitor collects the clarifying information as directed in the LOI via discussion with program stakeholders.

#### *Site Visit Report*

Following the close of the visit, any communication between the site visitor and program director ceases (except for submitting documentation for reimbursement of travel expenses). Any

remaining questions or concerns the program or visitor may have are directed to the program's accreditation specialist.

**Within 2 weeks** of site visit, the visitor submits one (1) electronic single **word document (not a PDF)** of the completed report template, including a copy of the meeting agenda and sign-in sheets, to the program's accreditation specialist at CSWE. The accreditation specialist is identified in the LOI. Report content is written in the visitor's own words and reflects objective and factual findings collected via discussion with program stakeholders. The report should not refer COA readers to the program's self-study or any supplemental materials provided onsite, nor should the visitor include copied/pasted narrative excerpts from program documents. The visitor does not include materials provided by the program in the report; the program will provide this information in their program response to the site visit report. The visitor destroys the program's documents upon confirmation of receipt of the report by the accreditation specialist.

#### Program Response

Upon receipt of the report, the accreditation specialist reviews the report for clarity and objectiveness. This review process may result in the program receiving the report beyond the initial 2 weeks granted for the visitor to submit the report. Please be patient and assured that the program will be granted a full **2 weeks** to submit their formal written response to the site visit report. Once the accreditation specialist accepts the report, the program will receive the site visit report via email with detailed instructions for responding.

The program responds to each standard itemized in the LOI and the site visit report. The program does not refer COA readers to the self-study nor previously submitted materials. The program submits one (1) electronic single **word document (not PDF)** of the completed response, including any supplemental materials provided to the site visitor, to the program's accreditation specialist at CSWE.

#### Understanding Reaffirmation Decision Types

The reaffirmation determination will be made based upon the LOI, site visit report, and program's response which will be reviewed at the COA Meeting identified in the LOI. Section 2.6. *COA Reaffirmation Determination and Decisions* in the [EPAS Handbook](#) details potential decision types and their rationales.

#### Policies, Procedures, & Resources

Policies and procedures regarding the site visit are located in sections 2.3. *Letter of Instruction, Site Visit Planning, and Site Visit Hosting* and 2.5. *Site Visit Report and Program Response* in the [EPAS Handbook](#). Additional site visit resources can be found on the [CSWE website, Accreditation pages](#). While it is advised that the visitor contact the program's accreditation specialist in advance of the visit to clarify any items in the LOI, accreditation staff are available before, during, and after the visit to address any questions, clarify expectations, or provide resources.

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

**Site Visit Report Template**

1. Program Visited Name:

---

2. Program Visited State:

---

3. Program Visited Level(s):

---

4. Date of Site Visit:

---

5. Site Visitor(s) Name:

---

1. Include a copy of the site visit schedule or a list of stakeholders with whom the site visitor met with during the visit (e.g., groups and individuals from the program and institution).
2. Write a brief summary of the general questions discussions pertaining to: program mission and goals (**AS 1.0**), diversity (**AS 3.0**), and assessment (**AS 4.0**).

**Program Mission and Goals (AS 1.0):**

**Diversity (AS 3.0):**

**Assessment (AS 4.0):**

3. List each **accreditation standard** and specific question raised by the COA in its *Letter of Instruction* (LOI). Provide a thorough discussion of objective/factual findings for each item.

***Accreditation Standard...:***

Insert full text of the accreditation standard from the LOI.

**Specific Question:**

Insert full citation language, including the instructions to the visitor, from the LOI.

**Site Visit Findings:**

Write your objective/factual findings to clarify this LOI item.

*[repeat for each standard itemized in the LOI]*



**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK ACCREDITATION (DOSWA)**

**COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION (COA)**

**CHAIR**

Deana F. Morrow, PhD, LICSW, ACSW  
West Virginia University

**VICE CHAIR**

Thomas K. Gregoire PhD, MSW  
Ohio State University

**COMMISSIONERS**

César G. Abarca, PhD, MSW  
California Polytech Humboldt

George Ashley, PhD, LMSW  
Eastern Kentucky University

Christina Bruhn, MSW, PhD  
Aurora University

Terry Cluse-Tolar, PhD  
Ohio University

Michael R. Daley, PhD, MSW  
Texas A&M University - Central Texas

Kim S. Downing, PhD, LCSW, ACSW  
Elizabeth City State University

Humberto E. Fabelo, PhD, LCSW  
Virginia Commonwealth University

Antoinette Y. Farmer, PhD  
Rutgers, The State Univ of New Jersey

Debra Fromm Faria, LCSW  
College at Brockport, State University of New York

Maria A. Gurrola, MSW, PhD  
California State University, Monterey Bay

Michele D. Hanna, PhD, MSW  
University of Denver

Daria V. Hanssen, PhD, LCSW  
Marist College

Sarah Hossenauer, PhD, MSW, LSCW, MBA  
University of Wisconsin – Whitewater

Lihua Huang, MSW, PhD  
Grand Valley State University

Randy Magen, PhD  
Boise State University

Isiah Marshall, Jr., PhD, MSW  
Norfolk State University

Cheryl A. McAuliffe PhD, LMSW  
Grand Canyon University

Christopher Mitchell, PhD  
University of Illinois Chicago

Lisa B. Moon, PhD, LCSW  
Walden University

April Murphy, PhD, MSW, CSW  
Western Kentucky University

Larry P. Ortiz, MSW, PhD  
Loma Linda University

Katherine Perone, DSW, MSW, LSW  
Western Illinois University

Helen E. Petracchi, PhD, MSSW, ACSW  
University of Pittsburgh

Octavio Ramirez, PhD, LSCSW  
Fort Hayes State University

Clifford J. Rosenbohm, PhD, LCSW  
King University

Ruth Weinzettle, PhD, LCSW-BACS  
Northwestern State Univ. of Louisiana

Shelly A. Wiechelt, BA, MSW, PhD  
University of Maryland, Baltimore County

James H. Williams, PhD, MSW, MPA  
Arizona State University

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DOSWA**  
Megan Fujita, PhD, MSW

**PRESIDENT & CEO, CSWE**  
Halaevulu F. O. Vakalahi, PhD, MSW, MEd

**CHAIR, BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
Hilary Weaver, DSW  
University at Buffalo

March 13, 2023

Framroze Virjee, JD  
President  
California State University, Fullerton  
Office of the President  
[presidentvirjee@fullerton.edu](mailto:presidentvirjee@fullerton.edu)

**RE:** *Reaffirm with a Progress Report*  
California State University, Fullerton (STATE)  
Master's Social Work Program (MSW)  
*2015 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS)*

Dear President Virjee:

At its February 2023 meeting, the Commission on Accreditation (COA) reviewed the *Reaffirmation* application for the master's social work program. The COA voted to reaffirm the program's accreditation for eight years, ending in February 2031 with a *Progress Report* to be reviewed by the COA.

In taking this action, the Commission identified the following area of concern:

***Accreditation Standard 1.0.1*** *The program submits its mission statement and explains how it is consistent with the profession's purpose and values.*

The program submitted its mission statement and a narrative explaining the connection between the program's mission and some elements of profession's purpose and values. However, the program did not explain specifically *how* the mission statement is consistent with all elements of the profession's purpose and values.

The program is asked to explain how its mission statement is consistent with each element of the profession's purpose and values.

***Accreditation Standard M2.0.2:*** *The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.*



The program provided a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice. The program also discussed practice and human behavior courses how this content could be applied in field. However, it was unclear how the program's curriculum design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

The program is asked to demonstrate how the curriculum design for generalist practice it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for classroom and field.

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

The program provided an updated curriculum matrix for competencies 6-9 and a narrative explaining how its generalist practice content implements the nine required generalist competencies. However, it was unclear how some of the course content covered all system levels (e.g., individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities) for competencies 6-9. In addition, the matrix did not include page number references to syllabi and only one updated course syllabus was provided.

The program is asked to provide a modified curriculum matrix illustrating how its generalist practice content implements competencies 6-9.. The program is also asked to provide updated syllabi for all courses content identified on the curriculum matrix to verify consistency.

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

The program provided a narrative that discussed its inclusion and retention efforts. However, the program did not explain how its efforts described in response to **Accreditation Standard 3.0.1** provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment.

The program is asked to describe how its efforts described in response to **Accreditation Standard 3.0.1** provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment.

**Accreditation Standard M3.1.1:** *The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program. The criteria for admission to the master's program must include an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association. Baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs are not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.*

The program explained that it does not offer advanced standing for baccalaureate social work graduates but is preparing to create this pathway, and it reported that baccalaureate social work graduates can test out of three courses. However, the program did not explain how baccalaureate social work graduates entering the master's social work program do not repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

The program is asked to explain how baccalaureate social work graduates entering the master's social work program does not repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

**Accreditation Standard 3.1.9:** *The program describes its policies and procedures specifying students' rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs.*

The program described procedures specifying students' rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs. However, the program did not provide specific written policies specifying students' rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs.

The program is asked to describe its written policies specifying students' rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs

COA reaffirmation decision types are described in section 2.6 *COA Reaffirmation Determination and Decisions* in the [EPAS Handbook](#).

The program is asked to submit one (1) electronic copy of the report, no later than [December 1, 2023](#) for review during its February 2024 meeting. The report must align with the formatting and submission requirements detailed in section 1.2.11. *Document Submission Policy* in the [EPAS Handbook](#).

The accreditation status obtained at *Reaffirmation* only covers the components that were reviewed in the self-study at the time of the COA review. Changes may take place within the program prior to its next scheduled accreditation review; however, some program changes impact compliance with EPAS and require reporting to the COA or DOSWA per section 1.2.4 *Program Changes* in the [EPAS Handbook](#). Accreditation is an elective, program-driven, and self-managed peer-review process. Programs are solely responsible for implementing, demonstrating, and maintaining compliance with the EPAS during and in-between review cycles.

Please be in touch with Karen Chapman, MSW, MPA, Accreditation Specialist in the Department of Social Work Accreditation, if there are any questions about this letter or the procedures and actions of the Commission on Accreditation.

Sincerely,



Chair, Commission on Accreditation  
Deana F. Morrow, PhD, LICSW, ACSW  
Chair, Commission on Accreditation

DFM/KYC

Cc: Mikyong Kim-Goh, PhD, LCSW  
Professor and Chair, Department of Social Work  
California State University Fullerton  
[mkimgoh@fullerton.edu](mailto:mkimgoh@fullerton.edu)

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

**Site Visit Report Template**

1. Program Visited Name:	California State University Fullerton
2. Program Visited State:	California
3. Program Visited Level(s):	Masters
4. Date of Site Visit:	October 17, 2022
5. Site Visitor(s) Name:	Rebecca Maldonado Moore

**Program Mission and Goals (AS 1.0):**

Note: all sources blended the mission and goals with diversity elements. There is overlap in this report.

Consistent with CSU Fullerton’s mission statement, Provost Carolyn Thomas, has been in office for two years with an agenda to assess faculty equity, and inclusion policies and practices to ensure diversity exists within the campus community. In collaboration with the President’s Cabinet, the *Guiding principles: Titans together* framework (<https://together.fullerton.edu/>) was published and posted throughout the campus. All academic units meet every semester as a team to address diversity and equity-related issues through a comprehensive approach. This entails providing lists of accomplishments and processes with a focus on recruitment, retention of People of Color (POC) and relevance to inclusion work.

Demographically, 62% of students are LatinX. The Provost believes Latinx faculty numbers have improved over the past two years since President Virgee arrived. The President prioritized CSU Fullerton status as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and collectively worked with all campus units to achieve the prestigious *Seal of Excelencia* (Certified 2021-2024). The seal recognizes institutions that achieve Latino/Hispanic student success.

Dean Thomas’s goals are focused on college directions, diverse faculty makeup, and student representation. Historically, CSU-F has been a predominantly white administration and faculty. “We want to change the culture of CSUF with POC leading the change. Social work does a great job of addressing these issues, social change, and are immersed in culturally competency standards. Unfortunately, SW has resource [financial] constraints that prevent them from doing more”. Her approach is to “focus on the people you have and invest.” Provost Thomas expressed the university is fortunate that people have been hired who reflect diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) work on campus; they are working toward bilingual competency in Counseling. She requires every tenure/tenure-track search includes a focus on community engagement and their needs. Human Resources, DEI office has standards for that includes each search committee

member must go through anti-bias training to serve on the committee. Human Resources channels complaints to either Title IX Student Affairs or HR for discrimination-based complaints.

The Provost's Office has an inclusiveness agenda targeting cluster hires for faculty based on special funding from the governor, GI 2025; to reduce the equity gap for POC. This allowed for funding five faculty positions focused on commitment to student success. She expressed the university's commitment to regional communities specific to representational diversity. Provost Thomas hired Dean Smith, College of Health and Human Development, three months ago.

Dean Smith reiterated Provost Thomas's remarks about faculty hiring constraints due to unavailability of funds. There is a faculty equity committee that focuses on DEI goals, i.e., the Counseling program and a bilingual education program. They are also exploring a program for Social Work that aligns faculty with curriculum and social justice goals. This will include increasing faculty lines for POC and advancing community engagement through service learning projects.

However, hiring faculty and connecting with Native American communities is absent. Previous administrations were interested in representational diversity. The university supports the true spirit of the Six Principles in trying to improve the status of women of color by giving them space to obtain tenure and do research. These efforts are inline with the university mission to ensure student success and DEI work from an anti-racist position.

### **Diversity (AS 3.0):**

President's Office is committed:

to providing an inclusive, transformational, just, and equitable educational experience for all members of our Titan community.

[http://president.fullerton.edu/\\_resources/pdf/CSUF-Guiding-Principles-for-Social-Justice.pdf](http://president.fullerton.edu/_resources/pdf/CSUF-Guiding-Principles-for-Social-Justice.pdf)

All stakeholder groups acknowledged there is a limited Indigenous student presence on campus, faculty, and within the social work program. Social Work faculty mentioned there was Title IV-E recruitment efforts from Indigenous communities in the past. The Field Education program has provided Indian Child Welfare Act training in part because there is a significant number of Indigenous communities in southern California. The demographics of CSU-F are 47% Hispanic, 22% Asian, 2% Black, and 896 AI students [<1%]. Programming to raise awareness of representational diversity occurs across campus. Social work has specialized curricula in Social Work Practice With LatinX Populations.

The MSW Program is committed to a multicultural perspective, human behavior in the environment approach in preparing students to practice social work effectively. All courses integrate this multicultural perspective to increase students' appreciation of all social and cultural groups.

The Social Work Department has posted a Commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Faculty Statement; Joint Statement. Social Work's Call to Action Against Pandemic Othering

and Anti-Asian Racism; and, a Statement Against Anti-APIDA Racism and Sexual Violence and A Call for Solidarity to Fight for Human Rights  
<http://hhd.fullerton.edu/msw/diversity/index.php>

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

The Social Work Department has strong collegial relationships among faculty, staff, and community agencies and organizations centering on students achieving CSWE competencies. Discussions with the faculty revealed a transparent, logical process in how they proceeded with designing an assessment framework for their program based on the program's three focus areas. The assessment committee, comprised of faculty and field education members, began by discussing and describing each of the nine CSWE competencies. All syllabi were reviewed to ensure relevant competencies were identified specific to course goals followed by planned assignments. The committee, with faculty input, decided which assignments would be used for assessment purposes. The Curriculum Matrix (Volume I, pp. 34-63) provides detailed information of these decisions that include specific competencies for each course, what the course content entailed, the systems levels the content covered, and the four dimensions associated with course content for each competency. The assessment measures for each competency had an 85% benchmark for achieving competency. All benchmarks were met across the curriculum with the exception of Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Researchinformed Practice (83.31%) and Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice (81.50%)

**Accreditation Standard 1.0.1:** The program submits its mission statement and explains how it is consistent with the profession's purpose and values.

The program submits its mission statement and explains how it is consistent with the profession's purpose and values. The program submitted its mission statement and a table to illustrate connections between the program's mission and the profession's purpose and values. However, the program did not explain specifically how the mission statement is consistent with the profession's purpose and values.

**Specific Question:** The site visitor is asked to review with the program its mission statement and how it is consistent with the profession's purpose and values.

**Site Visit Findings:** Faculty reported the last time the mission statement was revised began in spring 2019. The collective process examined the NASW Code of Ethics and core values, the university mission, and the larger surrounding Orange County area needs and resources. They discussed these core values and developed five goals focusing on 1) collaborative research; 2) social and economic justice; 3) supporting diverse faculty; 4) engaging in community partnerships; and, 5) producing students that are ethical, competent leaders advocating for social justice. Each goal corresponds with NASW values, i.e. goals 2 and 5 align with social justice; goal 3 aligns with dignity and worth of the person; goals 1 and 4 aligns with service and integrity.

**Accreditation Standard 1.0.2:** The program explains how its mission is consistent with institutional mission and the program's context across all program options

The program explains how its mission is consistent with institutional mission and the program's context across all program options. The program explained how its mission is consistent with the institutional mission. The program also identified its program context.

However, the program did not describe specifically how the master's-level mission statement is consistent with the program's context.

**Specific Question:** The site visitor is asked to discuss with the program how its mission statement is consistent with the program's context.

**Site Visit Findings:** The Social Work Director, an employee of CSU-Fullerton for 30 years, commented that the university mission evolved over the years. With the MSW program, more attention is paid to inclusive practices that is consistent with the university mission. The MSW program mission aspires to develop students that are culturally competent across focus areas (child welfare, community mental health, and aging) through scholarship and practice. These values are an extension of the NASW Code of Ethics core values. The Social Work Department's mission is consistent with addressing community needs; engaged with the community in service and research projects and serving significant numbers of LatinX and Asian/Pacific Islander populations. The community demographics of Orange county are 60% non-White; the largest population are LatinX 21% followed by Asian/Pacific Islanders. Sixty percent of the campus are LatinX; most are female, first generation students and range between traditional and non-traditional ages.

CSU-Fullerton Department of Social Work website reports:

Since its inception in 2007, the CSUF MSW program graduated nearly 1000 students and most of our alumni have remained in the region, joining the child welfare, health, and behavioral health workforce in the area. The program currently has approximately 260 students supported by 25 MSW faculty members who are experienced, highly-qualified, and deeply committed to teaching. Through federal and state grants such as California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC) Title IV-E Child Welfare Training, Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) Behavioral Health Workforce Education and Training (BHWET), and the Southern California Geriatric Social Work Education Consortium (GSWEC), the CSUF Social Work Department provides stipends to a number of students (70-75 students annually) who are pursuing the field of child welfare, integrated behavioral health, or aging. **Areas of focus include Aging, Child Welfare, and Community Mental Health.** Students complete a specialized field placement consistent with their area of focus.

Fifteen students participated in this site visit in person and on zoom. They confirmed that DEI theory and practice is in place within explicit and implicit curriculum. Scientific inquiry is evidenced in the curricular research sequence and final project. The global immersion initiative is bilingual with a visit to Chili to perform two weeks of service learning with three weeks of

classroom preparation. Korea and Germany programs with partner institutions were conducted as well.

In addition, the Social Work Department's community engagement is strongly connected to the university mission of collaboration and the College of Health and Human Development mission of "community outreach related to human health". The department was awarded a \$1.9 million HRSA grant to strengthen the mental health workforce through telehealth and student stipends in integrated care service delivery. The award addresses "integrated trauma-informed behavioral health care for underserved groups" (<http://bheal.fullerton.edu/>).

The social work program developed 15 years ago in response to the community's demand. No other institution in the area was offering an MSW degree at the time. Community stakeholders advocated for the program and some are still with the department as community advisory board members. "From its inception in 2007, the MSW program at CSUF has made a concerted effort to increase the number of professional social workers from Latinx backgrounds equipped to provide culturally and linguistically competent care," (Director, Dr. Kim-Goh)

After 2007 and based on community issues and demographics, the founding members of the program identified three focus areas for the curriculum: behavioral health, child welfare, older adults.

**Accreditation Standard M2.0.2:** The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field. The program provided a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice. However, one course (i.e., MSW 521) is inconsistently identified in the self-study as either a practice course or a policy course. Additionally, while the program discussed course sequencing, the narrative did not clearly explain the integration of classroom and field.

**Specific Question:** The site visitor is asked to clarify with the program how the MSW 521 course is identified (i.e., practice course or a policy course).

**Site Visit Findings:** MSW 521 is the second in three policy courses. The policy course developer/faculty intended for the course to be more subjective and analysis oriented; to see other ways of how policy is practiced. "Policy practice became more prominent in what the CSWE competencies are asking us to do. Text wise, policy is under Policy competencies not as a practice course." The faculty member stated MSW 521 is a policy course with content focusing on advocacy, policy making, and related assignments to build student skills.

**Specific Question:** The site visitor is also asked to discuss with the program how their formal curriculum design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

**Site Visit Findings:** The faculty expressed that foundational courses are provided in the curriculum to ensure students gain a solid understanding and appreciation of courses that will lead to advanced knowledge and practice across the three focus areas. Both the Advisory Board and Field Instructors reported reviewing SW 540 and SW 541 to determine if there were gaps between the syllabi and the matrix. Instructors and faculty mentioned “we understand the nine competencies, but don’t always know if students know the competencies. Field faculty stated “there were gaps in students understanding the competencies and we wanted to apply the competencies in assignments. We needed students to name what they were doing. They are engaging in policy and research as an example, on paper, but they may not know how to respond or make that connection. DBs and writing assignments are opportunities to reflect on what they are learning”.

The culminating outcome of the explicit curriculum is the Master’s Capstone course that integrates all courses, focus area, field placements, and professional identity. See: Capstone Projects <http://hhd.fullerton.edu/msw/research/poster-presentations2022/index.php>. Faculty acknowledge that the research sequence is rigorous, however some student projects have been successfully presented at the national Society for Social Work and Research (SSWR) over the years as well as at the State NASW conference.

Course assignments throughout the curriculum are aligned with the field education learning plan and objectives. This includes students receiving instruction on how practice behaviors connect with the CSWE nine competencies. For example, the student addresses and advances a practice skill set with their chosen focus area. If a student is interested in mental health, they are matched by the Field Education Director in their first year to a participating mental health agency. Field faculty reported that “processing field pieces take time” and some students need to learn to not “silo” their learning. Journaling helps when a field instructor poses a question and asks the student to integrate mental health related theory into practice. The learning portfolios demonstrate how nine competences are connected through written assignments and course instruction/discussions.

Field education is integral to the curriculum as stated by faculty and field instructors. Both components reinforce and support the other. In reviewing the SS and meeting the Field Education staff, this reviewer recognized the documents as well-organized policies and procedures; with an extensive Agency Student Partnership Network (ASPN) field placement management database. Multiple universities and colleges in the surrounding counties share resources and the database.

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

The program provides a matrix that illustrates how its generalist practice content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program. The program provided a curriculum matrix with generalist curriculum content. However, the matrix did not clearly illustrate content related to the organizational and community systems levels for competencies 6-9.



**Specific Question:** The site visitor is asked to review with the program an updated generalist practice curriculum matrix that illustrates how its curriculum content implements competencies 6-9, as well as review with the program updated syllabi to verify consistency between the matrix and syllabi.

**Site Visit Findings:** The site visitor reviewed the updated generalist practice curriculum matrix that demonstrated how competencies 6-9 are implemented. This Standard and the Syllabi will be submitted in the LOI response.

**Accreditation Standard M2.1.2:** The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for specialized practice demonstrating how the design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for specialized practice demonstrating how the design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field. The program provided a rationale for its formal curriculum design for specialized practice. However, the narrative did not clearly explain the integration of classroom and field.

**Specific Question:** The site visitor is asked to review with the program how its formal curriculum design for specialized practice is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for classroom and field

**Site Visit Findings:** Both the Advisory Board and Field instructors discussed developing SW 540 & SW 541 courses. They reported looking at how the field curriculum aligns with classroom curriculum. Lectures were provided in field and foundational practice courses to align with the generalist practice courses. In addition, the Field Ed Director and lecturer are members of the curriculum committee.

Title IV-E trains all field education instructors based on the needs of the field instructors and the course competencies with related assignments on an annual basis. Advanced practice courses focus on engagement, assessment, intervention and evaluation. Sequence courses are tied into the specialized courses with each semester of courses contributing to a more complex appreciation of content and practice. Courses are divided into three focus areas with related discussions and activities. This approach helps field education staff in matching student placement settings with related focus areas. The Field Education staff reported “students become more articulate over time and become more confident in their practice and in field education ... Post evaluation of student experiences following each academic year provide the data needed to fill the gap between effective field placements or student learning experiences”.

The CSU-F Social Work program also participates in the Southern California Geriatric Social Work Education Consortium. This inter-organizational, inter-institutional collaboration involves twelve non-profit agencies and eight schools of social work. “The goal is to increase the number of social workers prepared to be leaders in the field of aging” and available to second year students with a focus on aging (<http://hhd.fullerton.edu/msw/stipend/GSWECC.php> )

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

The program explains how these efforts provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment. The program provided a detailed description of demographics. However, the program did not explain how its efforts described in response to Accreditation Standard 3.0.1 provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment across all program options

**Specific Question:** The site visitor is asked to review with the program how its efforts described in response to Accreditation Standard 3.0.1 provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment. [For students, staff, and faculty]

**Site Visit Findings:** The Advisory Board members and Field Instructors response to providing a supportive and inclusive learning environment included several examples. There is a field readiness training for all students one week before classes start. They “break students into field projects to build relationships. One activity of this training involves identifying ten resources for a struggling student. Students learn how to find resource on campus for themselves which ultimately will be a skill that they can share with other students. Another activity involves taking bus routes to learn about the surrounding community. Students are told they will find connections early in the field readiness training and this support system will get them through their program. In addition, students register for SW 540 and SW 541 with the same cohort for two years. Title IV-E provides Lunch & Learns specific to Child Welfare. Scheduled speakers and resources.

The faculty intentionally strive for students to feel they belong by recognizing there are intersectionalities of each student as they go through the program. Faculty advise, mentor, teach and the program offers stipend programs for training with embedded support. As advisors and mentors, faculty monitor how students are doing and if necessary, refer students to Counseling & Psychological Services (CAPS), student programs, initiatives with the DEI committee in SW. The faculty sponsor an electives survey at the end of the student’s first year and are asked what they would like to take as an elective in the future. Electives are considered by the curriculum committee.

A new program is currently being piloted on “Seven Dimensions of Belonging in Classroom Climate”. Students are surveyed three times a semester with faculty involved in a specific community of practice. This is an interdisciplinary and inter-institutional project that was piloted last spring. A process evaluation is completed throughout these three surveys. Another new project is the “Self-Guided Academic Program” (SAGE) involving student advising online with modules. So far, the feedback has positive, includes opportunity to engage with resources, self-assessments, schedule meetings

Outside of the classroom, the faculty launched a Decolonizing Curriculum. Next steps to address equity and anti-racism in the curriculum. This project included students. Students serve on several social work committees – Graduation Committee, Community Advisory Board, and are invited to view prospective faculty’s teaching workshops as part of search committees. The MSW Student Organization President regularly meets with the department chair and faculty.

And there is a Student Exit Survey facilitated by the social work Assessment Committee. The survey includes two open-ended questions specific to belonging and inclusion. The University Student Survey is separate that the social work students take as they graduate.

Several students reported: *shock at their first impression of the social work curriculum. Other verbatim comments included “After the first wave of the midterms, I was able to get adjusted to the program. It helps to know the professors. You need to understand the expectations of each professor. Give it your all and know I am trying and doing my best. What I am learning is way more valuable than getting an ‘A’. Building a support system with peers helps. I don’t know everything and need to gain the skills to learn. Give yourself grace. I’m learning humility. I believe how much effort you put into the program is as important as building the relationships with your peers. Mental health is a high need; SW 503/Differential Diagnosis meets the needs of what is going on in society. These are the things I needed to work on to feel confident in a clinical setting”.*

Comments on course work included: *“Overall, the feedback has been good. Comments for a paper are good, so I know what to improve on. We are working on our master’s project with a lot of checkpoints along the way. Diving into the 2<sup>nd</sup> year, our classes don’t have midterm exams and we get paper feedback which is better. This takes away stress of exams. If feedback is asked before assignment is due, professors are willing”.*

*“Fullerton meets your needs for the focus’s. Mental health focus is available here and this is why I chose Fullerton. My internship is very engaging and focused on MH; my supervisor provided resources and I use that information for my current internship. The hours of the internship are long. A good relationship with supervisors is helpful. Cultural humility: the reason I chose my placement is because of the diversity and I wanted to work with clients who are Korean American. This is the most diverse cohort I’ve ever experienced, first generation students are inspiring, making friends with others with other backgrounds. Cultural humility gives us an opportunity to relate to others in a unique space, as a whole person with all of their intersectionalities. Cultural humility provides us a chance to change, to be in the environment and to help change others”.*

Asked if they feel they “belong” in the program, students reported: *“I went to UCD – there were huge classes. Here, professors spend more time with us ; community is fostered in class projects. Students connect with each other. Our students are super diverse and I feel we have a welcoming community of people. Starting the program, Day 1 included Field education training, lots of conversations about what brought them to social work, we all have one thing in common [SW]. Professors bring a lot to the table, we are connected to faculty.”*

**Accreditation Standard M3.1.1:** The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program. The criteria for admission to the master’s program must include an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association. Baccalaureate social work graduates entering master’s social work programs are not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program. The criteria for admission to the master's program must include an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association. Baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs are not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs. The program identified the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program, which includes an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association. However, the program did not clearly explain how it ensures baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs do not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

**Specific Question:** The site visitor is asked to review with the program how it ensures that baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs do not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

**Site Visit Findings:** Logistically, the annual application rate for CSU-F is 600 applicants with 90 accepted into the two-year program and 30 into the 3<sup>rd</sup> year program. The admissions committee includes some Advisory Board members, Field Instructors, and faculty sit on the admission committee with the Admissions Coordinator. Live interviews are conducted in groups with two faculty members. This helps students feel they are connected to others. The students meet the faculty and staff early in the process.

Faculty reported there is a shift from an undergraduate BSW program to the MSW program that brings new challenges. Students can test out of some courses (up to nine credit hours) Some students with MSW courses from an accredited program can transfer up to nine credit hours which is case-by-case. "The level of detail and curriculum provided is greater than BSW level curriculum in part because there is a higher level of critical thinking skills required." "For example, the program's benchmark for course competencies maintains an 85% pass rate. CSU-F is ranked highest in California". Graduate students receive a lot of structured curriculum, faculty and field support, and community-driven experiences. The field placements require advanced learning experiences in the MSW program compared to a BSW program. CSU-F Social Work Department collaborates with the Community Partner Field Placements Network to ensure placements meet quality standards for instruction and practice.

**Accreditation Standard 3.1.9:** The program describes its policies and procedures specifying students' rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs.

The program describes its policies and procedures specifying students' rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs. The program described university-level student involvement and briefly described some program-level student involvement. However, the program did not provide specific policies and procedures specifying students' rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs.

**Specific Question:** The site visitor is asked to review with the program its policies and procedures specifying students' rights and opportunities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs for students across all program options.

**Site Visit Findings:** In meeting with the students, they expressed an interest in serving on the Curriculum Committee but never considered asking. Faculty stated there is no student representation on the Curriculum Committee. Title IV-E has student representatives in planning the child welfare focus training. The primary reference to student rights was mentioned in the Student Handbook if there were field education related problems. However, the Handbook did not specify student rights regarding due process. The Handbook did reference the University Policies and Procedures that addressed Grade Appeals and Incomplete Grades procedures. A Student Status Review described student performance and conduct problems procedures.

**Accreditation Standard 3.4.2:** The program describes how it uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program.

The program describes how it uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program. The program described its budget and how it has changed over time. However, the narrative did not clearly describe specific examples of how the program uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program.

**Specific Question:** The site visitor is asked to discuss with the program specific examples of how it uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program.

**Site Visit Findings:** As reported by the MSW Program director, about 2 years ago, the Program moved admissions and Field Education from paper to electronic platforms. Simultaneously, the Agency Student Partnership Network (ASPN) processes all field-related material, onboarding of students, training for field instructors, and uses CANVAS to electronically manage field items. The HERSA grant mentioned above also increased resources for students with stipends for 30 students. CSU-F has excellent IT support when needed and has provided support to conduct student surveys and a laptop rental program. The Program has access to SPSS and NVIVO, Google Drive and related software. The Director also mentioned the university's Faculty Development Center services. These include data analysis, equitable learning and teaching, such as inclusive learning classrooms.

Students also have the opportunity to attend the NASW Lobby Days and Chilean program through "IRA" funding. Although faculty development funds are only \$1000/faculty, the Dean's office supplements this amount to ensure faculty have opportunities to present research or attend trainings and conferences. The Dean did mention that the Social Work Program has financial constraints similar to most other departments and programs. Several years ago, the university did complete several cluster hires to ensure BIPOC faculty were appointed. Social Work was not one of these hires. The Field Education Director mentioned they are routinely reviewing and assessing potential field instructors to serve the Program's focus area placements.



# COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

STRENGTHENING THE PROFESSION OF SOCIAL WORK

*Leadership in Research, Career Advancement, and Education*

333 John Carlyle Street, Suite 400, Alexandria, VA 22314

TEL 703.683.8080

FAX 703.683.8099

www.cswe.org

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK  
ACCREDITATION (DOSWA)**

**COMMISSION ON  
ACCREDITATION (COA)**

**CHAIR**

Deana F. Morrow, PhD, LICSW, ACSW  
West Virginia University

**VICE CHAIR**

Francis X. R. Origanti, PhD  
Sacred Heart University

**COMMISSIONERS**

George Ashley, PhD, LMSW  
Oakwood University

Needha Boutté-Queen, PhD  
Texas Southern University

Christina Bruhn, MSW, PhD  
Aurora University

Terry Cluse-Tolar, PhD  
Ohio University

Michael R. Daley, PhD, MSW  
Texas A&M University - Central Texas

Kim S. Downing, PhD, LCSW, ACSW  
Elizabeth City State University

Humberto E. Fabelo, PhD, LCSW  
Virginia Commonwealth University

Debra Fromm Faria, LCSW  
College at Brockport, State University of New York

Thomas K. Gregoire PhD, MSW  
Ohio State University

Maria A. Gurrola, MSW, PhD  
California State University, Monterey Bay

Michele D. Hanna, PhD, MSW  
University of Denver

Daria V. Hanssen, PhD, LCSW  
Marist College

William A. Heiss, MSSW  
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Lihua Huang, MSW, PhD  
Grand Valley State University

Ji Seon Lee, PhD, MSSW, MPA  
Fordham University

Randy Magen, PhD  
Boise State University

Isiah Marshall, Jr., PhD, MSW  
Norfolk State University

Cheryl A. McAuliffe PhD, LMSW  
Grand Canyon University

Christopher Mitchell, PhD  
University of Illinois Chicago

Lisa B. Moon, PhD, LCSW  
Walden University

Megan H. Morrissey, MSW, PhD  
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities

Larry P. Ortiz, MSW, PhD  
Loma Linda University

Helen E. Petracchi, PhD, MSSW, ACSW  
University of Pittsburgh

Clifford J. Rosenbohm, PhD, LCSW  
King University

Thomas C. Walsh, BA, MSW, PhD  
Boston College

Ruth Weinzettle, PhD, LCSW-BACS  
Northwestern State Univ. of Louisiana

Shelly A. Wiechelt, BA, MSW, PhD  
University of Maryland, Baltimore County

James H. Williams, PhD, MSW, MPA  
Arizona State University

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DOSWA**  
Megan Fujita, PhD, MSW

**PRESIDENT & CEO, CSWE**  
Darla Spence Coffey, PhD, MSW

**CHAIR, BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
Saundra H. Starks, MSSW, EdD, LCSW  
Western Kentucky University

July 27, 2022

Rebecca Maldonado Moore, PhD, LMSW  
Professor  
New Mexico Highlands University  
[rmmoore@nmhu.edu](mailto:rmmoore@nmhu.edu)

**RE:** *Letter of Instruction*  
California State University, Fullerton (CA)  
Master's Social Work Program (MSW)  
*2015 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS)*

Dear Dr. Moore:

At its meeting, the June 2022 Commission on Accreditation (COA) reviewed the self-study submitted by the social work program and issued this *Letter of Instruction (LOI)* to the site visitor.

### Instructions for General Questions

Discuss general questions related to these three standards with the program: program mission and goals (**AS 1.0**), diversity (**AS 3.0**), and assessment (**AS 4.0**). Ask broad questions about how the program's mission and goals relate to the level of practice it prepares students for and find out if it gained any insight from the assessment of student outcomes. In addition, explore the challenges and achievements the program has experienced in making specific and continuous efforts to provide a learning context in which respect for all persons and understanding of diversity are practiced.

### Instructions for Specific Questions

***Accreditation Standard 1.0.1: The program submits its mission statement and explains how it is consistent with the profession's purpose and values.***

The program submitted its mission statement and a table to illustrate connections between the program's mission and the profession's purpose and values. However, the program did not explain specifically *how* the mission statement is consistent with the profession's purpose and values.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program its mission statement and how it is consistent with the profession's purpose and values.

**Accreditation Standard 1.0.2:** *The program explains how its mission is consistent with institutional mission and the program's context across all program options.*

The program explained how its mission is consistent with the institutional mission. The program also identified its program context. However, the program did not describe specifically *how* the master's-level mission statement is consistent with the program's context.

The site visitor is asked to discuss with the program how its mission statement is consistent with the program's context.

**Accreditation Standard M2.0.2:** *The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.*

The program provided a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice. However, one course (i.e., MSW 521) is inconsistently identified in the self-study as either a practice course or a policy course. Additionally, while the program discussed course sequencing, the narrative did not clearly explain the integration of classroom and field.

The site visitor is asked to clarify with the program how the MSW 521 course is identified (i.e., practice course or a policy course). The site visitor is also asked to discuss with the program how their formal curriculum design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

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

The program provided a curriculum matrix with generalist curriculum content. However, the matrix did not clearly illustrate content related to the organizational and community systems levels for competencies 6-9.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program an updated generalist practice curriculum matrix that illustrates how its curriculum content implements competencies 6-9, as well as review with the program updated syllabi to verify consistency between the matrix and syllabi.

**Accreditation Standard M2.1.2:** *The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for specialized practice demonstrating how the design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.*

The program provided a rationale for its formal curriculum design for specialized practice. However, the narrative did not clearly explain the integration of classroom and field.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program how its formal curriculum design for specialized practice is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for classroom and field.

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

The program provided a detailed description of demographics. However, the program did not explain how its efforts described in response to **Accreditation Standard 3.0.1** provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment across all program options.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program how its efforts described in response to **Accreditation Standard 3.0.1** provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment.

**Accreditation Standard M3.1.1:** *The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program. The criteria for admission to the master's program must include an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association. Baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs are not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.*

The program identified the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program, which includes an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association. However, the program did not clearly explain how it ensures baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs do not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program how it ensures that baccalaureate social work graduates entering master's social work programs do not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

**Accreditation Standard 3.1.9:** *The program describes its policies and procedures specifying students' rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs.*

The program described university-level student involvement and briefly described some program-level student involvement. However, the program did not provide specific policies and procedures specifying students' rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs.

The site visitor is asked to review with the program its policies and procedures specifying students' rights and opportunities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs for students across all program options.

**Accreditation Standard 3.4.2:** *The program describes how it uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program.*

The program described its budget and how it has changed over time. However, the narrative did not clearly describe specific examples of how the program uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program.

The site visitor is asked to discuss with the program specific examples of how it uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program.

### **Arranging the Site Visit**

Using this letter as a guide, work with the program director to plan the site visit schedule, including the names and positions of those with whom you will meet.



The program director is provided a copy of this *LOI* for informational purposes and guidance in working with you to plan the visit.

During the site visit, you are expected to give the program the opportunity to provide you with information that clarifies, corrects, or supplements those parts of its self-study about which the COA has questions. Any additional materials the program provides during the site visit must be included by the program in its program response. Please note, the site visitor is not responsible for sending any supplemental materials provided during the visit. Additionally, the program is not required nor encouraged to provide a written response to this *LOI*.

### **Site Visit Report**

Within 2 weeks of the last day of the site visit, send one (1) electronic copy of the report with your findings to the program's accreditation specialist at CSWE. The report should summarize the conversation on general questions regarding: program mission and goals (**AS 1.0**), diversity (**AS 3.0**), and assessment (**AS 4.0**) as well as cite each **accreditation standard** and corresponding questions raised by the COA in its *Letter of Instruction* and thorough discussion of your findings for each standard. The *Site Visit Report* template is enclosed for your convenience.

### **Program Response to the Site Visit Report**

The COA does not expect the program to take formal action on the *LOI*, nor to submit a response to it. Instead, within 2 weeks of receipt of the *Site Visit Report* from CSWE, the program should submit a formal written response, one (1) electronic copy to Karen Chapman, MPA, MSW, Accreditation Specialist, in the Department of Social Work Accreditation.

The COA will review the *Site Visit Report* and the program response at its February 2023 meeting to determine if the program's accreditation should be reaffirmed. COA reaffirmation decision types are described in [policy 2.6 in the EPAS Handbook](#).

Sincerely,



Deana F. Morrow, PhD, LICSW, ACSW  
Chair, Commission on Accreditation

DFM/KYC

Cc: Mikyong Kim-Goh, PhD, MSW, LCSW  
Professor, MSW Program Director, and Department Chair  
California State University, Fullerton  
Social Work Program  
[mkimgoh@fullerton.edu](mailto:mkimgoh@fullerton.edu)

**Enclosure:** *Site Visit Report* Template

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

### **Site Visit Information**

***Instructions:*** Please review this information in preparation for each site visit assigned and conducted. Complete the required Site Visit Report Template and return it to the program's accreditation specialist at CSWE within 2 weeks of the visit. Do not alter nor edit this template.

#### *Role, Scope, and Boundaries of the Site Visitor*

The site visit is an important step in the peer-review reaffirmation process. Qualified site visitors operate under the authority and jurisdiction of the Commission on Accreditation (COA). The visitor's role is that of information gatherer; visitors do not determine compliance nor select a decision type. The COA is the sole arbiter of compliance. Visitors do not provide feedback, opinions, advice, recommendations, nor instructions to the program. Visitors may not share program-specific information, LOI information, self-study content, or material discussed onsite with parties outside of the reaffirmation process (e.g., accreditation specialist, COA, etc.).

The content of the visit and report are structured around collecting clarifying information pertaining to general and specific questions raised in the COA-issued Letter of Instruction (LOI). The LOI includes both general and specific questions. If the program's self-study narrative was unclear, incomplete, or missing information, the standard is cited by the COA in the LOI and instructions are provided to the visitor to collect clarifying information from the program. While the visitor reviews the self-study in its entirety in advance of the visit, only standards itemized in the LOI may be discussed onsite with the program. Information beyond the boundaries of the LOI should not be discussed, requested, nor reported. Visitors must use the required report template provided on the final page of the LOI.

#### *Developing the Agenda*

The agenda is collaboratively developed by the visitor and program. Onsite meetings are conducted with program faculty, students, and administrators; which includes a meeting with the institution's president/chancellor or their designee (e.g., provost). Additional program stakeholders, groups or individuals, with whom the visitor elects to meet with is driven by the standards identified in the LOI. The visitor may not meet with additional constituent groups beyond the agreed upon agenda without the program's consent.

#### *Self-study & Supplemental Materials*

No later than 30 days prior to the visit, the program send the visitor one (1) electronic copy of the exact self-study submitted to the COA. Programs do not submit formal written responses to the LOI nor furnish the visitor with supplemental materials (beyond the self-study) in advance of the visit. Programs are permitted share documentation, visuals, or materials explicitly requested in the LOI with the visitor onsite. However, the visitor does not collect nor submit these materials with their report. The program is solely responsible for documenting compliance and submitting evidence in their formal written response to the site visit report. The visitor collects the clarifying information as directed in the LOI via discussion with program stakeholders.

#### *Site Visit Report*

Following the close of the visit, any communication between the site visitor and program director ceases (except for submitting documentation for reimbursement of travel expenses). Any

remaining questions or concerns the program or visitor may have are directed to the program's accreditation specialist.

**Within 2 weeks** of site visit, the visitor submits one (1) electronic single **word document (not a PDF)** of the completed report template, including a copy of the meeting agenda and sign-in sheets, to the program's accreditation specialist at CSWE. The accreditation specialist is identified in the LOI. Report content is written in the visitor's own words and reflects objective and factual findings collected via discussion with program stakeholders. The report should not refer COA readers to the program's self-study or any supplemental materials provided onsite, nor should the visitor include copied/pasted narrative excerpts from program documents. The visitor does not include materials provided by the program in the report; the program will provide this information in their program response to the site visit report. The visitor destroys the program's documents upon confirmation of receipt of the report by the accreditation specialist.

#### Program Response

Upon receipt of the report, the accreditation specialist reviews the report for clarity and objectiveness. This review process may result in the program receiving the report beyond the initial 2 weeks granted for the visitor to submit the report. Please be patient and assured that the program will be granted a full **2 weeks** to submit their formal written response to the site visit report. Once the accreditation specialist accepts the report, the program will receive the site visit report via email with detailed instructions for responding.

The program responds to each standard itemized in the LOI and the site visit report. The program does not refer COA readers to the self-study nor previously submitted materials. The program submits one (1) electronic single **word document (not PDF)** of the completed response, including any supplemental materials provided to the site visitor, to the program's accreditation specialist at CSWE.

#### Understanding Reaffirmation Decision Types

The reaffirmation determination will be made based upon the LOI, site visit report, and program's response which will be reviewed at the COA Meeting identified in the LOI. Section 2.6. *COA Reaffirmation Determination and Decisions* in the [EPAS Handbook](#) details potential decision types and their rationales.

#### Policies, Procedures, & Resources

Policies and procedures regarding the site visit are located in sections 2.3. *Letter of Instruction, Site Visit Planning, and Site Visit Hosting* and 2.5. *Site Visit Report and Program Response* in the [EPAS Handbook](#). Additional site visit resources can be found on the [CSWE website, Accreditation pages](#). While it is advised that the visitor contact the program's accreditation specialist in advance of the visit to clarify any items in the LOI, accreditation staff are available before, during, and after the visit to address any questions, clarify expectations, or provide resources.

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

**Site Visit Report Template**

1. Program Visited Name:

---

2. Program Visited State:

---

3. Program Visited Level(s):

---

4. Date of Site Visit:

---

5. Site Visitor(s) Name:

---

1. Include a copy of the site visit schedule or a list of stakeholders with whom the site visitor met with during the visit (e.g., groups and individuals from the program and institution).
2. Write a brief summary of the general questions discussions pertaining to: program mission and goals (**AS 1.0**), diversity (**AS 3.0**), and assessment (**AS 4.0**).

**Program Mission and Goals (AS 1.0):**

**Diversity (AS 3.0):**

**Assessment (AS 4.0):**

3. List each **accreditation standard** and specific question raised by the COA in its *Letter of Instruction* (LOI). Provide a thorough discussion of objective/factual findings for each item.

***Accreditation Standard...:***

Insert full text of the accreditation standard from the LOI.

**Specific Question:**

Insert full citation language, including the instructions to the visitor, from the LOI.

**Site Visit Findings:**

Write your objective/factual findings to clarify this LOI item.

*[repeat for each standard itemized in the LOI]*