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In 2001, the Division of Social Work changed the framework for delivering Field Education to both BASW and MSW students. For the past ten years Field education has been delivered under the “Practice/Liaison Model.” While the feedback we have received from students and Field Instructors has been overwhelmingly positive, we have not specifically examined the role of the Practice/Liaison Faculty.

The assessments questions to be addressed this year was:

1) Does the Practice/Liaison Model help students integrate classroom teachings into their Field Practicum?
2) What specifically was the most and least helpful?
3) Do Field Instructors find the Practice/Liaison Model helpful?
4) What specifically was most and least helpful?

The data collected and analyzed:

1) Student Evaluation of Faculty Liaison
2) Field Instructor Evaluation of Faculty Liaison.

This assessment will begin (Section 1) with the Mission, Goals and Objectives of the Division, a description of the roles and responsibilities of Field Instructors and Faculty Liaisons, followed by the Academic Standards for Field Education from our accrediting body: Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). Section 2, is the Assessment: description of the instruments, descriptive statistics, and overall findings.
Section 3 explores possible recommendations and plan for faculty collaboration for future model refinements.

Section 1
DIVISION OF SOCIAL WORK VISION, MISSION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Division’s mission of both the BASW and MSW programs is consistent with the professional competence and leadership missions of the University and the College of Health and Human Services. The following Vision, Mission, and Guiding Principles were unanimously adopted by faculty in October, 2006.

Our Vision:

We envision our graduates to be part of a globally conscious educational community with a lifelong passion for learning and a quest for excellence whose practice is guided by a commitment to sustainable human and societal development. Our individual faculty strengths join to create a mosaic of integrated program excellence. Our curriculum is distinctive and continually works toward evaluation and dynamic change through engagement and interaction with our diverse community. Through teaching, research, and joint collaboration we address solutions to community and world problems using various levels of intervention with a commitment to social justice.
The Mission:

The Division of Social Work strives to prepare competent social workers who can both lead and serve the richly diverse region in the development and delivery of services that contribute to human well-being and social justice. Towards this end, the Division offers high quality undergraduate and graduate degree programs and teaching, research, and joint collaboration with the community.

Our mission is strengthened by the following guiding principles:

- As the Division of Social Work, we value the richness of human diversity; respect for human uniqueness; and constructive response to the challenges of diversity in an evolving pluralistic society.
- We value an educational curriculum and practice approaches that advance social justice: including, but not limited to, the attention to human rights; confrontation and transformation of oppressive forces; and empowerment of populations at risk.
- We value the importance of human relationships that are strengths-based and promote human well-being, through collaborative and partnership processes.
- We value the preparation of ethically-driven, critical-thinking change agents who practice with and on behalf of individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.
- We value recruiting and maintaining a diverse faculty who collectively share the Division’s guiding principles and whose individual strengths and experiences provide special expertise to accomplish the Division’s mission.
• We value the inevitability of change as evidenced by our commitment to a curriculum that is dynamic and responsive to different levels of knowledge and practice approaches.

Social Work Curriculum

A core requirement in both the BASW and MSW program is Field Education. Field is the “Heart of Social Work Education.” It is the theory/practice nexus that demonstrates a student’s readiness for the profession. Not simply an internship or an apprenticeship, field is an educational and professional development effort that involves real live clients and situations. Because of this, the utmost care must be given to this collective endeavor.

In the Bachelor’s Program, Field takes place in the senior year and consists of two-semester (32 weeks); in the MSW Program, Field takes place over four-semester (64 weeks). Social Work Field is a series of integrated courses which place students in human service organizations under the instruction of professional social work practitioners (Field Instructor), and with the guidance of faculty from the Division of Social Work (Faculty Liaison).

Field Education is an educationally-directed practicum through which students are expected to progress in their professional development from one semester to the next. The program recognizes that students develop professionally at different rates, and allows for this differential timing within reason. Students who exhibit particular problem behaviors and/or skill deficiencies in one semester are expected to work on these areas with guidance from both their field instructor and faculty liaison in order to demonstrate improvement the next semester and throughout the remainder of the program.
In 2001, the Division of Social Work implemented a unique model that calls for the student’s social work practice professor to also act as the student’s Faculty Field Liaison. Most liaisons are full-time tenure-track faculty members. The model was adopted as a way to improve integration of the practice and field curricula. The separate field seminar was made optional, and in its place the practice professor/field liaison tailored some practice course content to their students’ field settings, and monitored students’ field experiences through practice class discussion and assignments as well as through field site visits, journals and other field assignments. Practice professor/liaisons also met individually with students to discuss field issues. Under this model, liaisons visit each student in their placement once during the first semester, and again in the second semester as needed. They maintain monthly phone or email contact with the field instructor as needed, and are available for additional site visits as needed.

Course Instructors

The Field Instructor is an MSW working within the placement agency, or contracted by the agency, providing oversight of the student’s learning experience in the placement.

The Faculty Liaison is a member of the Social Work faculty who tracks the placement, and provides consultation and monitoring for the student and the Field Instructor. In most cases, the Faculty Liaison will also be the student’s practice course professor. Students can expect the Faculty Liaison to monitor their placements through sites visits (once in the Fall semester and as needed in Spring) email, phone contact, class discussion and in-person meetings.
THE FIELD INSTRUCTOR

Field Instructors are qualified staff members of an agency who possess a Master’s of Social Work Degree and who, with the approval of agency administrators and the Division, are willing and able trainers of social work students. Field Instructors are considered Adjunct Faculty. Their dual role as a staff member and an Adjunct Faculty member of the Division of Social Work makes their responsibility unique and demanding.

Role

Field Instructors carry out three different roles relative to each student: they are educators, teachers, and gatekeepers. As an “educator,” they guide and assess the overall professional development of the student. As a “teacher,” they facilitate “learning opportunities” for students and model for and observe the student and provide meaningful feedback. As a “gatekeeper,” they assist the Field Faculty in assessing whether or not the student is appropriate for the profession – demonstrates the personal/professional capacities/behaviors requisite of professional social workers.

Responsibilities

Over the course of an academic year it is expected on average, that Field Instructors will spend approximately three hours per week in the training of a student. A portion of these three hours must be individual instruction (the “instructional hour”) and the remaining time is to be spent observing students in the practice of social work and their engagement with other staff in organizational tasks/activities, modeling for students, reviewing students’ case notes/charting, analyzing and providing feedback on process recordings,
and any other such tasks that enable the Field Instructor to properly facilitate and assess the student’s professional competency, identity, and behavior. In addition to time spent with students, Field Instructors are expected to consult with and be consulted by Division representatives (Faculty Liaison). Lastly, Field Instructors are required to participate in a 7-hour “Introduction to Field Instruction” and thereafter engage in field instruction seminars at least once every three years.

The specific responsibilities of Field Instructors include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Be involved in the interviewing and selection of the field student(s).

2. Provide on average three hours of training/instruction per week that includes, but is not limited to, the “instructional hour” observation, modeling, reading case notes/charts, reviewing process recordings, etc.

3. Provide time for reading student materials, holding informal conferences and meetings, and consulting with Division faculty.

4. Use recordings as a teaching tool in individual conferences.

5. Develop a written educational contract with the student.

6. Provide appropriate assignments for the student throughout the placement.

7. On an ongoing basis, assess and provide feedback to students regarding their social work skills, professional behavior/identity and to provide written evaluations consistent with the Division’s calendar and deadlines. Note: identification and documentation of student performance problems in the field are the responsibility of the Field Instructor. Field Instructors who fail to carry out this responsibility in a professional manner will not be allowed to continue as Field Instructors.

8. Conduct a formal written evaluation of the student at the end of each semester. Complete an evaluation of the Faculty Liaison using the form provided by the Division.
Off-Site Field Instructors

Field Instructors who are off site are responsible for insuring that the responsibilities noted above are carried out in whole through both their own efforts as well as those of the Task Supervisor (see below). The off site Field Instructor must meet with the student weekly for one hour. The focus of these meetings is social work content—social work perspective, values, ethics, practice theories and theories for practice. The reference point for discussion should be the Learning Agreement. These hours constitute the “instructional hour.” In addition to the instructional hour, the off site Field Instructor must communicate with the Task Supervisor to obtain feedback on the student’s progress in the area of skill development and must review the student’s process recordings and case notes. Lastly, the off site Field Instructor is responsible for completing the student’s evaluation in concert with the Task Supervisor.

Task Supervisors

A Task Supervisor is a regular staff member who is responsible for the day-to-day assignments of the student and the observation and assessment of the skills portion of student learning. The individual staff member assuming this role must be approved by and able to work with the Field Instructor of record. It is expected that the Task Supervisor will model skills and observe the student in his/her daily assignments, meet with the Faculty Liaison as appropriate, and provide relevant feedback to both the student and the Field Instructor. The Task Supervisor does not need to have a social work degree.
THE FACULTY LIAISON

The Faculty Liaison is the university-based field educator who oversees and monitors the student’s placement.

Role
The Faculty Liaison’s role is threefold:

1. to assist and assess students in their professional growth and development as they progress through the field education curriculum;

2. to assist Field Instructors in the development of appropriate learning opportunities or support them in their role as a Field Instructor; and

3. to mediate or resolve problems affecting a student’s progress in the field.

Each student is assigned a Faculty Liaison. In most instances the student’s liaison is also the student’s Practice course instructor and generally, all practice course instructors are full time faculty members.

Responsibilities
The Faculty Liaison:

1. Serves as liaison between Division and Agency;

2. Consults with the student and Field Instructor about assignments, learning agreements, field journals, process recordings, and field evaluations;

3. Serves as the student's advocate to ensure that the Division's expectations of the agency are being met;

4. Serves as troubleshooter, problem-solver and mediator in the event that a problem in the field placement experience is identified (whether the problem rests with the student, agency, or Field Instructor);

5. Reviews/approves and provides feedback to the student on each of the required field assignments;

6. Meets with each student on a regular basis individually or in group (at least bi-weekly) to ascertain the student’s progress towards his/her professional development and to assess the quality of the experience based on Liaison/student discussion about the tasks/activities or cases in which the student is engaged;
7. Visits the agency during the Fall semester, meeting with the student and Field Instructor(s) to insure the viability of the placement experience once it begins and to establish a working relationship with the Field Instructor; and in the Spring semester as needed to review the Learning Agreement and ensure that the student is able to work towards all competencies.

8. Maintains telephone or e-mail communication with the Field Instructor throughout the year, as needed.

9. Assigns the student’s grade for the Field Education based on course grading policy (see p. 20).

**Description**

The Faculty Liaison also serves as a general resource for students who need a sounding board, referral source and/or general support regarding personal problems or life issues that may arise (health, family, financial, housing, workload) interfering with the completion of the field experience or the student’s competence in the field. In such situations, the liaison can assist the student to follow a course of action that will result in a positive outcome for the student, clients and the agency.

Liaisons will also be in touch with the Field Instructor(s) during the first few weeks of the Fall semester to insure that agency orientations are underway and to verify contact information (phone numbers, e-mail addresses, etc).

Finally Field is integrally related to Social Work 140B and 140C. Students apply class lessons to the field setting and field situations and dilemmas form the basis of classroom examples. Integration is enhanced through field liaison assignment to the Practice class. The field liaison is either (a) the actual instructor herself/himself or (b) assigned to primarily one practice course. When the field liaison is not the practice course instructor, he or she attends many of the practice class sessions; thus, he or she understands the curriculum, witnesses the student’s individual practice classroom
experience, and hears directly and promptly of problems in the student’s field instruction experience.

To enhance the student-faculty connection as well as support the integrated field education model, the practice professors for SWRK140B&C in the BASW program and SWRK 204A&B and SWRK 204C&D in the MSW program are also the field liaisons for the students’ field education (SWRK195A&B, SWRK 295A&B, SWRK 295C&D). To further enrich the ongoing development of a community of learners as well as the integrated field-practice class integration, practice professors teach the same students for both semesters each year.


**AS 2.1 The goal of the Social Work Field Education Program is to help students develop their identity and competence as professional social workers through educationally directed field practica.** Under the guidance of a MSW or BASW field instructor and a faculty field liaison, students integrate classroom-based knowledge with field practice, as they work toward becoming culturally competent multi-level generalist social work practitioners.

Each student’s placement is governed by a Learning Agreement consisting of 21 Learning Objectives. Each Learning Objective directly relates to one or more BASW or MSW Program Goals and Objectives. The relationship of the Learning Objectives to the Program Objectives are made explicit in the Field Syllabus. Students, under the guidance of a Field Instructor and Faculty Liaison, operationalize each Learning
Objective with tasks and activities available at the placement. The list of tasks, therefore, is not merely a job description, but rather an explicit plan for concrete ways that students will work towards developing key Field competencies, and in turn, BASW and MSW Program Objectives. During the course of the placement, students and field instructors use the Learning Agreement as a roadmap for the placement, as well as a method of tracking how well a student’s field experience is meeting field objectives.

**AS 2.1.4 Monitoring and Supporting Students: The Liaison/Practice Instructor Model**

Around the middle of the first semester, the Field Instructor completes a one-page Placement Progress Report. This form is submitted to the liaison, and provides early feedback on progress and potential problems. The student evaluation is completed by the student and field instructor at the end of each semester. Field instructors are expected to provide ongoing feedback to their students throughout the semester. If problems are identified during the semester, students and field instructors are expected to contact the liaison for assistance. When appropriate, a performance contract may be developed, so that a student’s progress can be closely monitored. Students receive “Credit” or “No Credit” at the end of each semester. “Credit” is awarded if a student demonstrates satisfactory progress in each of the learning objectives. This determination is made by the liaison, with input from the field instructor.

The Division has monitored this model closely during the past ten years. Feedback received from students and liaisons via end-of-the-year evaluations consistently indicate satisfaction with the merged practice professor/liaison model, both citing that it facilitates classroom-based curriculum/field integration. Field instructors also were
satisfied with the model. Eliminating the separate field seminar, however, has overburdened the practice class. Students highly valued time in the practice class devoted to field issues, while practice faculty found it increasingly difficult to cover their syllabus if they allowed too much time for field discussion. Faculty found that while the merged liaison/practice professor role enabled them to more easily adapt practice material to field issues, and thus enhance integration, they could not provide sufficient opportunity for concrete field problem-solving discussions within the practice course setting.

Another by-product of the liaison model adopted in 2001 was changes in the nature and consistency of field assignments. While journals and process recordings were part of the field course syllabus, practice professor/liaisons modified and in some cases merged them with practice assignments. Again, integration of field experience with practice curriculum was enhanced, but some of the other purposes of the field assignments were either diluted or lost. For example, journals were eliminated or reduced in content or frequency by some liaison/practice professors, thus reducing the journal’s usefulness as an ongoing monitor of student progress and placement challenges. In addition, the inconsistency of expectations about field assignments across liaisons created difficulties in ensuring a consistent level of monitoring, as well as confusion among students regarding field practicum expectations.

Although this model relies on the practice instructor also serving as faculty liaison, sometimes schedule and workload issues interfere, and a different faculty member serves as faculty liaison. In addition, ideally, the immediate field supervisor has
an MSW and serves as the Field instructor, however, sometimes non-MSW task supervisors are utilized supported by weekly MSW supervision by an off site MSW.

Originally, Faculty Liaisons ideally would make Field visits to each student’s placement in both Fall and Spring semesters, however, as workload demands on both faculty members and field instructors have increased over the past few years, many Spring Field visits have taken place over the phone. These variations in the model require monitoring and evaluation to insure the integrity of the model is sustained.

**AS 2.1.6 Support for Field Instructors**

Faculty field liaisons have in-person, telephone and email contact with their respective field instructors. The liaison is a consultant to the field instructor and makes him/herself available to the field instructor upon request. Given the liaison/practice course linkage, the liaison is well versed in the specific practice course assignments of his/her students and communicates these to the field instructor (though all students are requested to do so prior to the field instructor/liaison communication). In that most field liaisons are full time faculty, and thereby have been engaged in curriculum discussions across the core areas, they are able to communicate the relationship among the core courses (and assignments) in any given semester.

At the end of the year, students complete evaluations of their placement/field instructor, and their faculty liaison. Field instructors as well as students complete an evaluation of the faculty liaison. Liaisons provide feedback regarding their perception of each placement. These data are reviewed by the Field Director, who follows up with placement, field instructor or faculty liaison problems. It is these evaluations that were
used to create this year’s Division Assessment: 1) Student Evaluation of Faculty Liaison and 2) Field Instructor Evaluation of Faculty Liaison.

Section 2
Faculty Practice/Liaison Assessment

In recent years, the Division of Social Work Assessments have analyzed the Student Field Evaluations; specifically examining the student’s progress over the course of their Field experience. This year’s data will build upon past years’ assessments by looking, not at the students’ performance in Field, but at the effectiveness of the Faculty Liaison. Noted earlier, there are a number of variations that have taken place over the past decade in this model due to workload issues for Faculty members as well as Field Instructors. As our budget decreases and workload increases, it would seem a good time to take a closer look at this model.

The Instruments

Student Evaluation of Faculty Liaison.

This is a 20-item survey developed by the Director of Field Education, consisting of dichotomous, categorical, Likert, and open-ended questions. This survey was emailed to the students on May 10, 2011. Students were sent two reminders; acceptance of completed surveys closed on June 20, 2011.

Field Instructor Evaluation of Faculty Liaison.

This is a 16-item survey developed by the Director of Field Education, consisting of dichotomous, categorical, Likert and open-ended questions. This survey was emailed to the Field Instructors on May 10, 2011. Field Instructors were sent two reminders; acceptance of completed surveys on June 20, 2011.
The Results

Student Evaluation of Faculty Liaison

The Student Evaluation of Faculty Liaison was completed by 117 respondents. Thirteen percent (15) of the respondents were Title IVE students. Title IVE students receive visits from Title IVE liaisons at their field site; their Practice instructor is not their Faculty Liaison. There were an additional 12 students who reported that their Practice Instructor was not their Faculty Liaison, totaling 27 students, or 22% of the sample were not part of the Practice/Liaison Model.
Chart 1  **Student Respondents**
Total number of students enrolled in Field and the number of survey respondents: indicating an overall response rate of slightly less than 32%.

The response rate here is lower than expected. Although the end of the school year can be a hectic time for students, next year, care will need to be taken to increase the response rate.

Chart 2  **When did the Liaison make their first Field visit?**
The Practice/Liaison Model has proven most effective when field placement issues can be identified early in the school year. The high number of Liaison visits in October and November are somewhat troubling, however not as troubling as the 6 students who stated they never had a field visit from their Liaison. In next year’s revised survey, there will be space for students to comment on their answers. In addition, next year, due to recently enacted risk management procedures, Field Liaisons will be required to make their first Field visit during the first month of classes.

**Chart 3  How many visits did Liaisons make in the Fall semester?**
Chart 4  *How many visits did Liaisons make in the Spring semester?*

![Chart showing the number of Liaison visits in the Spring semester]

An integral part of the Practice/Liaison Model is Field visits; students report visits to field sites were made in Fall in a timely way, much fewer visits were reported in the Spring semester. Some faculty make their Spring Field visits late in the year (possibly after students completed the survey), which might account for some of the lower numbers.

Table 1  *What Did Students Find Most Helpful?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students' experience</th>
<th>Individual meetings</th>
<th>Class discussion</th>
<th>Phone contact</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Writing field journal</th>
<th>Verbal feedback</th>
<th>Field-related assignments</th>
<th>Liaison visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely helpful</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful enough</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very helpful</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extremely unhelpful</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students reported the most helpful ways Faculty Liaison can assist their learning are:

Field-related assignments, verbal feedback, Field visits, and email contact. It is unknown if phone contact is helpful to students, 58% reported “not applicable,” while only 18%
reported email contact as “not applicable.” Seventy-nine percent found email contact helpful. One of the most interesting findings here is the weight of satisfaction students have with email contact. In addition, although the numbers are not especially high, the highest level of dissatisfaction came from Liaison visits and writing Field Journals.

Table 2 Students’ Experiences with Liaisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ experience with Liaison</th>
<th>helpful integrating classroom teaching with field experience</th>
<th>helpful with Field problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely helpful</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful enough</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very helpful</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extremely helpless</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhelpful</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the heart of the Practice/Liaison Model, is the belief that if the person who teaches Practice is also the person who visits students in the Field, students will be able to integrate classroom information into their Field work, and bring Field dilemmas back to the classroom. The table above seems to provide some evidence of that. Students overwhelmingly feel the Practice/Liaison model helps integrate practice knowledge and skills, and many feel the presence of their liaison helped with problems in the Field.

The Field Instructor Evaluation of Faculty Liaison

The Field Instructor Evaluation of Faculty Liaison was completed by 179 respondents out of 343 possible respondents. Sixty-seven percent (121) of the respondents were from agencies within Sacramento County, followed by 13% from Yolo County, 6% from Solano, 4% from Placer and one or two field instructors from: San Joaquin, Contra Costa, Sonoma, Napa, and El Dorado Counties.
Chart 5  *Did the Faculty Liaison meet with Field Instructor in Fall?*

This information seems to confirm the students report regarding Fall Field visits. Close to 90% report having met with the Faculty Liaison, however, 21 Field Instructors reported they did not see the Faculty Liaison in the Fall semester.

Chart 6  *Did the Faculty Liaison meet with Field Instructor in Spring?*

Again, these data confirm that Faculty Liaisons are meeting with Field Instructors far more in the Fall semester than in the Spring.
Table 3 *What topics did the Liaison cover?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students' Learning Agreement</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the Liaison</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas for learning activities</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field policies and procedures</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact information</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field Instructors reported that needed information was given to them by the Faculty Liaisons.

Chart 7 *Number of Contacts per year?*

[Bar chart showing the number of contacts Field Instructors had with Faculty Liaison during the year.]
The previous three graphs seem to indicate that the Practice/Liaison Model is working and Field Instructors had contact with the Faculty Liaisons, the meetings were helpful and they had a positive relationship with the Faculty Liaison.
Section 3  
Recommendations Based on Findings

Overall, the Practice/Liaison model is working well: 1) students felt supported when problems arose; 2) students are able to integrate classroom knowledge into field practice; and 3) Field instructors are kept informed regarding academic expectations; and 4) Field instructors feel there is back-up when problems arise. This data exemplifies the reasons why the Division changed to this model in 2001. There are also some indications for areas of improvement.

1) The Practice Committee will be emailed the results of the assessment prior to the beginning of the Fall 2011 semester; discussion and recommendations will be included in the Practice Committee’s annual work plan.

2) A discussion among Practice faculty regarding ways to improve response rates on surveys. A means of discovering the effectiveness of the Practice/Liaison Model, the two surveys used in this assessment, are vital in keeping the curriculum current.

3) A discussion amongst the Practice/Liaison instructors specifically surrounding the findings in Table 1, describing what students and Field instructors have found most and least helpful.

4) A discussion amongst the Practice/Liaison faculty regarding Spring semester field visits. A larger than expected number are not taking place according to this data. Is this due to workload issues or the preference of Field instructors and students to communicate via email and phone after the first in-person visit?
5) Next year, the surveys will be administered using Survey Monkey, allowing more data analysis than was possible this year.

Students, field instructors and faculty continue to be satisfied with the Practice/Liaison model. Some areas of discussion for Practice faculty in the coming year are: 1) the ideal time for the first field visit; 2) what is the ideal means of contact during the second semester; 3) how can the faculty liaison best help when problems arise in the student field placements? These are topics that will be addressed by the Practice Committee in Fall; if changes in the model are suggested and/or implemented, further assessment will be necessary.