

STATE OF SOCIAL WORK FIELD EDUCATION

National Survey Report 2020



Transforming the Field
Education Landscape

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
INTRODUCTION	7
LITERATURE REVIEW	8
Defining Field Education	8
Role of Field Educators	8
Field Staffing, Partnerships, and Supporting Students	9
TRANSFORMING THE FIELD EDUCATION LANDSCAPE (TFEL) PROJECT	11
METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS	12
FINDINGS	13
Characteristics of the Field Education Coordinator and Director Position	13
Program Details	15
Practicum Placement and Staffing Models	16
Resources	17
FECD Activities	19
PERSPECTIVES AND EXPERIENCES OF FECD	22
Field education resources, including staffing and time	24
Finding and establishing field placements	25
Issues of students in field	26
Relationships with field agencies	27
THEMES FROM THE SURVEY	29
RECOMMENDATIONS	30
THE POSITIONED RESEARCHER – REFLECTIONS FROM THE STUDENT TEAM	31
LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH	32
CONCLUSION	33
REFERENCES	34
APPENDIX A – SURVEY QUESTIONS	36
APPENDIX B – PERSPECTIVES AND EXPERIENCES OF FECDs	48
APPENDIX C – ACTIVITIES EXPECTED BY FIELD TEAM (TO BE COMPLETED)	51

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The State of Social Work Field Education National Survey 2020 was an initiative undertaken by the Transforming the Field Education Landscape (TFELP) partnership. Field education coordinators and directors were surveyed on field administrative models, staffing, and resources. We gratefully acknowledge the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) in the United States for sharing their survey instrument which was adapted with permission in this study. We wish to offer our thanks to all the field coordinators and directors who participated in this study.

REPORT AUTHORS

Julie Drolet (TFEL Program Director)
Mohammad Idris Alemi (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Tara Collins (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Louisa Jaslow (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Ashley Labossiere (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Emma Lee (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Ellen Mi (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Jeff Walsh (McGill University, Research Assistant)

STREAM 2 CO-INVESTIGATOR WORKING GROUP

Uzoamaka Anucha (York University)
Marion Bogo (University of Toronto)
Grant Charles (University of British Columbia)
Natalie Clark (Thompson Rivers University)
Julie Drolet (TFEL Project Director)
Sheri McConnell (Memorial University)
Eileen McKee (University of Toronto)
David Nicholas (University of Calgary)
Tamara Sussman (McGill University)
Christine Walsh (University of Calgary)

MEMBERS OF THE FIELD EDUCATION SURVEY WORKING GROUP (PLANNING & IMPLEMENTATION)

Mohammad Idris Alemi (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Wasif Ali (University of Calgary, Post-Doctoral Scholar)
Cara Au (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Tara Collins (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Julie Drolet (TFEL Program Director)
Jacqueline Fields (University of Calgary, Post-Doctoral Scholar)
Louisa Jaslow (University of Calgary, Research Assistant),
Vibha Kaushik (University of Calgary, Post-Doctoral Scholar)
Ashley Labossiere (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Emma Lee (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Ellen Mi (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Elisa Poon (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Ory Li Pi Shan (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Jayden Wickman (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Jeff Walsh (McGill University, Research Assistant)

MEMBERS OF THE FIELD EDUCATION SURVEY WORK GROUP (ANALYSIS)

Mohammad Idris Alemi (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Tara Collins (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Julie Drolet (TFEL Program Director)
Louisa Jaslow (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Ashley Labossiere (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Emma Lee (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Ellen Mi (University of Calgary, Research Assistant)
Jeff Walsh (McGill University, Research Assistant)

The Transforming the Field Education Landscape (TFEL) project is supported in part by funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).

Dr. Julie Drolet
TFEL Project Director

SUGGESTED CITATION

Transforming the Field Education Landscape (TFEL). (2020). *State of social work field education: National survey report 2020*. University of Calgary, AB: Authors.

CONTACT

Dr. Julie Drolet, Professor & TFEL Project Director, Faculty of Social Work, University of Calgary,
3-250, 10230 Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, T5J 4P6, Canada
jdrolet@ucalgary.ca

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The State of Social Work Field Education is a study designed to provide an assessment of the current state of social work field education in Canada by examining the structure and delivery of field education programs, field resources, and staff. Transforming the Field Education Landscape (TFEL) is a partnership project that aims to prepare the next generation of social workers in Canada by creating training and mentoring opportunities for students, developing and mobilizing promising and wise field education practices, and improving the integration of research and practice in field education. The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) in the United States designed a survey instrument in 2015, and this tool was adapted with permission for the Canadian context. An online survey was sent to all 43 Canadian Association for Social Work Education (CASWE) accredited institutions in Canada. Field education coordinators and directors (FECD) were invited to complete the survey to share information about their field education program, staffing models, resources, activities and their perspectives on the state of field education across the country.

Some of the key findings from the survey include:

- A majority of CASWE-ACFTS accredited programs in Canada participated in the survey with 39 of 43 FECDs, or 90.7%, completing the survey.
- Most FECD have Masters' degree (87%), held permanent contracts (54%), and worked full time (69%). Three FECDs reported having a doctorate degree (8%).
- Almost all universities offered urban placements (97%) while only half the universities offered placements on reserve (51%).
- On average, universities employed two personnel in their field education program; programs with 250 - 499 students had the higher number of employees in field education.
- Two-thirds of institutions offered both BSW and MSW programs.
- The majority of respondents worked in English-speaking programs (75%), while 26% of FECD worked in French-speaking programs.
- Some institutions offered programs in an online or blended format (44%), but very few had designated staff assigned to manage placements for online students.

In this study, field education resources were explored including staffing, collaborative partnerships with external agencies, and the ability to support student demands. Some of the key findings from the survey are included in each of these areas:

Staffing

- MSW programs had greater full-time equivalents (FTEs) for a fewer number of students.
- Faculty member liaison model was the most common model used in field education, followed by a sessional faculty liaison model.
- Most institutions (94%) have 1.0 FTE or less in administrative assistants/office support assigned to field education; the highest number of individuals on a core field team was reported under full-time staff, usually two staff members.
- Thirty-seven percent of individuals at institutions with BSW and MSW programs reported having 5.5 or more FTEs for the "onsite" program.
- Meanwhile, 36% of respondents at institutions with both BSW and MSW programs reported having less than 2.4 FTE's at the "onsite" program who match or place students.
- The number of FTEs for the "onsite" program rose as the number of students increased.

- The average number of FTEs reported to adequately staff on site programs was 2.5, with a greater average of FTEs needed for BSW programs (2.9) compared to MSW programs.

Field Education Coordinators and Directors (FECD) are responsible for building relationships with agencies and organizations to support student placements. Some of the key findings from the survey include:

Duties

- The three most common collaborative partnerships included provincial health agencies (77%), local organizations (71%), and government ministries (61%).
- FECD are involved in many diverse field related activities including developing field manuals, building relationships with agencies, and participating in policy development.
- FECD reported they were responsible for more activities (average of 16 – 37) than other faculty staff (average of 8 – 33) involved with the field team.
- However, only 42% of the institutions reported having content for field instructorship in their programs.

With the wide array of responsibilities, FECD were also asked to respond to 25 statements that reflected varying perspectives of field education experiences. Some of the highlights from the survey include:

Challenges & Perspectives

- Most common challenges facing FECDs were student dynamics, including field placements, pressures to increase student enrollment, and meeting student demands.
- Staffing numbers, funding levels, and recruiting field placements were also identified as significant challenges.
- These challenges exist for FECDs because of the increase in student enrollment in social work programs. This increase in enrollment puts more pressure on FECDs to find, arrange, and manage field placements for their institutions, agencies, and students, while working within a restricted timeframe.
- COVID-19 was identified as a significant challenge exacerbating existing financial cutbacks, lack of agency ability to support field placements, and FECD feeling overwhelmed by workload.

INTRODUCTION

The Transforming the Field Education Landscape (TFEL) project, funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada's (SSHRC) partnership grant program, carried out an assessment of the state of social work field education across Canada. The purpose of the study was to assess the state of field education by examining the structure and delivery of field education programs, field resources, and field staff.

This report on the State of Social Work Field Education in Canada presents the results of a national survey conducted with field education coordinators and directors between May and June of 2020. The findings reflect the experiences, conditions, and challenges experienced by field education coordinators and directors across Canada, including Indigenous and non-Indigenous social work programs and English- and French-speaking social work field education programs. It is anticipated that this report will create opportunities for dialogue to improve field education and advocate for a more concerted effort to restructure field education, and explore and develop new approaches that will inform the development of more sustainable social work field education models. This discussion is critical to highlight the current challenges and discrepancies in field education staffing, structures, approaches, and practices across Canada.

In Canada, social work field education is in a state of crisis (Ayala et al., 2018; Bogo, 2015). Many social work programs are currently experiencing challenges due to a lack of resources, difficulties in staff retention, increased student enrollment, and financial cutbacks that have impacted educational institutions and social work agencies (Ayala et al., 2017; Macdonald, 2013). This is a cause for concern. Field education is a crucial aspect of social work education and allows students to gain valuable and meaningful experience through direct practice (Ayala et al., 2017). Field education is an opportunity that not only fosters and enhances students' social work identity but also their ability to incorporate theory, research, and knowledge into practice (Ayala et al., 2017; Bogo, 2015). In turn, students are able to use field education as an avenue for building skills, increasing competency of social work practices, and gaining positive work experiences in different social work areas and specialties (Bogo, 2015). Additionally, as there is a limited amount of research in the integration of Indigenous culture, practices, and perspectives in field education, it would be beneficial to examine and combine this essential area of practice into field education training and existing models (Clark & Drolet, 2014). Existing literature on this area of practice supports the integration of Indigenous intersectionality into field education, to create a culturally rich and safe environment for social work students (Clark & Drolet, 2014).

This report aims to create opportunities for dialogue to improve social work field education. A more concerted effort is needed to restructure field education, identify innovative approaches, and promising and wise practices. Ultimately, this report aims to inform the development of more sustainable social work field education models. Continued dialogue is critical to highlight the current challenges and discrepancies in field education staffing, structures, approaches, and practices in Canada.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining Field Education

Social work education involves a combination of course work and field education. In the United States, field education has been recognized as the “signature pedagogy” for social work (CSWE, 2015a, p.12), while in Canada it is a “central component” and a “critical and distinctive aspect” for social work education (CASWE, 2015, p.14). Despite these assertions, field education and the FECD role have been undervalued compared to the coursework and research components of social work education (Asakura et al., 2018; Macdonald, 2013). Field education has been defined as “the component of social work education where students learn to practice social work through delivering social work services in agency and community settings” (Bogo, 2006, p. 163). It is through field education that students are introduced to a range of social work interventions with guidance and feedback from agency social workers (Bogo, 2006). Practicum allows for the enhancement and evaluation of student learning, growth, and areas for improvement. Field education also plays a role in providing an opportunity to determine the suitability of students for the profession (Robertson, 2013; Sowbel, 2012). This protects clients and allows for ethical and competent social work graduates in the workforce.

Research on social work field education has increasingly focused on new models, best practices, and methods. For example, interprofessional health care field education (Charles et al., 2011) and social work research practica (Hewson et al., 2010) have emerged as new field models with empirical evaluations. The literature suggests that new ways of conceptualizing field education are needed, such as including a culturally safe environment that challenges students (Ayala et al., 2018; George et al., 2013; Mooney, Dale, & Hay, 2020; Todd & Schwartz, 2009; Wayne et al., 2010;). Social work education field placements are often heavily influenced by a western framework and perspective, therefore new ways of conceptualizing field education models need to include and nurture Indigenous worldviews on a global scale (Mooney, Dale, & Hay, 2020).

Role of Field Educators

Field education instructors, faculty liaisons, and FECD all play important roles in social work field education. Field instructors are agency-based social workers with the primary role of supporting student learning through supervising, teaching, and evaluating practicum students, historically on a one-to-one basis (Bogo, 2006). Additionally, social work schools appoint faculty members or sessionals as faculty liaisons. They provide additional support to student learning and build rapport between educational institutions and agencies. The faculty liaison role includes communicating between the agency and school program, assisting in student monitoring and evaluation, and advising on educational issues (Bogo, 2006). There has been less interest and commitment for faculty members to occupy faculty liaison roles and work with diminished resources, while fulfilling the increased expectations for scholarly work (Kilpatrick et al., 1994; Macdonald, 2013; Wayne et al., 2006).

FECD face increasing challenges in their role, which is to coordinate the placement process for students and match students with agencies. Their roles are complex and involve managing competing demands between students, field agencies, and post-secondary institutions (Asakura et al., 2018; Buck et al., 2012). Asakura et al. (2018) argue that FECDs use a critical relational teaching approach that is best achieved when they are recognized as skilled educators and practitioners. Nevertheless,

16% of FECDs in the United States have an administrative role with no faculty designation and 64% are precariously employed through an annual or long-term contract rather than a tenure track faculty position (CSWE, 2015b). Furthermore, there is a notable minority of FECDs in America that are not involved in institutional leadership decisions with only half the FECDs reported being part of leadership committees (CSWE, 2015b). Additionally, workload, resources and other barriers can hinder FECDs from participating in regional and national conferences and workshops (CSWE, 2015b). These findings from the CSWE (2015b) survey demonstrate that FECDs are not fully recognized for their essential role in social work education in America. Limited research from Canada suggests a similar pattern (Macdonald, 2013), and this survey seeks to build upon it to better understand the state of social work field education in Canada.

Field Staffing, Partnerships, and Supporting Students

In this project, resources are defined as human resources, collaborative partnerships with external agencies, and the ability to support student demands. A common theme across Canadian social work field education literature is the lack of resources and supports for FECD and field education programs (CSWE, 2015a; Macdonald, 2013; Robertson, 2013). Notably, Macdonald (2013) found FECDs and related faculty were marginalized within the university. The study revealed that FECDs lacked tenure and faculty positions which perpetuated the notion that field education was less important than teaching and research in social work education. This resulted in field education receiving fewer resources. Similarly, FECDs have little influence on improving the state of field education as they are not considered part of the faculty which further limited their role (Bogo, 2015; CSWE, 2015b). Nevertheless, it is critical to involve FECDs in redesigning the field education curriculum to better meet the needs of students and field agencies (Ayala et al., 2017).

FECDs also report unreasonable expectations in assessing students' suitability in becoming professionals but lack support from their institutions in addressing these challenges (Robertson, 2013). They commonly express a lack of institutional support with difficult or ambiguous situations and are often required to make decisions without support (Robertson, 2013). FECDs are challenged with increasing demands from students and faculty members, which increases their workload, often leading to lower FECD morale (Asakura et al., 2018; Ayala et al., 2018). The increasing workload and complexities in field education have created a challenge in recruiting and retaining FECDs in social work education programs (Ayala et al., 2017; Ayala et al., 2018).

Additionally, FECDs also manage an increasing workload (Macdonald, 2013). There are high expectations on FECDs pertaining to teaching and conducting research, but they are not provided with opportunities for advancement (Macdonald, 2013). Ayala et al. (2017) further emphasized these concerns by asserting that FECDs engage in counselling, referring, advising, and mentoring students.

Structural policies and financial cutbacks from government and outside agencies create additional challenges for FECDs (Ayala et al., 2017; Bogo, 2015). The cutbacks also negatively impact the availability of FECDs to support students in the field, creating more challenges as student enrollment increases (Ayala et al., 2017). Examining the importance of Indigenous field education and cultural awareness, Clark and Drolet (2014) found that financial cutbacks increase the challenges FECDs experience by forcing them to work in isolation. The lack of financial support and limited resources impact FECDs' abilities to develop relationships in community, particularly with Indigenous communities and Elders (Clark & Drolet, 2014). This results in discrepancies in allocating available

resources to create effective practicum opportunities for social work students in Indigenous and non-Indigenous settings.

The literature suggests that FECDs are a vital and integral part of social work education yet simultaneously face a lack of resources and power. Moreover, due to the increasing workload of FECDs, a transformation in the structure of field education is crucial. FECDs must be involved in this transformation (Bogo, 2015). Transformative leadership in policy and programs, accompanied by appropriate funding, is essential to address the challenges facing field education (CSWE, 2015b).

TRANSFORMING THE FIELD EDUCATION LANDSCAPE (TFEL) PROJECT

The TFEL partnership brings together a diverse team of social work educators, researchers, and partners to address the crisis evident in the literature by creating new training and mentorship opportunities in field education for students. The project aims to assess the current state of social work field education in Canada and create opportunities for student research in developing new models of practice (Drolet & Harriman, 2020).

The goal of the TFEL project is:

“to integrate research and practice in the preparation of the next generation of social workers by developing partnered research training initiatives, both within academia and across the public and not-for-profit sectors, that enhance student research practice knowledge and applied skill development” (Drolet, 2020, p. 3).

The project has five main objectives:

1. To transform social work field education by bridging the gap between research and practice through joint training initiatives, projects, and other forms of multi-stakeholder engagement and integration;
2. To strengthen the recognition of the importance of social work practice research by building knowledge and skills among students, postdoctoral fellows, as well as current and future practitioners;
3. To train and mentor students and postdoctoral fellows through new partnered research training initiatives that build the research capacity of current and future social work scholars, practitioners and policymakers;
4. To support the development of sustainable models of field education through engaging students and postdoctoral fellows in research on promising practices in social work field education across Canada; and
5. To engage students and postdoctoral fellows in partnered knowledge mobilization and the multi-directional exchange of knowledge in Canada and internationally on promising practices for sustainable field education and practice research (TFEL, 2020).

The project is built on an inquiry-based learning and a transformational approach to create “opportunities for students and postdoctoral fellows to explore, identify, and develop promising practices for integrating research training in social work practice” (Drolet, 2020, p.7). The national survey is part of TFEL’s Stream 2 that includes various research activities to create new knowledge that will inform the development of sustainable field education models across Canada (Drolet, 2020).

METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS

The study's purpose was to learn about the range of administrative models, staffing patterns, and resources available to fulfill administrative functions, conduct and monitor field placements, and engage in field education. This study aimed to investigate the current gaps in field education and collect data from the perspectives of FECDs, who are in a unique position to share their perceptions of the institutional resources available given their key role in field education and social work education.

In Spring 2020, a survey link was emailed to all CASWE-ACFTS accredited field education programs at institutions in Canada. The survey consisted of a mixed method data collection to gather descriptive statistics on the demographics of the FECDs, staffing levels and students. It also provided FECDs the opportunity to provide qualitative responses on the current state of social work field education in BSW and MSW programs. The study included reflective questions on FECDs' views of staff ratios, workload expectations, and university faculty pressures. The survey consisted of 56 questions, including open-ended, multiple-choice and Likert scale. The survey was developed and distributed using the platform SurveyMonkey. The survey was piloted on a sample of FECDs to ensure it was applicable and appropriate in both English and French languages. Questions were translated professionally from English to French and reviewed for context. While surveys were emailed to all accredited programs, only one response per institution was requested to gain an accurate representation of a program and avoid over-representation from institutions with multiple programs. Research ethics approval was obtained by the University of Calgary's Research Ethics Board. In one school, the FECD was not granted permission by the Director to complete the survey. French responses to the survey were translated into English by research assistants using Google Translate.

The survey resulted in two data files – one for English responses and one for French responses. These were merged into a single Excel file. The data were carefully reviewed (e.g., cleaned) to remove surveys that were left entirely blank or to remove partially completed surveys if there was a more complete survey submitted by a respondent. The response rate was 90.7% as 39 of the 43 programs responded to the survey. This included 31 (79.5%) participants who fully completed the survey and 8 (20.5%) who partially completed the survey. Data were analyzed for descriptive statistics. Next, comparative analyses were completed for different questions based on one main question/topic, such as the number of students within each program. The results of the data analysis are presented in the next section.

FINDINGS

This section summarizes the findings from the survey, organized in the following categories: characteristic of the Field Education Coordinator and Director position, program details, practicum placement and staffing models, resources, and FECD activities.

Characteristics of the Field Education Coordinator and Director Position

This section sets out the findings on overall characteristics of FECDs, including employment type (full-time or part-time), position (faculty or administrative position), and contract type (tenure, contract, or sessional). Additional analyses explore characteristics of FECDs by program type and program size. The salaries of FECDs by years in social work education are also discussed.

In terms of FECD employment status by type of social work programs offered (e.g., only BSW, only MSW, and both BSW and MSW), most FECDs across all program types are full-time appointees. Most FECD, across all program types, are in administrative/professional (no faculty designation) positions and have a permanent contract type. Considering that most survey respondents work in institutions with both BSW and MSW programs, it should be noted that institutions offering both programs had the most variety in terms of FECD employment, position and contract type.

Table 1. Characteristics of Field Education Position by Program Type

Field Education Coordinator/Director Employment Status	Type of Program Offered		
	Only BSW	Only MSW	BSW and MSW
Employment Type (n=34)			
Full-time	7 (20.6%)	2 (5.9%)	18 (52.9%)
Part-time within a full-time appointment with other duties assigned	2 (5.9%)	-	4 (11.8%)
Part-time	-	-	1 (2.9%)
Total	9 (26.5%)	2 (5.9%)	23 (67.6%)
Position (n=34)			
Faculty (with clinical, practice or field designation)	1 (2.9%)	-	3 (8.8%)
Faculty with academic rank*	3 (8.8%)	-	7 (20.6%)
Administrative/professional (no faculty designation)	5 (14.7%)	2 (5.9%)	13 (38.2%)
Total	9 (26.5%)	2 (5.9%)	23 (67.6%)
Contract Type (n=31)			
Tenure track	3 (9.7%)	-	4 (12.9%)
Permanent contract	5 (16.1%)	2 (6.5%)	14 (45.2%)
Long-term contracted	-	-	1 (3.2%)
Contracted annually	-	-	1 (3.2%)
Sessional	-	-	1 (3.2%)
Total	8 (25.8%)	2 (6.5%)	21 (67.7%)

*Assistant professor, associate professor, professor, or instructor/senior instructor

With regards to characteristics of FECD employment status by the size of the social work program, or the relative number of students enrolled, most FECD across all the program sizes are in full-time employment, administrative/professional (no faculty designation) positions, and permanent contracts. After administrative/professional (no faculty designation), the second most common FECD position, in program sizes with 100 students or greater, is faculty with academic rank. The most variety in FECD employment, position and contract type are in institutions with 100-249 students in their social work program.

Table 2. Characteristics of Field Education Position by Program Size

Field Education Coordinator/Director Employment Status	Size of Social Work Program			
	Less than 100	100-249	250-499	500+
Employment Type (n=31)				
Full-time	5 (16.1%)	9 (29.0%)	8 (25.8%)	3 (9.7%)
Part-time within a full-time appointment with other duties assigned	2 (6.5%)	1 (3.2%)	-	2 (6.5%)
Part-time	-	1 (3.2%)	-	-
Total	7 (22.6%)	11 (35.4%**)	8 (25.8%)	5 (16.2%)
Position (n=31)				
Faculty (with clinical, practice or field designation)	2 (6.5%)	1 (3.2%)	1 (3.2%)	-
Faculty with academic rank*	1 (3.2%)	3 (9.7%)	2 (6.5%)	2 (6.5%)
Administrative/professional (no faculty designation)	4 (12.9%)	7 (22.6%)	5 (16.1%)	3 (9.6%)
Total	7 (22.6%)	11 (35.5%)	8 (25.8%)	5 (16.1%)
Contract Type (n=29)				
Tenure track	2 (6.9%)	2 (6.9%)	-	2 (6.9%)
Permanent contract	4 (13.8%)	7 (24.1%)	7 (24.1%)	3 (10.3%)
Long-term contracted	-	-	1 (3.5%)	-
Contracted annually	-	-	-	-
Sessional	-	1 (3.5%)	-	-
Total	6 (20.7%)	10 (34.5%)	8 (27.6%)	5 (17.2%)

*Assistant professor, associate professor, professor, or instructor/senior instructor

In general, the average years that FECD have been in their role at their current institution was similar to the survey respondents' average total years in the FECD role, which is slightly over six years. Interestingly, there was a wide range (from one year to 20 years) in survey respondents' years of involvement in social work education – this could include involvement in other roles such as field instructor or faculty liaison or sessional work. Regarding FECDs' salary, it appears there is a general increase in relation to the number of years involved in social work education.

Table 3. Field Education Position Salary by Years in Social Work Education

Salary (N=33)	Years in Social Work Education			
	10 or less	11 to 20	21 or more	Total
\$69,999 or less	5 (15.2%)	-	-	5 (15.2%)
\$70,000 - \$79,999	5 (15.2%)	2 (6.1%)	-	7 (21.2%)

\$80,000 - \$89,999	1 (3.0%)	3 (9.1%)	3 (9.1%)	7 (21.2%)
\$90,000 - \$99,999	2 (6.0%)	3 (9.1%)	-	5 (15.2%)
\$100,000 or more	1 (3.0%)	5 (15.2%)	3 (9.1%)	9 (27.2%)
Total	14 (42.4%)	13 (39.4%)	6 (18.2%)	33 (100.0%)

Program Details

Of the respondents, 25.6% offered BSW only, 7.7% offered MSW only, and 66.7% offer both BSW and MSW programs. The majority of programs were offered in English (74.4%) compared to French (25.6%). Programs varied in size, with most of the English-speaking institutions ranging from 100-249 students, and the French-speaking programs at slightly higher than 50% in the 250-499 students' range.

Programs that had less than 100 students enrolled in the program were more likely to offer BSW programs at 16.1% compared to both BSW and MSW programs at 6.4%. There were no MSW programs with less than 100 students. As the number of students enrolled in the program increased, it was more likely that BSW and MSW programs were being offered with program sizes 100-249 offering both BSW and MSW at 22.6%, 250-499 at 19.4%, and 500+ only offering BSW and MSW programs at 16.1%.

Fifty-six percent of the respondents reported that their institution did not offer online, distance, or blended program models. Out of the 44% institutions that did offer online, distance, or blended program models, only two respondents reported that they had separate or distinct field staff overlooking the blended model. Additionally, findings on program details revealed limitations in terms of models of programs offered, a variety of field placement settings, and staffing of the specialized models. Concerning the program content, 58% of respondents indicated that their program did not have content provided to students increasing awareness and knowledge of field instructorship. This finding suggests a lack of field instructorship content and the need to support, train and foster student's growth in this area of field education.

Table 4. Program Details by Program Type

Program Details	Type of Program Offered		
	Only BSW	Only MSW	BSW and MSW
Program Size (n=31)			
Less than 100	5 (16.1%)	0	2 (6.4%)
100-249	3(9.7%)	1 (3.2%)	7 (22.6%)
250-499	1 (3.2%)	1 (3.2%)	6 (19.4%)
500+	-	-	5 (16.1%)
Total	9 (29.0%)	2 (6.4%*)	20 (64.5%)
Program Language (n=39)			
English	7 (17.9%)	3 (7.7%)	19 (48.8%)
French	3 (7.7%)	-	7 (17.9%)
Total	10 (25.6%)	3 (7.7%)	26 (66.6%)

Practicum Placement and Staffing Models

When participants were asked to report on their core field team/department size, the highest average of individuals on a core team was reported under the full-time option as slightly less was part-time at half time, or 0.50, and the lowest and significantly less was part-time on a 0.8 schedule. When comparing this data with program size, the number of students corresponded to field team size, with bigger cohorts linked to bigger teams. Programs with 250-499 students reported the highest average for full-time and part-time (at about one fifth or 0.20).

Most FECDs reported having less than 1 FTE administrative assistant assigned to help with field education activities. As student numbers increased, the number of FTE administrative staff also increased, although not significantly. Of note, approximately a quarter of survey respondents whose social work programs have 499 students or less reported that there is no administrative assistant/office support staff assigned to field education. By comparison, institutions that had 250 students or greater noted that they have more than 1.0 FTE administrative assistants/office support assigned to field education.

Table 5. Staffing Size by Program Size

Staffing Size	Size of Social Work Program			
	Less than 100	100-249	250-499	500+
Average Size of Core Field Team/Department for Onsite Program (n= 35)				
Full-time	1.8	1.7	4.6	3.8
Part-time (0.80)	-	1.2	0.8	1
Part-time (0.50)	0.5	1.0	1.0	3.6
Part-time (0.20)	3.0	1.7	3.6	1.3
Administrative Assistants/Office Support Assigned to Field Education (n=31)				
None	1 (3.2%)	4 (12.9%)	3 (9.7%)	-
Less than 1.0 FTE	5 (16.1%)	4 (12.9%)	3 (9.7%)	1 (3.2%)
1.0 FTE	1 (3.2%)	3 (9.7%)	1 (3.2%)	3 (9.7%)
More than 1.0 FTE	-	-	1 (3.2%)	1 (3.2%)
Total	7 (22.6%)	11 (35.5%)	8 (25.8%)	5 (16.1%)

Regarding field education for programs with multiple campuses, there was not a general trend or theme, other than the response that there was at least one person, either full or part-time assigned to each campus. The majority of respondents (67.8%) stated that they used a faculty liaison model. From further comments in the open-ended sections, there was a trend of full-time faculty getting first choice of which section of field or which classes they wanted to teach. Additionally, the majority (64.5%) stated yes when asked if they use a sessional faculty liaison model.

For baccalaureate programs, the most common field placement was a year-long placement where students completed their practicum during the academic year with concurrent full-time coursework. For master's level programs, a more significant number of placements were not indicated in the question type, but a small minority were year-long or started during the winter block with few concurrent classes.

When asked to report the number of sessional instructors in field liaison roles for the “onsite” program, 1-5 sessionals were reported the most across all program sizes. When divided into program sizes, smaller programs of less than 100 students had the same findings. Whereas programs with over 500 students reported having 11 or more sessionals.

Table 6. Faculty Liaison Model by Program Size

Faculty Liaison Model	Size of Social Work Program				
	Less than 100	100-249	250-499	500+	Total
Program Model (n=31)					
Faculty Liaison Model (All Faculty Members)	6 (19.4%)	6 (19.4%)	5 (16.1%)	4 (12.9%)	21 (67.8%)
Faculty Liaison Model (Field Staff Members)	2 (6.5%)	4 (12.9%)	3 (9.7%)	1 (3.2%)	10 (32.3%)
Sessional Faculty Liaison Model	6 (19.4%)	5 (16.1%)	5 (16.1%)	4 (12.9%)	20 (64.5%)
“Blended” Model	5 (16.1%)	3 (9.7%)	2 (6.5%)	2 (6.5%)	12 (38.8%)
Number of Sessionals in Field Liaison Roles for Onsite Programs (n=28)					
0 Sessionals	2 (7.1%)	4 (14.3%)	2 (7.1%)	1 (3.6%)	9 (32.1%)
1-5 Sessional(s)	4 (14.3%)	4 (14.3%)	4 (14.3%)	1 (3.6%)	13 (46.5%)
6-10 Sessionals	-	1 (3.6%)	-	1 (3.6%)	2 (7.1%)
More than 1.0 FTE	-	1 (3.6%)	1 (3.6%)	2 (7.1%)	4 (14.3%)

Respondents were asked about the prevalence of unique placements. The responses, shown in Table 7, might suggest a trend towards more unique designs as well as disruptions to placements. These results could be related to FECD perspectives on the challenges to complete all of their tasks within regular hours of work (see section on Perspectives and Experiences of FECDs).

Table 7. Prevalence of Unique Placements

Percentage of Students in Field	Type of Unique Placements			
	Outside Business Hours (n=32)	Within Workplace (n=33)	Other Unique Designs (n=32)	Disrupted & Replaced (n=33)
Less than 6%	18 (56.3%)	24 (72.7%)	19 (59.4%)	24 (72.7%)
6-10%	8 (25.0%)	2 (6.1%)	7 (21.9%)	7 (21.2%)
11-20%	4 (12.5%)	7 (21.9%)	4 (12.5%)	2 (6.1%)
Above 20%	2 (6.3%)	-	2 (6.3%)	-

Resources

Fifty-nine percent of survey respondents reported that they do not believe field education receives adequate resources to sustain the increased demands in their program. Responses concerning staff to meet increasing enrollment depicted that in order to have an adequate level of support for onsite placements, on average, 2.9 FTE staff were required to support BSW programs, 1.8 FTE staff were required to support MSW programs and 2.5 FTE staff were required to support a combination of BSW and MSW programs. The range of adequate staff to support onsite placements ranged from 1.0 FTE to 12.0 FTE. Thirty percent of the responses stated that their social work program had more than 7.5

FTE staff assigned to any onsite field education function. In comparison, 65% of the responses stated that less than 2.4 FTE onsite staff were assigned to place or match students. Forty-seven percent of survey respondents reported that they had 5.5 or more FTE staff assigned to any onsite field education function. Thirty-seven percent of universities that support both BSW and MSW programs reported 5.5 or more FTE were assigned to any onsite field education function. Thirty-six percent of the survey responses reported less than 2.4 FTE staff assigned to place or match students in both BSW and MSW programs. FECD responses that only support BSW or MSW programs only had varying reports of how many staff supported field education functions. Comparatively, 26% of the responses reported that less than 2.4 FTE staff in the BSW programs were assigned to support placing or matching students.

Table 8. Number of FTE Positions by Program Size

Program Size	Number of Full-time Equivalent Positions			
	0-2.4 FTE	2.5-5.4 FTE	5.5-7.4 FTE	7.5+ FTE
Faculty/Staff Assigned to any Onsite Field Function (n=30)				
Less than 100	3 (10.0%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.3%)	-
100 - 249	2 (6.7%)	4 (13.3%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)
250 - 499	-	4 (13.3%)	2 (6.7%)	3 (10.0%)
500+	-	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)	3 (10.0%)
Unknown	-	-	-	2 (6.7%)
Total	5 (16.7%)	11 (36.7%)	5 (16.6%)	9 (30.0%)
Onsite Faculty/Staff Assigned to Place or Match Students (n=31)				
Less than 100	5 (16.1%)	-	1 (3.2%)	-
100 - 249	7 (22.6%)	3 (9.7%)	-	-
250 - 499	5 (16.1%)	4 (12.9%)	-	-
500+	2 (6.5%)	3 (9.7%)	-	-
Unknown	1 (3.2%)	-	-	-
Total	20 (64.5%)	10 (32.3%)	1 (3.2%)	-

Respondents were asked to report how many FTE faculty or staff members are assigned to any field education functions within “onsite” programs including administration, field advising, monitoring and supporting placements, and site visits. Personnel includes relevant teaching, research, and field faculty, including part-time and sessional faculty. Results were reported by BSW programs, MSW programs and institutions with both BSW and MSW programs. It is perhaps not surprising that programs including both BSW and MSW report having more FTEs. When respondents were then asked to identify how many FTEs of the “on-site” program match and place students in agencies, the number of FTEs dropped significantly across all program levels. When viewing the same data organized by the number of students in the program, the number of FTEs rose as did the number of students; however, the most commonly reported number of FTEs was still between 2.5-5.4. On-site faculty/staff assigned to place or match students was most reported in the lowest range. It was significantly less regardless of school size. When asked to report how many FTE’s would be an adequate number that would result in timely and effective placements for the onsite program, the BSW programs reported a higher mean (2.9) and a larger range (1-12) than MSW programs, suggesting that BSW programs are lacking more resources than MSW.

Comparing the FTEs to student ratio, the findings suggested that MSW programs had more FTEs for fewer students. This finding is in line with our literature review from the CSWE (2015b) report suggesting that more resources are allocated for MSW programs.

Table 9. Number of FTE Positions by Program Type

Program Type	Number of FTE Positions		
	Less than 2.4	2.5-5.4	5.5 or more
Faculty/Staff Assigned to any Onsite Field Function (n=30)			
BSW	3 (10.0%)	4 (13.3%)	2 (6.7%)
MSW	1 (3.3%)	-	1 (3.4%)
Both BSW and MSW	1 (3.4%)	7 (23.3%)	11 (36.7%)
Total	5 (16.7%)	11 (36.7%)	14 (46.7%)
Onsite Faculty/Staff Assigned to Place or Match Students (n=31)			
BSW	8 (25.8%)	-	1 (3.2%)
MSW	1 (3.2%)	1 (3.3%)	-
Both BSW and MSW	11 (35.5%)	9 (29.0%)	-
Total	20 (64.5%)	10 (32.3%)	1 (3.2%)

To support increased student enrollment and student demands for field placements, FECDs are also responsible for building collaborative relationships with field agencies that will support student placements. The top 3 collaborative relationships reported by FECDs are with provincial health agencies (77%, n=24), local organizations (68%, n=21) and government ministries (61%, n=19). FECDs reported a diverse array of agencies in these three sectors, where they established several collaborative relationships. Examples of these agencies were child welfare agencies, provincial health organizations, schools and non-government organizations. Only 29% (n=9) of FECDs reported that they had collaborative relationships with their province’s regulatory bodies. About half the respondents reported collaborative relationships with a professional body (52%, n=16). Similarly, 52% (n=16) reported collaborative relationships with regional organizations. These collaborative relationships are essential for creating student field placements and improving the willingness of these agencies to create student placements.

Table 10. Type of Collaborative Partnerships by Prevalence

Collaborative Partnerships	Number of Responses (n=31)
Provincial Health	24 (77.4%)
Local Organizations	21 (68.0%)
Government Ministries	19 (61.3%)
Regional Organizations	16 (51.6%)
Professional Body	16 (51.6%)
Regulatory Body	9 (29.0%)

FECD Activities

Field Education Coordinators and Directors are responsible for a wide array of activities that range from developing field manuals to student’s retention and supporting student career planning. The survey highlighted 41 different tasks and responsibilities that were specific to field education. For the

full list of FECD activities and survey responses, see Appendix C. These activities are not an exhaustive list of activities conducted by FECD, but activities specifically asked in the survey.

The top five most common activities for which FECDs were responsible are: developing field manuals; building relationships with agencies; participating in policy development; advising students on field education-related matters; and participating in social work program committees. Over 85% of the 33 responses to the survey stated that they were responsible for those activities as part of their university role.

On the other hand, the top five least common activities that FECDs reported are: teaching social work courses other than field education; scholarly research, publications, and presentations; advising students on course selection, degree requirements, and/or career planning; administration of field education awards; and participating in student retention processes. Less than 50% of the survey responses reported that they were responsible for those activities.

The vast difference in responsibilities between FECDs across the multiple social work programs in Canada captures versatility and diversity of field roles. In addition to these responsibilities, FECDs have reported other responsibilities like academic responsibility, operational responsibility, community engagement, student admissions, course planning, supporting faculty who supervise internships and seminars, coordinating internships, and program management.

Table 11. Type of FECD Activities by Frequency

Type of Activity	Number of Responses (n=33)
Most Frequent FECD Activities	
Developing field manual	31 (93.9%)
Relationship building with agencies	31 (93.9%)
Participating in policy development	30 (90.9%)
Advising students on field education-related matters	30 (90.9%)
Participation on social work program committees	29 (87.9%)
Least Frequent FECD Activities	
Teaching social work courses other than field education	10 (30.3%)
Scholarly research, publications and presentations	11 (33.3%)
Advising students on course selection, degree requirements and/or career planning	11 (33.3%)
Administration of field education awards	13 (39.4%)
Participation in student retention processes	15 (45.5%)

This report examined the range of activities FECDs were responsible for correlated to the size of the social work program. Out of 29 responses from FECDs, an average of 29 field related activities were reported, although the number of activities ranged from a minimum of 12 activities to a maximum of 40. University programs that hosted 100-249 students reported the highest range of activities, 18 to 38, with the average being 30 activities. In comparison, of 25 survey responses from other field faculty (such as professional/administrative staff), an average of 21 field related activities were reported, ranging from a minimum of 3 field activities to a maximum of 38 activities. The disproportionate amount of responsibilities and activities demonstrate the workload differences

between FECDs and other field team members. In some cases, FECDs reported that they did not have a faculty team or other staff to support field responsibilities and activities.

Table 12. Number of FECD Activities by Program Size

Program Size	Number of FECD Activities			
	Responses (n)	Average (mean)	Minimum	Maximum
FECD Activities (n=29)				
Less than 100	7 (24.1%)	28.4	13	40
100 - 249	10 (34.5%)	30.0	18	38
250 - 499	7 (24.1%)	27.4	22	33
500+	5 (17.3%)	28.4	12	37
Total/Average	29 (100.0%)	28.6	16.3	37
Field Faculty or Administrative Staff Activities (n=25)				
Less than 100	5 (20.0%)	17.4	12	27
100 - 249	7 (28.0%)	20.7	3	38
250 - 499	8 (32.0%)	20.6	10	31
500+	5 (20.0%)	23.6	9	37
Total	25 (100.0%)	20.6	8.5	33.3

PERSPECTIVES AND EXPERIENCES OF FECD


Survey respondents were given a series of 25 statements about their experiences as FECDs and asked to indicate their level of agreement on a 7-point Likert-style (“strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “somewhat disagree”, “somewhat agree,” “agree”, “strongly agree,” and “not applicable”). For ease of interpretation and presentation, Table 13 below shows responses to all 25 items by the combined “Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree,” the combined “strongly agree/agree/somewhat Agree,” and “not applicable.” For detailed responses to the 25 statements, please refer to Appendix B.

Following the full presentation, the 25 statements are further analyzed by theme. They are grouped into four themes: field education resources, including staffing and time; finding and establishing field placements; issues of students in the field; and relationships with field agencies.

Table 13. FECD Perceptions on the State of Social Work Field Education

Statement	■ Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree ■ Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree ■ N/A
1. Field education receives adequate resources overall, including staffing, financial resources, technology, and technical support, for its programs and operations at my institution.	
2. Field education staffing levels in my school/program are adequate to address fully the responsibilities of overseeing field education.	
3. Having enough appropriate placements for the number of students admitted to this social work program is a significant, ongoing challenge.	
4. Pressures to increase student enrollment at my institution have affected the field education process, including identifying and providing appropriate placements for students.	
5. Because of large numbers of students, it is sometimes necessary to place students in field education settings that we would otherwise not choose to use.	
6. The field team has adequate staffing resources to ensure that placements provide the full range of expected learning activities and experiences.	
7. The region where we place students has adequate placement opportunities to provide the full range of expected learning activities and experiences.	
8. Locating appropriate placements based on the range of skills and preparation of students admitted to this institution is very time-consuming.	
9. Given the range of expectations for the field director/coordinator and field staff, locating appropriate placements regularly results in work performed for the functioning of the field office by the director/coordinator well beyond the recognized work hours of the day, week, month, or year.	

Statement	■ Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree ■ Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree ■ N/A
10. Given the range of expectations for the field director/coordinator and field staff, it is difficult to find the time to do everything that is needed.	
11. Out of necessity, the field team often utilizes non-BSW or non-MSW supervisors to supervise students in field education.	
12. Most community agencies are committed to providing quality field instruction on an ongoing basis.	
13. Field education opportunities depend heavily upon the willingness of agencies and their social workers to provide voluntarily field instruction.	
14. At my school/program, the number of students admitted is considered in relation to the number of field education opportunities typically available for students in a given year in this geographic area.	
15. Student performance problems in field education are treated very similarly to classroom performance problems in my program's retention and advancement policies and practices.	
16. Student performance problems, in both classroom and field, are addressed at my institution to the degree that is commensurate with the circumstances presented by the student.	
17. It is difficult to cultivate new field placement opportunities because of the range of responsibilities assigned to/expected of the director/coordinator of field education.	
18. It is difficult to cultivate new field placement opportunities because of the complexity of students' needs and requests related to field education, often necessitating the design of unique and individualized placement experiences.	
19. Student safety is addressed to a sufficient degree.	
20. Within the past five years, it seems that agencies have been struggling to provide field instruction, as agency budgets have been cut and staff positions lost.	
21. Within the past five years, placement disruptions due to changes in agency staffing or funding have become more common.	
22. Within the past five years, placement disruptions due to lack of student readiness and/or student difficulties have become more common.	
23. My school/program is developing partnerships with community agencies to enhance collaboration in field education from year to year.	
24. My school/program enjoys strong support from community agencies for many or most aspects of field education.	

Statement	■ Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree ■ Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree ■ N/A
25. Institutional priorities provide incentives for full-time, tenure track teaching and research faculty members (beyond those already assigned to field education functions) to participate in field education functions.	





Field education resources, including staffing and time




This section analyzes the statements pertaining to field education resources (statements 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 25). There was moderate disagreement (strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree), at 59.4% and 56.3% (statements 1 and 2), that overall resources and staffing levels were adequate for field education programs and responsibilities. An overwhelming majority of respondents agreed on some level (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree), at 84.4% (statement 8), that locating appropriate placements was very time-consuming. The lack of time and the overwhelming demands of the FECD role were reflected in the majority of respondents agreeing on some level that they worked well beyond the bounds of their workdays (75.0% agreement for statement 9), and that it was difficult to find the time to do everything required of them (71.9% agreement for statement 10).

Interestingly, 65.6% of respondents agreed on some level that the field team has adequate staffing resources to ensure that placements provide the full range of expected learning activities and experiences (statement 6). Although these statements may seem contradictory, statement 6 may have been interpreted to mean that, despite being stretched in resources, time, and staffing levels, the field team was able to draw on the resources in creative ways to provide a complete learning experience for students in field.

The final item in this thematic section addressed incentivizing tenure track teaching and research faculty members to participate in field education (statement 25). Most respondents disagreed on some level, at 65.6%, that their institutions provided incentives for tenure track teaching and/or research faculty members to be involved in field education.

Table 14. FECD Perceptions on Field Education Resources, Staffing, and Time

Statement	■ Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree ■ Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree ■ N/A
1. Field education receives adequate resources overall, including staffing, financial resources, technology, and technical support, for its programs and operations at my institution.	
2. Field education staffing levels in my school/program are adequate to address fully the responsibilities of overseeing field education.	
6. The field team has adequate staffing resources to ensure that placements provide the full range of expected learning activities and experiences.	
8. Locating appropriate placements based on the range of skills and preparation of students admitted to this institution is very time-consuming.	

Statement	■ Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree ■ Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree ■ N/A
9. Given the range of expectations for the field director/coordinator and field staff, locating appropriate placements regularly results in work performed for the functioning of the field office by the director/coordinator well beyond the recognized work hours of the day, week, month, or year.	
10. Given the range of expectations for the field director/coordinator and field staff, it is difficult to find the time to do everything that is needed.	
25. Institutional priorities provide incentives for full-time, tenure track teaching and research faculty members (beyond those already assigned to field education functions) to participate in field education functions.	

Finding and establishing field placements

This section analyzes the statements pertaining to identifying, establishing, and matching students with field placements (statements 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 14, 17, and 18). An overwhelming majority of respondents agreed on some level, at 87.5% (statement 3), that having enough appropriate placements for the number of students admitted to their program was a significant and ongoing challenge. Slightly more than half agreed (56.3% agreement for statement 4) that pressures to increase student enrollment at their institution have affected the field education process, including identifying and providing appropriate placements for students.

As further evidence that pressures to increase enrollment have affected the field education process, 75.0% of respondents agreed that it was sometimes necessary to place students in settings they would not otherwise choose because of large numbers of students (statement 5). Moreover, the majority of respondents agreed that they utilize non-BSW or non-MSW supervisors to supervise students in field education out of necessity (65.6% agreement for statement 11). Also related to enrollment pressures is 56.3% disagreement that the number of students admitted was considered in relation to the number of field education opportunities typically available (statement 14), suggesting a lack of consultation with the field team prior to increasing enrollment.

Recall that 65.6% of respondents agreed on some level that the field team has adequate staffing resources to ensure that placements provide the full range of expected learning activities and experiences (statement 6). In a similar vein, despite the challenges with increased student numbers set out above, the majority of respondents agreed that the region where they placed students had adequate placement opportunities to provide the full range of expected learning activities and experiences (62.5% agreement for statement 7).

The final two statements in this thematic section related to the complexity of cultivating new placements. For both statements (17 & 18), 68.8% agreed on some level that it was difficult cultivating new placements due to the range of FECD responsibilities and due to complex student needs/demands that often required unique and individualized placement designs.

Table 15. FECD Perceptions on Finding Field Placements

Statement	■ Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree ■ Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree ■ N/A
3. Having enough appropriate placements for the number of students admitted to this social work program is a significant, ongoing challenge.	
4. Pressures to increase student enrollment at my institution have affected the field education process, including identifying and providing appropriate placements for students.	
5. Because of large numbers of students, it is sometimes necessary to place students in field education settings that we would otherwise not choose to use.	
7. The region where we place students has adequate placement opportunities to provide the full range of expected learning activities and experiences.	
11. Out of necessity, the field team often utilizes non-BSW or non-MSW supervisors to supervise students in field education.	
14. At my school/program, the number of students admitted is considered in relation to the number of field education opportunities typically available for students in a given year in this geographic area.	
17. It is difficult to cultivate new field placement opportunities because of the range of responsibilities assigned to/expected of the director/coordinator of field education.	
18. It is difficult to cultivate new field placement opportunities because of the complexity of students' needs and requests related to field education, often necessitating the design of unique and individualized placement experiences.	

Issues of students in field

This section analyzes the statements pertaining to student issues in field placements (statements 15, 16, 19, and 22). The first two statements related to student performance problems. There is moderate disagreement, at 56.3% (statement 15), that student performance problems in field education were treated similarly to classroom performance. However, the majority of respondents agreed, at 81.3% (statement 16), that student performance problems in classroom and field are appropriately addressed. The vast majority of respondents also agreed that student safety is addressed sufficiently (87.5% agreement for statement 19). Of concern is the final statement in this thematic section, with 71.9% of respondents agreeing on some level that placement disruptions due to lack of student readiness and/or student difficulties have become more common in the past five years (statement 22).

Table 16. FECD Perceptions on Student Issues in Field

Statement	■ Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree ■ Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree ■ N/A
15. Student performance problems in field education are treated very similarly to classroom performance problems in my program's retention and advancement policies and practices.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 56.3%; background-color: #e91e63; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 34.4%; background-color: #4db6ac; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 9.4%; background-color: #545454; height: 15px;"></div> </div>
16. Student performance problems, in both classroom and field, are addressed at my institution to the degree that is commensurate with the circumstances presented by the student.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 12.5%; background-color: #e91e63; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 81.3%; background-color: #4db6ac; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 6.2%; background-color: #545454; height: 15px;"></div> </div>
19. Student safety is addressed to a sufficient degree.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 12.5%; background-color: #e91e63; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 87.5%; background-color: #4db6ac; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 0%; background-color: #545454; height: 15px;"></div> </div>
22. Within the past five years, placement disruptions due to lack of student readiness and/or student difficulties have become more common.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 25.0%; background-color: #e91e63; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 71.9%; background-color: #4db6ac; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 3.1%; background-color: #545454; height: 15px;"></div> </div>

Relationships with field agencies

This section analyzes the statements pertaining relationships with and challenges relating to field agencies (statements 12, 13, 20, 21, 23, and 24). This section has by far the highest levels of agreement.

The majority of respondents agreed that most community agencies were committed to providing quality field placements (87.5% agreement for statement 12), and the majority responded receiving strong support from community agencies for many or most aspects of field education (90.6% agreement on statement 24). Most also agreed that field education opportunities depended heavily on the willingness of agencies and their social workers to provide voluntarily field instruction (93.8% agreement for statement 13). It would thus follow that the majority of programs were invested in developing partnerships with community agencies to enhance collaboration in field education (84.4% agreement for statement 23).

Almost all respondents, at 90.6% (statement 20), agreed that agencies have been struggling to provide field instruction due to budget cuts in the past five years. Moreover, 87.5% of respondents agreed that placement disruptions due to changes in agency staffing or funding have become more common in the past five years (statement 21).

Table 17. FECD Perceptions on Field Agencies

Statement	■ Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree ■ Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree ■ N/A
12. Most community agencies are committed to providing quality field instruction on an ongoing basis.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 9.4%; background-color: #e91e63; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 87.5%; background-color: #4db6ac; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 3.1%; background-color: #545454; height: 15px;"></div> </div>
13. Field education opportunities depend heavily upon the willingness of agencies and their social workers to provide voluntarily field instruction.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 93.8%; background-color: #4db6ac; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 6.2%; background-color: #545454; height: 15px;"></div> </div>
20. Within the past five years, it seems that agencies have been struggling to provide field instruction, as	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 90.6%; background-color: #4db6ac; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="width: 9.4%; background-color: #545454; height: 15px;"></div> </div>

Statement	<p>■ Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree</p> <p>■ Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree ■ N/A</p>						
agency budgets have been cut and staff positions lost.							
21. Within the past five years, placement disruptions due to changes in agency staffing or funding have become more common.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td> <td>3.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree</td> <td>87.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>9.4%</td> </tr> </table>	Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree	3.1%	Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree	87.5%	N/A	9.4%
Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree	3.1%						
Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree	87.5%						
N/A	9.4%						
23. My school/program is developing partnerships with community agencies to enhance collaboration in field education from year to year.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td> <td>15.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree</td> <td>84.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </table>	Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree	15.6%	Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree	84.4%	N/A	0%
Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree	15.6%						
Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree	84.4%						
N/A	0%						
24. My school/program enjoys strong support from community agencies for many or most aspects of field education.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td> <td>9.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree</td> <td>90.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </table>	Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree	9.4%	Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree	90.6%	N/A	0%
Somewhat Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree	9.4%						
Strongly Agree/Agree/Somewhat Agree	90.6%						
N/A	0%						

THEMES FROM THE SURVEY

Three major themes emerged from the examination of the 2020 State of Social Work Field Education Survey responses: the need for more resources, difficulties finding field placements, and community partnerships.

In the State of Social Work Field Education Survey, FECDs expressed their concern about not having enough resources, including time, to meet the needs of the increasing number of students requiring field placements in their social work programs. FECDs express a lack of resources such as staffing, technology, and technical support for social work programs and operations; these resources are limited by allocated funding. With the lack of resources available, FECDs found it difficult to cultivate new field placement opportunities, given the range of responsibilities assigned to or expected from FECDs. FECDs are also finding it difficult to do everything that they are assigned or expected to do. As a result, FECDs often find themselves going over their recognized work hours, locating appropriate placements, and are not recognized or appreciated for their work in social work programs.

FECDs have also stated that they find it challenging to find appropriate field placements for students due to several factors that include an increased demand and enrollment of students in social work programs for field placements. Among this increase in student enrollment, placement disruptions are also common due to staffing or funding changes. FECDs state that it is challenging to secure field placements because of the limited number of social workers in the field who are willing to be field instructors, as this is heavily dependent upon the willingness of agencies and their social workers to provide voluntarily field instruction. Field instructors must set aside time from their work to supervise and mentor students, and social workers in the field may not have the time or energy to take on a social work student. There is also increased competition between social work programs and other professions seeking student placements, making finding appropriate placements even more difficult. Due to the global COVID-19 pandemic, an additional layer of difficulty is added to FECDs, as field placements and community partnerships are hesitant to take social work students due to health safety concerns. Because of this, many FECDs must come up with alternative practicum opportunities such as self-directed, faculty-led, or research-based practica for students who are unable to find traditional in-person agency-based placements or for students who feel more comfortable working remotely.

These major themes indicate the need to look at these challenges and themes more closely and for institutions to carefully evaluate how resources such as funding, time, and staff are being allocated to field education. In addition to resources, the major theme of placement difficulties helps bring awareness to potential areas of research and development for new mentorship models, new ways of establishing and sustaining community partnerships, and encouraging social workers in the field to become field instructors. Greater awareness of these issues and challenges in social work field education can help inform a plan for change through future research and policy development in institutions across Canada.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2020 Canadian State of Social Work Field Education National Survey helped us understand the current state of social work field education. Some of the areas that this national survey focused on include the roles and responsibilities of FECDs, field education placements, resources for FECDs and students, and the perceptions of FECDs on their role and the state of field education. This survey helped us understand the areas that need attention, such as existent strengths and weaknesses in Canada's current field education landscape. Based on the survey's responses and findings, some recommendations for social work programs, social work educators, and FECDs include:

- Further assess and monitor the state of social work field education. This can be achieved through an ongoing and collaborative partnership with CASWE-ACFTS accredited universities.
- Examine effective FECD and field education staffing models that can help support student learning and community partners is required. Additionally, models that consider the amount of available funding would be beneficial.
 - Assessment of FECDs' roles and responsibilities in field education and develop new resources, tools, and training for FECDs, so they can support students and community partnerships.
 - Creating opportunities for FECDs in leadership and management.
- Develop innovative and sustainable models in social work field education, as the current one-on-one mentorship model is unsustainable.
 - Examining and integrating more online/remote field placements
 - Integrating practice research into field placements
 - Engaging in new models of learning like near-peer mentorship
- Create resources and enhance learning opportunities for field placements in social work curriculum, for students preparing for field placement, or who are already in a field placement.
- Investigate and understand the student's perspective and need in a field placement. Additionally, investigate and understand the perspective and need of community partnerships.
- Collaborate with social work accreditation bodies or regulatory bodies to create more interest and opportunities for social workers in the field to become field instructors.
- Investigate sustainable and innovative practices related to social work field education.
- Build awareness of the current state of social work field education in Canada and collaborate with essential stakeholders to address this current crisis.
- Review the voluntary 'non-paid' field instructorship and student practicum model.
- Review, investigate, and reflect on Indigenous field education and anti-racist models or elaborate on the crisis of racism in social work field education.

Since the research for the current state of field education in Canada is in its early stages, implementing these recommendations will require commitment and collaboration with multiple stakeholders, partners, CASWE-ACFTS accredited universities, FECDs, Canadian social work regulatory bodies, and many others. The TFEL study findings have the potential to not only inform the changes in mentorship models in field education, but also policy development and staffing models in social work institutions across Canada. More research and information are required to understand how to cultivate an innovative and sustainable social work field education for the future.

THE POSITIONED RESEARCHER – REFLECTIONS FROM THE STUDENT TEAM

As members of the study team, student researchers and social work students had the opportunity to develop our understanding of field education from the perspectives of FECDs and our field experiences. The limited opportunities and challenges with finding a practicum placement have created anxiety and stress for students because of the need to balance learning with future aspirations. Our experiences with FECDs have shown us how intense and challenging it can be to find a placement. However, after contributing to this study and report, each of us has developed a sense of understanding, appreciation and empathy for the hardship, creativity, and ambition FECDs bring to social work programs. FECDs are essential figures in improving and implementing field education as the signature pedagogy for social work. We believe that the information presented in this report should be distributed across Canada to faculty and students to help advocate for FECDs and bring awareness to the challenges and difficulties they experience. Since each of us has experienced this growth in understanding, we hope that current and future generations of social workers can also support FECDs in developing innovation and sustainability for field education. We hope this report will inspire social workers to consider the importance of field instructorship in creating opportunities for future students to gain insight, knowledge and skills in the social work profession.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study is specific to the Canadian context, capturing only CASWE-ACFTS accredited universities; the findings should not be generalized to social work certificate/diploma programs or programs in other countries. Additionally, there was a small sample size as the survey only had 39 respondents, with only 31 of the surveys fully complete; four social work schools did not answer the survey, and eight responses were incomplete, and the findings may not reflect all social work programs in Canada. On the other hand, it is important to recognize that the 39 respondents were invited to represent their social work field education program. Some institutions had multiple FECDs or field staff who integrated their answers to submit one single response per institution. As a result, surveys might reflect the combined experiences of all field staff in an institution or the personal experience of the individual who completed it. Furthermore, French responses did not always correspond to the English titles of field instructors, liaisons, and coordinators/directors. Even in English, some schools had titles such as “field education manager” that did not correspond to specific field education roles within the literature. The questions and context may have also created difficulties in respondents understanding a question, as some suggested. FECDs had the opportunity to explain some of their answers further, and as such, certain values in this report were inferred based on their explanations. Given that the survey was conducted during COVID-19, some of the results may reflect the changes during the pandemic that are not the norm for placements. For example, the survey queried whether their program is online and some may have been answered yes with necessary pandemic changes where they usually would not have offered programs online. Some of the findings in the survey were inferred by interpreting open-ended responses. Finally, this National Survey does not address newer Indigenous field education and anti-racist models or elaborate on other issues in field education such as the "crisis of racism" in social work field education. This is a topic that can be further investigated and reflected upon as strategies to make social work field education more inclusive & diverse.

The findings presented in this report will be compared with the CSWE (2015b) survey results in the US for cross-national comparison. There is a crucial need to conduct research on social work field education. Additional future research topics could include understanding social work field education from the perspectives of students, field instructors, other non-FEC social work educators, and community partners. Further research into the details of online/blended social work programs and best practices could be relevant, especially given the increase in online/remote field education due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Finally, research should continue to evaluate and share promising and wise practices within social work field education.

CONCLUSION

This report brings forth the voices and perspectives of FECDs in social work education programs who responded to the National Survey to increase awareness, knowledge and understanding of the state of field education in Canada. FECDs responded to survey questions regarding FECD demographics, activities, field education programs, administrative models, staffing and resources at their institutions.

Despite limitations, some findings from the survey supported other literature findings and revealed some that were unique to the Canadian context. Field education is an essential component of social work education; however, many factors contribute to the challenges faced by stakeholders in field education in the context of neoliberalism. Some common FECDs' responses on the challenges in field education include changes in agency staffing and funding, complex needs of students, and increasing difficulty in finding field placements.

The TFEL project supported this study and the student research assistants who collected and analyzed the survey data. It is hoped that the information from this report will add to the wealth of information and promising and wise practices being collected and generated from other training, mentorship, and research initiatives in the TFEL project. It is critical to widely share the results of the study to build awareness and understanding of the current state of field education in Canada as well as engage in a concerted effort to bring together Canadian social work education programs, key decision-makers, and stakeholders to support the development of more sustainable models of field education.

REFERENCES

- Asakura, K., Todd, S., Eagle, B., & Morris, B. (2018). Strengthening the signature pedagogy of social work: Conceptualizing field coordination as a negotiated social work pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 38*(2), 151-165.
- Ayala, J., Drolet, J., Fulton, A., Hewson, J., Letkemann, L., Baynton, M., Elliott, G., Judge-Stasiak, A., Blaug, C., Gerard Tetreault, A., & Schweizer, E. (2017). Field education in crisis: Experiences of field education coordinators in Canada. *Social Work Education, 37*(3), 281-293.
- Ayala, J., Drolet, J., Fulton, A., Hewson, J., Letkemann, L., Baynton, M., Elliott, G., Judge-Stasiak, A., Blaug, C., Gerard Tetreault, A., & Schweizer, E. (2018). Restructuring social work field education in 21st Century Canada: From crisis management to sustainability. *Canadian Social Work Review / Revue Canadienne De Service Social, 35*(2), 45-66.
- Bogo, M. (2006). Field instruction in social work: A review of the research literature. *The Clinical Supervisor, 24*(1-2), 163-193. https://doi.org/10.1300/j001v24n01_09
- Bogo, M. (2015). Field education for clinical social work practice: Best practices and contemporary challenges. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 43*(3), 317-324.
- Buck, P. W., Bradley, J., Robb, L., & Kirzner, R. S. (2012). Complex and competing demands in field education: A qualitative study of field directors' experiences. *Field Educator, 2*(2), 1-17. <https://fielddeducator.simmons.edu/article/complex-and-competing-demands-in-field-education/>
- Canadian Association of Social Workers (CASW). (2005). *Code of Ethics*. https://www.casw-acts.ca/sites/default/files/attachements/casw_code_of_ethics.pdf
- Canadian Association for Social Work Education (CASWE). (2014). *Standards for accreditation*. <https://caswe-acfts.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/CASWE-ACFTS.Standards-11-2014-1.pdf>
- Charles, G., Barring, V., & Lake, S. (2011). What's in it for us? Making the case for interprofessional field education experiences for social work students. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 31*(5), 579-593. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2011.615265>
- Clark, N., & Drolet, J. (2014). "Melq'ilwiye" coming together: Reflections on the journey towards Indigenous social work field education. *Currents: Scholarship in the Human Services, 13*(1), 1-21.
- Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). (2015a). *Educational policy and accreditation standards for baccalaureate and master's social work programs*. https://www.cswe.org/getattachment/Accreditation/Accreditation-Process/2015-EPAS/2015EPAS_Web_FINAL.pdf.aspx
- Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). (2015b). *State of Field Education Survey*. <https://www.cswe.org/CMSPages/GetFile.aspx?guid=05519d2d-7384-41fe-98b8-08a21682ed6e>
- Drolet, J. (2020, May). A new partnership: Transforming the field education landscape – Intersections of research and practice in Canadian social work field education. *Field Educator, 10* (1). <https://fielddeducator.simmons.edu/article/transforming-the-field-education-landscape/>
- Drolet, J., & Harriman, K. (2020). A conversation on a new Canadian social work field education and research collaboration initiative. *Field Educator, 10*(1)(Spring 2020). https://fielddeducator.simmons.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Conversation_10.1-1.pdf
- Garthwait, C.L. (2015). Social work education: A vehicle for innovative practice. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 5*(9), 798-803.

- George, P., Siver, S., & Preston, S. (2013). Reimagining field education in social work: The promise unveiled. *Advances in Social Work, 14*(2), 642-657. <https://doi.org/10.18060/2440>
- Greenblatt, A., Muskat, B., & Perlman, I. (2018). 10 years later... Are rotational field placements working?. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 47*(1), 43-52.
- Hewson, J. A., Walsh, C. A., & Bradshaw, C. (2010). Enhancing social work research education through research field placements. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 3*(9), 7-15. <https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v3i9.230>
- Jennissen, T., & Lundy, C. (2011). *One hundred years of social work: A history of the profession in English Canada, 1900–2000*. Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Kilpatrick, A. C., Turner, J. B., & Holland, T. P. (1994). Quality control in field education: Monitoring students' performance. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 9*(1-2), 107-120. https://doi.org/10.1300/j067v09n01_08
- Macdonald, L. (2013). Making the invisible visible: A workload study on the role of field education coordinators in Canada. *Canadian Social Work, 15*(1), 60-73.
- Mooney, H., Dale, M., & Hay, K. (2020). Qualitative research: Quality social work placements for Maori social work students. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work, 32*(3), 54.
- Raskin, M. S., Wayne, J., & Bogo, M. (2008). Revisiting field education standards. *Journal of Social Work Education, 44*(2), 173-188. <https://doi.org/10.5175/jswe.2008.200600142>
- Robertson, J. S. (2013). Addressing professional suitability in social work education: Results of a study of field education coordinators' experience. *The Journal of Practice Teaching and Learning, 11*(3), 98-117. doi: 10.14288/1.0064604
- Roulson, I., Nguyen, C., Huckwell, I., Pakstas, M. (2020). *Promising, wise, and innovative practices in social work field education* [unpublished manuscript].
- Sowbel, L. R. (2012). Gatekeeping: Why shouldn't we be ambivalent? *Journal of Social Work Education, 48*(1), 27-44. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41705846>
- Todd, S., & Schwartz, K. (2009). Thinking through quality in field education: Integrating alternative and traditional learning opportunities. *Social Work Education, 28*(4), 380-395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470902808326>
- Transforming the Field Education Landscape (TFEL). (2020). *About the TFEL Project*. <https://tfelproject.com>
- Wayne, J., Bogo, M., & Raskin, M. (2006). Field notes: The need for radical change in field education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 42*(1), 161-169. <https://doi.org/10.5175/jswe.2006.200400447>
- Wayne, J., Bogo, M., & Raskin, M. (2010). Field education as the signature pedagogy of social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 46*(3), 327-339. <https://doi.org/10.5175/jswe.2010.200900043>

APPENDIX A – SURVEY QUESTIONS

Informed Consent to "State of Field" Survey of Field Education: Administrative Models, Staffing, and Resources, 2020.

This study has been approved by the University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board. This survey meets standards for human subject protections. Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and will not affect your relationship with the TFEL partnership. By choosing to continue in this survey, you note your understanding of these protections. If you wish to decline participation in the survey, you may simply exit the survey. This survey may take 40 minutes to complete. There are no anticipated risks to participating in this survey. Participants may prefer to begin the survey, stop, and return to the survey later.

The purpose of this study is to gain clarity about the range of administrative models, staffing patterns, and resources available and being utilized to fulfill administrative functions, conduct field placement and monitoring, and engage in the academic and practice communities in the field offices of schools and departments of social work accredited by CASWE across Canada.

The survey includes questions about models of administration, staffing, and resources available and utilized at each participant's institution, as well as perceptions of how social work field education is currently situated in the larger community environment, aspects of which may impact administration, staffing, and resources. General demographic data are also requested.

Information collected through this survey will be kept confidential except for aggregated data sets that allow analysis and communication of results. Responses will be aggregated into data sets, such as geographic region and school size; individual responses will not be identifiable or available to parties other than the TFEL researchers.

Introduction

This survey seeks to gather information from field directors/coordinators of field education from BSW and MSW programs. To aid in clarity of analysis, only one survey response is requested per institution. Many schools have both BSW and MSW programs and separate field education staffs. If this applies to your institution, you and your colleagues may combine your answers to reflect both perspectives.

Accessibility for persons with disabilities: This electronic survey is compatible with most screen reading technology. Google's ChromeVox is one option, but other screen reading programs can be used.

The online survey is being administered by SurveyMonkey®, an American software company. As such, your responses are subject to U.S. laws, including the USA Patriot Act. The risks associated with participation are minimal and similar to those associated with many e-mail programs, such as Hotmail® and social utilities spaces, such as Facebook® and MySpace®.

If you have any questions, please contact Julie Drolet (jdrolet@ucalgary.ca).

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Julie Drolet

Project Director, Transforming the Field Education Landscape (TFEL)

Professor, Faculty of Social Work, University of Calgary

Institution Name: _____

Background Information

Please select the option that best describes you.

- Woman
- Man
- Gender fluid, non-binary, and/or Two-Spirit
- I prefer not to answer

What is your year of birth?

- _____ (YYYY)
- I prefer not to answer

Do you identify as Indigenous; that is First Nation (North American Indian), Métis, or Inuk (Inuit)?

- Yes
- No
- I prefer not to answer

Do you identify as a member of a visible minority?

- Yes
- No
- I prefer not to answer

Are you a person with a disability?

Note: Person with a disability is a person who has a long-term or recurring physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric or learning impairment and:

- Who considers themselves to be disadvantaged by reason of that impairment; or
- Who believes that an employer or potential employer is likely to consider them to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment; and
- Includes persons whose functional limitations owing to their impairment may have been accommodated in their current job or workplace.

- Yes
- No
- I prefer not to answer

What is the highest degree you have earned?

- Bachelor of Social Work
- Bachelor in a discipline other than social work
- Master of Social Work
- Master in a discipline other than social work
- Doctorate in Social Work (advanced practice-focused)
- Doctorate in Social Work (research-focused)
- Doctorate in a discipline other than social work
- Other
- I prefer not to answer

How many years have you been participating in social work education following receipt of your most relevant degree? Please count all of the following: as a field supervisor, field liaison, part-time or adjunct faculty, full-time faculty, field director, assistant/associate director, etc.

- Years in social work education _____

How many years have you been a field director/coordinator?

- Total years as a field director/coordinator _____
- Years as field director/coordinator at your current institution _____

What best describes your current annual salary?

- Less than \$40,000
- \$40,000 - \$49,999
- \$50,000 - \$59,999
- \$60,000 - \$69,999
- \$70,000 - \$79,999
- \$80,000 - \$89,999
- \$90,000 - \$99,999
- \$100,000 - \$109,999
- \$110,000 - \$119,999
- \$120,000 or more
- I prefer not to answer

What is/are the practice setting(s) for field education associated with your institution? Select all that apply.

- Urban
- Urban Indigenous
- Rural
- On reserve

The survey information I will provide is relevant to:

- The BSW program at my institution (there is no MSW program here).
- The MSW program at my institution (there is no BSW program here).
- Both the BSW and MSW programs at my institution.

Students

What are the current numbers of full-time and part-time (if any) students enrolled in your program(s)?

- Number of BSW full-time students _____
- Number of BSW part-time students _____
- Number of MSW full-time students _____
- Number of MSW part-time students _____

How many students are engaged in field education (i.e., actually placed in field agencies) for the 2019-2020 academic year?

- BSW, primarily face-to-face _____
- BSW, primarily online/distance _____
- MSW, primarily face-to-face _____
- MSW, primarily online/distance _____

In your program's curriculum, is it typical standard practice for students to be placed in two or more agencies for a field placement experience in an academic year, as in rotation among programs and/or agencies?

- Yes
- No

How is the field experience typically scheduled for the majority of BSW students over the course of one academic year?

- We do not have a BSW program.

- One full academic year (September-May), concurrent with full-time coursework (either two semesters or three quarters)
- One semester starting in fall term (block placement, few if any concurrent courses)
- One semester starting in winter term (block placement, few if any concurrent courses)
- One semester starting in spring term (block placement, few if any concurrent courses)
- One semester starting in summer term (block placement, few if any concurrent courses)
- Other (Please specify) _____

How is the field experience typically scheduled for the majority of MSW students over the course of one academic year?

- We do not have a MSW program.
- One full academic year (September-May), concurrent with full-time coursework (either two semesters or three quarters)
- One semester or quarter starting in fall term (block placement, few if any concurrent courses)
- One semester starting in winter term (block placement, few if any concurrent courses)
- One semester starting in spring term (block placement, few if any concurrent courses)
- One semester starting in summer term (block placement, few if any concurrent courses)
- Other (Please specify) _____

For the total number of your students in field education each year, what is your estimate of the percent of students completing a uniquely designed field education experience (e.g., modified block internships, international or out-of-province, out-of-sequence)?

Please do not include students who need alternative hours to weekday business hours (e.g., evening or weekend internships). This question is designed to capture field education resources spent on students who do not fit into your typical placement model.

- Less than 6%
- 6 - 10%
- 11 - 20%
- More than 20%

For the total number of your students in field education each year, what is your estimate of the percent of students completing a field education experience that involves hours that are not primarily weekday business hours?

- Less than 6%
- 6 - 10%
- 11 - 20%
- More than 20%

For the total number of your students in field education each year, what is your estimate of the percent of students completing a field education experience in their workplaces?

- Less than 6%
- 6 - 10%
- 11 - 20%
- More than 20%

For the total number of your students in field education each year, what is your estimate of the percent of students whose placements are disrupted and require re-placement during the academic year?

- Less than 6%
- 6 - 10%
- 11 - 20%
- More than 20%

Student safety is addressed by our field education program(s) in the following ways. Please select all that apply.

- Student safety is not addressed.
- Student handbook
- Field manual
- Student orientation at college/university
- Field seminar or other seminar(s)
- In courses
- Agency orientation
- Formal agency agreement with college/university
- Field instructor training
- Student learning contract
- Liaison site visits

Staffing and Resources

The position of director or coordinator of field education at my institution is:

- Full-time
- Part-time
- Part-time within a full-time appointment with other duties assigned

The position of director or coordinator of field education at my institution is best described as:

- Faculty (with clinical, practice or field designation)
- Faculty with academic rank (assistant professor, associate professor, or professor)
- Administrative/professional (no faculty designation)

The position of director or coordinator of field education at my institution is:

- Tenure track
- Permanent contract
- Contracted annually
- Long-term contracted (3 or more years)

What is your core field team/department size for your "on site" program(s)? That is, how much time do the individuals in your core field team or department devote directly to field education? Please indicate the number of individuals in each category below. Count all professional and administrative support staff and faculty, but exclude sessional faculty.

- Full-time _____
- Part-time (at about four-fifths time or .80) _____
- Part-time (at half time or .50) _____
- Part-time (about one-fifth time or .20) _____

How many members of your "on site" field team place students in agencies for field education experiences?

- Number of "field site" team members placing students in agencies _____

Please estimate your field office's overall FTE-to-student ratio (excluding administrative support staff and seasonal placement assistance) regarding student placements in your "on site" program(s). Please answer below for BSW or MSW program as applicable.

- Number of full-time employees in BSW program's field office _____
- Number of BSW students being placed _____
- Number of full-time employees in MSW program's field office _____
- Number of MSW students being placed _____

About how many sessionals, if any, fill the field faculty liaison role in your "on site" program(s)?

- Number of sessionals, if applicable _____

If additional individuals, such as sessionals working under contract, are typically hired to contribute to the functioning of the field office in your "on site" program(s), please estimate how many hours these individuals contribute to the functioning of the field office in a year.

- Number of hours contributed by additional personnel for the BSW field office, if applicable _____
- Number of hours contributed by additional personnel for the MSW field office, if applicable _____

What is the total full-time equivalent (FTE) of faculty and/or staff members assigned to any field education functions (including administration, field advising, monitoring and supporting placements, and site visits) within your "on site" program(s)? Please count all personnel, including relevant teaching, research, and field faculty, plus part-time or sessional faculty. Use a FTE formula that makes sense for your setting.

- Less than 1.5 FTE
- 1.5 - 2.4 FTE
- 2.5 - 3.4 FTEs
- 3.5 - 4.4 FTEs
- 4.5 - 5.4 FTEs
- 5.5 - 6.4 FTEs
- 6.5 - 7.4 FTEs
- 7.5 - 8.4 FTEs
- 8.5 - 9.4 FTEs
- 9.5 - 10.4 FTEs
- 10.5 - 11.4 FTEs
- 11.5 - 12.4 FTEs
- 12.5 or more FTEs

What is the total full-time equivalent (FTE) of faculty and/or staff members in your "on site" program(s) who place/match students in agencies for field education experiences? Please count all personnel, including part-time or sessional faculty. Use a FTE formula that makes sense for your setting.

- Less than 1.5 FTE
- 1.5 - 2.4 FTE
- 2.5 - 3.4 FTEs
- 3.5 - 4.4 FTEs
- 4.5 - 5.4 FTEs
- 5.5 - 6.4 FTEs
- 6.5 - 7.4 FTEs
- 7.5 or more FTEs

Given the number of students that the field office places, what would be an adequate number of FTEs assigned to the field office for the "on site" program(s) that your institution offers that would result in timely and effective placements?

- Number of FTEs that should be assigned to student placements for the BSW program (if applicable)

- Number of FTEs that should be assigned to student placements for the MSW program (if applicable)

Does your field education program have an administrative assistant or office professional assigned to field education functions?

- No
- Yes, less than full-time assigned to field education functions

- Yes, one full-time administrative assistant dedicated to field education functions
- Yes, more than one administrative assistant (including at least one FTE) dedicated to field education functions

Field Education Seminar

Does the field education curriculum for your program require a field education seminar taken concurrently with field practicum?

	Yes	No	Not Applicable
(a) BSW 1 st practicum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) BSW 2 nd practicum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) MSW foundation year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) MSW advanced year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please estimate the percent and number of full-time faculty at your institution who are tenure track or with a contract with primary responsibility for teaching and/or research, with a workload assignment that includes directly supporting students placed in agencies, that is, the field faculty liaison role.

- Percent of full-time faculty (tenure track or with contracts primarily for teaching and/or research) in field faculty liaison role _____
- Number of full-time faculty (tenure track or with contracts primarily for teaching and/or research) in field faculty liaison role _____

Do any of your programs use a faculty liaison model in which faculty members -- including teaching and research faculty -- monitor students' field education and communicate with the placement agency and supervisor during the course of the student's field education experience?

- Yes
- No
- Please explain, if helpful _____

Do any of your programs use a faculty liaison model -- using only field faculty and/or staff -- to monitor students' field education and communicate with the placement agency and supervisor during the course of the student's field education experience?

- Yes
- No
- Please explain, if helpful _____

Do any of your programs use a sessional faculty liaison model to monitor students' field education and communicate with the placement agency and supervisor during the course of the student's field education experience?

- Yes
- No
- Please explain, if helpful _____

About how many sessionals fill the field faculty liaison role in your "on site" program(s)?

- Number of sessionals in field faculty liaison role _____

Would you say that you use a "blended" field faculty liaison and sessional field liaison model?

- Yes
- No
- Please explain, if helpful _____

Do you have an online/distance or blended program at your institution?

- Yes, BSW only (Go to Page No. 7)
- Yes, MSW only (Go to Page No. 7)
- Yes, BSW and MSW (Go to Page No. 7)
- No (Go to Page No. 9)
- If Did Not Answer Then Go to Page No. 9

(Page 7)

Does your online/distance or blended program have a field education staff separate and distinct from the field education staff for your "on site" program?

- Yes (Go to Page No. 8)
- No (Go to Page No. 9)
- If Did Not Answer Then Go to Page No. 9

(Page 8)

Online Program

What is your core field team/department size for your online/distance or blended program(s)? That is, how much time do the individuals in your core field team or department for your online/distance or blended program(s) devote directly to field education? Please indicate the number of individuals in each category below. Count all professional and administrative staff and faculty, but exclude sessional faculty.

- Full-time _____
- Part-time (at about four-fifths time or .80) _____
- Part-time (at half time or .50) _____
- Part-time (about one-fifth time or .20) _____

How many members of your online/distance or blended field team place students in agencies for field education experiences?

- Number of online field team members placing students in agencies _____

Please estimate your field office's overall FTE-to-student ratio (excluding administrative support staff and seasonal assistance) regarding student placements in your online/distance or blended program(s). Please answer below for BSW or MSW program as applicable.

- Number of full-time employees in online/distance or blended BSW program's field office _____
- Number of BSW students being placed _____
- Number of full-time employees in online/distance or blended MSW program's field office _____
- Number of MSW students being placed _____

About how many sessionals, if any, fill the field liaison role in your online/distance or blended program(s)?

- Number of sessionals, if applicable _____

If additional individuals, such as sessionals working under contract, are typically hired to contribute to the functioning of the online/distance or blended field program, perhaps at peak placement time of year, please estimate how many hours these individuals contribute to the functioning of the online/distance or blended program in a year.

- Number of hours contributed by additional personnel for the BSW field office, if applicable _____
- Number of hours contributed by additional personnel for the MSW field office, if applicable _____

What is the full-time equivalent (FTE) of faculty and/or staff members assigned to any field education functions including administration, field advising, monitoring and supporting placements, and site visits) within your online/distance or blended program(s)? Please count all personnel, including relevant teaching, research, and field faculty, plus part-time or sessional faculty. Use a FTE formula that makes sense for your setting.

- Less than 1.5 FTE
- 1.5 - 2.4 FTE
- 2.5 - 3.4 FTEs
- 3.5 - 4.4 FTEs
- 4.5 - 5.4 FTEs
- 5.5 - 6.4 FTEs
- 6.5 - 7.4 FTEs
- 7.5 - 8.4 FTEs
- 8.5 - 9.4 FTEs
- 9.5 - 10.4 FTEs
- 10.5 - 11.4 FTEs
- 11.5 - 12.4 FTEs
- 12.5 or more FTEs

What is the full-time equivalent (FTE) of faculty and/or staff members in your online/distance or blended program(s) who place students in agencies for field education experiences? Please count all personnel, including part-time or sessional faculty. Use a FTE formula that makes sense for your setting.

- Less than 1.5 FTE
- 1.5 - 2.4 FTE
- 2.5 - 3.4 FTEs
- 3.5 - 4.4 FTEs
- 4.5 - 5.4 FTEs
- 5.5 - 6.4 FTEs
- 6.5 - 7.4 FTEs
- 7.5 or more FTEs

Given the number of students that the field office places, what would be an adequate number of FTEs assigned to the field office for the online/distance or blended program(s) that your institution offers that would result in timely and effective placements?

- Number of FTEs that should be assigned to student placements _____

(Page 9)

Please identify the activities required/expected of the field director/coordinator (or the individual primarily in charge of field education curriculum and field office functions). Please select all that apply.

- Placing students with agencies
- Re-placing students
- Developing new placements
- Outreach to agencies
- Relationship building with agencies
- Trouble-shooting or resolution creation
- Teaching field education seminars
- Teaching field education preparatory seminars
- Teaching social work courses other than field education
- Orientation and training for agency field instructors
- Recruitment of field liaisons (if personnel other than or beyond full-time research and teaching faculty are utilized)
- Orientation, supervision, and evaluation of field liaisons
- Consultation with field liaisons about specific agency and/or student problems
- Evaluation of field education programs and activities
- Student orientations
- Participation on social work program committees
- Participation on social work program curriculum committee

- Participation on college/university committee(s)
- Participation in student retention processes
- Participation in admissions processes
- Administration of field education awards
- Planning field recognition event
- Planning continuing education events for field instructors, field liaisons, and/or social work professionals
- Creating and editing school documents
- Scholarly research, publications, and presentations
- Serving as a field liaison
- Submitting practicum grades
- Addressing student health, wellness, or mental health issues
- Advising students on field education-related matters
- Advising prospective students on field education-related matters
- Advising students on course selection, degree requirements, and/or career planning
- Assisting with development of atypical course and field education schedules due to transfer credits or leaves of absence
- Developing policies and procedures to guide employment-based field practica
- Serving on management/leadership team
- Overseeing contracts
- Supervising field staff/faculty
- Developing field manual
- Participating in policy development
- Working with college administrative offices, including but not limited to registrar and admissions
- Participating in outcomes assessment
- Participating in technology development and management of data and data systems
- Other (Please specify) _____

Please identify the activities required/expected of the other field faculty or professional/administrative staff members of the field team (not including professional administrative support staff). Please select all that apply.

- Placing students with agencies
- Re-placing students
- Developing new placements
- Outreach to agencies
- Relationship building with agencies
- Trouble-shooting or resolution creation
- Teaching field education seminars
- Teaching field education preparatory seminars
- Teaching social work courses other than field education
- Orientation and training for agency field instructors
- Recruitment of field liaisons (if personnel other than or beyond full-time research and teaching faculty are utilized)
- Orientation, supervision, and evaluation of field liaisons
- Consultation with field liaisons about specific agency and/or student problems
- Evaluation of field education programs and activities
- Student orientations
- Participation on social work program committees
- Participation on social work program curriculum committee
- Participation on college/university committee(s)
- Participation in student retention processes
- Participation in admissions processes
- Administration of field education awards

- Planning field recognition event
- Planning continuing education events for field instructors, field liaisons, and/or social work professionals
- Creating and editing school documents
- Scholarly research, publications, and presentations
- Serving as a field liaison
- Submitting practicum grades
- Addressing student health, wellness, or mental health issues
- Advising students on field education-related matters
- Advising prospective students on field education-related matters
- Advising students on course selection, degree requirements, and/or career planning
- Assisting with development of atypical course and field education schedules due to transfer credits or leaves of absence
- Developing policies and procedures to guide employment-based field practica
- Serving on management/leadership team
- Overseeing contracts
- Supervising field staff/faculty
- Developing field manual
- Participating in policy development
- Working with college administrative offices, including but not limited to registrar and admissions
- Participating in outcomes assessment
- Participating in technology development and management of data and data systems
- Other (Please specify) _____

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.
(25 Statements with 7-point Likert scale – See Appendix B for full list)

Please share your perspective on the state of field education in Canada

Is there content in your BSW/MSW 2019-2020 social work program regarding students' future professional responsibility to be a field instructor? If yes, please specify:

- Yes. Please specify:
- No

Please identify whether your program has collaborative partnerships with any of the following bodies to jointly increase the number of quality practicum settings:

- Regulatory body. Please specify:
- Professional association. Please specify:
- Government ministries. Please specify:
- Provincial organizations in health, mental health, or social services. Please specify:
- Regional organizations. Please specify:
- Local organizations. Please specify:

Is there anything else about field education administrative models, staffing, and/or resources that you would like to share?

If you wish to receive a confirmation copy of this submitted survey or send a copy to someone else, please enter an e-mail address below.

WARNING: You can only enter one e-mail address; otherwise this option will not work.

* If you have completed this survey, please respond to this item and then click the "Submit" button below. You will not be able to access this survey instrument after you submit your survey.

Thank you for your participation.

APPENDIX B – PERSPECTIVES AND EXPERIENCES OF FECDS

Statement (n=32)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
1. Field education receives adequate resources overall, including staffing, financial resources, technology, and technical support, for its programs and operations at my institution.	12.5%	15.6%	31.3%	21.9%	15.6%	3.1%	0.0%
2. Field education staffing levels in my school/program are adequate to address fully the responsibilities of overseeing field education.	9.4%	18.8%	28.1%	25.0%	15.6%	3.1%	0.0%
3. Having enough appropriate placements for the number of students admitted to this social work program is a significant, ongoing challenge.	0.0%	3.1%	9.4%	15.6%	28.1%	43.8%	0.0%
4. Pressures to increase student enrollment at my institution have affected the field education process, including identifying and providing appropriate placements for students.	9.4%	12.5%	12.5%	21.9%	9.4%	25.0%	9.4%
5. Because of large numbers of students, it is sometimes necessary to place students in field education settings that we would otherwise not choose to use.	9.4%	3.1%	12.5%	28.1%	25.0%	21.9%	0.0%
6. The field team has adequate staffing resources to ensure that placements provide the full range of expected learning activities and experiences.	6.3%	9.4%	18.8%	46.9%	12.5%	6.3%	0.0%
7. The region where we place students has adequate placement opportunities to provide the full range of expected learning activities and experiences.	12.5%	6.3%	15.6%	43.8%	12.5%	6.3%	3.1%
8. Locating appropriate placements based on the range of skills and preparation of students admitted to this institution is very time-consuming.	0.0%	3.1%	9.4%	12.5%	21.9%	50.0%	3.1%
9. Given the range of expectations for the field director/coordinator and field staff, locating appropriate placements regularly results in work performed for the functioning of the field office by the director/ coordinator well beyond the recognized work hours of the day, week, month, or year.	3.1%	3.1%	12.5%	12.5%	31.3%	31.3%	6.3%
10. Given the range of expectations for the field director/coordinator and field staff, it is difficult to find the time to do everything that is needed.	0.0%	12.5%	9.4%	0.0%	21.9%	50.0%	6.3%
11. Out of necessity, the field team often utilizes non-BSW or non-MSW supervisors to supervise students in field education.	15.6%	9.4%	9.4%	21.9%	18.8%	25.0%	0.0%

Statement (n=32)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
12. Most community agencies are committed to providing quality field instruction on an ongoing basis.	0.0%	0.0%	9.4%	18.8%	46.9%	21.9%	3.1%
13. Field education opportunities depend heavily upon the willingness of agencies and their social workers to provide voluntarily field instruction.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	25.0%	62.5%	6.3%
14. At my school/program, the number of students admitted is considered in relation to the number of field education opportunities typically available for students in a given year in this geographic area.	15.6%	25.0%	15.6%	6.3%	15.6%	9.4%	12.5%
15. Student performance problems in field education are treated very similarly to classroom performance problems in my program's retention and advancement policies and practices.	0.0%	31.3%	25.0%	15.6%	15.6%	3.1%	9.4%
16. Student performance problems, in both classroom and field, are addressed at my institution to the degree that is commensurate with the circumstances presented by the student.	0.0%	6.3%	6.3%	31.3%	31.3%	18.8%	6.3%
17. It is difficult to cultivate new field placement opportunities because of the range of responsibilities assigned to/expected of the director/coordinator of field education.	3.1%	9.4%	15.6%	25.0%	12.5%	31.3%	3.1%
18. It is difficult to cultivate new field placement opportunities because of the complexity of students' needs and requests related to field education, often necessitating the design of unique and individualized placement experiences.	0.0%	3.1%	21.9%	18.8%	34.4%	15.6%	6.3%
19. Student safety is addressed to a sufficient degree.	0.0%	3.1%	3.1%	21.9%	40.6%	25.0%	6.3%
20. Within the past five years, it seems that agencies have been struggling to provide field instruction, as agency budgets have been cut and staff positions lost.	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	21.9%	28.1%	40.6%	6.3%
21. Within the past five years, placement disruptions due to changes in agency staffing or funding have become more common.	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	18.8%	31.3%	37.5%	9.4%
22. Within the past five years, placement disruptions due to lack of student readiness and/or student difficulties have become more common.	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%	21.9%	28.1%	21.9%	3.1%
23. My school/program is developing partnerships with community agencies to	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	15.6%	43.8%	25.0%	6.3%

Statement (n=32)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
enhance collaboration in field education from year to year.							
24. My school/program enjoys strong support from community agencies for many or most aspects of field education.	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	25.0%	37.5%	28.1%	6.3%
25. Institutional priorities provide incentives for full-time, tenure track teaching and research faculty members (beyond those already assigned to field education functions) to participate in field education functions.	21.9%	18.8%	25.0%	6.3%	6.3%	3.1%	18.8%

APPENDIX C – ACTIVITIES EXPECTED BY FIELD TEAM

ACTIVITY	FIELD DIRECTOR/COORDINATOR (n=33)		OTHER FIELD FACULTY OR PROFESSIONAL/ADMIN STAFF (n=33)	
	Number	%	Number	%
1. Placing students with agencies	26	78.8	18	54.5
2. Re-placing students	27	81.8	16	48.5
3. Developing new placements	28	84.8	19	57.6
4. Outreach to agencies	29	87.9	18	54.5
5. Relationship building with agencies	32	97.0	22	66.7
6. Trouble-shooting or resolution creation	29	87.9	20	60.6
7. Teaching field education seminars	15	45.5	15	45.5
8. Teaching field education preparatory seminars	23	69.7	13	39.4
9. Teaching social work courses other than field education	10	30.3	12	36.4
10. Orientation and training for agency field instructors	28	84.8	11	33.3
11. Recruitment of field liaisons (if personnel other than or beyond full-time research and teaching faculty are utilized)	16	48.5	5	15.2
12. Orientation, supervision, and evaluation of field liaisons	17	51.5	6	18.2
13. Consultation with field liaisons about specific agency and/or student problems	24	72.7	18	54.5
14. Evaluation of field education programs and activities	26	78.8	15	45.5
15. Student orientations	26	78.8	17	51.5
16. Participation on social work program committees	30	90.9	22	66.7
17. Participation on social work program curriculum committee	24	72.7	16	48.5
18. Participation on college/university committee(s)	22	66.7	10	30.3
19. Participation in student retention processes	15	45.5	11	33.3
20. Participation in admissions processes	19	57.6	13	39.4
21. Administration of field education awards	13	39.4	9	27.3
22. Planning field recognition event	27	81.8	17	51.5
23. Planning continuing education events for field instructors, field liaisons, and/or social work professionals	26	78.8	17	51.5
24. Creating and editing school documents	26	78.8	15	45.5
25. Scholarly research, publications, & presentations	11	33.3	9	27.3

ACTIVITY	FIELD DIRECTOR/COORDINATOR (n=33)		OTHER FIELD FACULTY OR PROFESSIONAL/ADMIN STAFF (n=33)	
	Number	%	Number	%
26. Serving as a field liaison	19	57.6	13	39.4
27. Submitting practicum grades	19	57.6	14	42.4
28. Addressing student health, wellness, or mental health issues	25	75.8	20	60.6
29. Advising students on field education-related matters	31	93.9	23	69.7
30. Advising prospective students on field education-related matters	28	84.8	14	42.4
31. Advising students on course selection, degree requirements, and/or career planning	11	33.3	9	27.3
32. Assisting with development of atypical course and field education schedules due to transfer credits or leaves of absence	16	48.5	11	33.3
33. Developing policies and procedures to guide employment-based field practica	26	78.8	11	33.3
34. Serving on management/leadership team	21	63.6	9	27.3
35. Overseeing contracts	20	60.6	10	30.3
36. Supervising field staff/faculty	20	60.6	9	27.3
37. Developing field manual	32	97	15	45.5
38. Participating in policy development	31	93.9	19	57.6
39. Working with college administrative offices, including but not limited to registrar and admissions	16	48.5	10	30.3
40. Participating in outcomes assessment	17	51.5	15	45.5
41. Participating in technology development and management of data and data systems	23	69.7	10	30.3