Findings From the 2015 State of Field Education Survey:

A Survey of Directors of Field Education on Administrative Models, Staffing, and Resources

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CSWE

COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Suggested citation: Council on Social Work Education Council on Field Education. (2015). *Findings from the 2015 State of Field Education Survey: A survey of directors of field education on administrative models, staffing, and resources.* https://cswe.org/CMSPages/GetFile.aspx?guid=cabf3e01-6800-4c2a-b14f-aaac4f84cdb5

The 2015 State of Field Education Survey was the first in a planned series of surveys of directors or coordinators of field education. This first survey focused specifically on administrative models of field education, staffing, resources, activities, and perceptions of field education directors. This report summarizes findings from the survey. The following are some highlights from the different sections of the report:

- Responses reflected institutional representation similar to the 2014 CSWE Annual Survey of Programs
- Almost three quarters (73.9%) of respondents indicated that MSW field experiences occur over the full academic year
- A little more than half (51.6%) reported the same for BSW field experiences (p. 7)
- 83.6% of respondents reported that less than 6% of students experienced disruptions in field placements requiring re-placement (p. 8)
- 64% of field directors or coordinators represented in this survey are contracted in their positions; 36% are tenure track (p. 9)
- Survey respondents reported a median of 1.5 full-time field education employees to 117 MSW students being placed (p. 10)
- One third (33.8%) of the survey respondents estimated that less than 1.5 FTEs of faculty/staff are assigned to any field education functions (p. 12)
- 44.6% of respondents reported no administrative assistant for field education functions (p. 14)
- 47.9% of respondents reported that teaching and research faculty members serve as field liaisons, assisting in monitoring students and communicating with the placement agencies and supervisors (p. 17)
- 82.7% of respondents reported that student safety is addressed in the field seminar or other seminar; only five respondents reported that student safety was not addressed by field education programs (p. 20)

In spring 2015 COFE, with support from CSWE's Educational Initiatives and Research staff, launched the first CSWE nationwide survey of field directors and coordinators to examine a range of issues in social work field education. Recognizing field education as the signature pedagogy of social work in the 2008 *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards* has brought welcome attention to field education experiences. Although the CSWE Annual Survey of Social Work Programs includes questions about field education, those questions focus solely on the number of students in the field and type of placement. COFE members felt there was a dearth of information about the faculty and staff who are running field education offices, how placements are being structured and modified to accommodate students, and the resources available to accomplish the field mission. This survey was the first in a planned series of surveys of directors or coordinators of field education. This first survey focused specifically on administrative models of field education, staffing, resources, activities, and perceptions of field education directors. Follow-up surveys of directors and coordinators of field education will focus on additional factors related to field education. Many of the factors that emerged from the 2015 State of Field Education survey also emerged during discussions at the 2014 CSWE Summit on Field Education, and survey results provide further context for recommendations outlined in the *Report of the CSWE Summit on Field Education 2014* as well as identify additional issues.

This executive summary provides the descriptive data from the survey. More in-depth analyses of the survey data will be published later.

Survey Design

The survey instrument consisted of 65 questions, including multiple-choice, open-ended, and scale-type questions. Survey invitations were e-mailed April 6, 2015, to one field education director or coordinator at each higher education institution housing a CSWE-accredited social work program. The e-mail addresses for field directors were obtained from institutional websites. If an e-mail address for a field director/coordinator was not available on the institutional website, the invitation was sent to the program chair/director. The survey closed in May 2015. The project had approval from the institutional review board at Springfield College in Massachusetts.

At the time of the survey launch, there were 562 institutions with baccalaureate and master's social work programs accredited by CSWE. The survey was returned by 312 respondents with a response rate of 57.8% (based on 540 successfully delivered invitations). Comparing responses institutionally and demographically from the field education survey with all programs, the range in relation to program level, CSWE region, institutional auspice, institutional ethnic/sex identification, and Carnegie Classification was similar to that of the 2014 CSWE Annual Survey of Social Work Programs.

Survey Respondents and Programs

Institutional Demographics

The survey instrument included some questions about the social work program and institutional demographics. Additional institutional characteristics were not included in the survey instrument but were prefilled for the respondents (e.g., institutional Carnegie Classification). Table 1 shows the number of institutions that participated in the field survey compared with the 2014 annual survey. Additional tables with institutional characteristics (e.g., region, auspice) can be found in Appendix A.

Table 1. Participating Institutions by Program Level

Program Level	2015 Field Education Survey		2014 Annual Survey	
	Number	%	Number	%
BSW	174	55.8	323	58.0
MSW	40	12.8	60	10.8
Co-located (BSW and MSW)	98	31.4	174	31.2
Total	312		557	

Respondents were asked to identify practice settings for field education offered by their program. This was a multiple-select question, so the response exceeds 100% (see Table 2).

Table 2. Practice Setting(s) for Field Education

Setting	Number	%
Urban	207	66.3
Rural	189	60.6
Suburban	156	50.0
Respondents reporting	312	

A question addressed whether institutions offer a primarily online program. For those individuals that responded positively, a follow-up question asked about whether there are separate staff for the online and "brick and mortar" programs (see Table 3).

Table 3. Online Field Education Programs

Institutions with primarily online programs	Number	%
BSW only	4	1.6
MSW only	16	6.5
BSW and MSW	3	1.2
No	224	90.7
Respondents reporting	247	
Online programs whose field education staff are separate and distinct from field education staff for brick-and-mortar programs		
Yes	6	26.1
No	17	73.9
Respondents reporting	23	

Field Director/Coordinator Demographics
Participants in the field education survey were asked a series of demographic questions, which included items on sex, racial/ethnic identification, age, salary, highest earned degree, and years in field education. Where possible, we have included comparison data from the 2014 CSWE Annual Survey of Social Work Programs. Please note when comparing data from the field education survey with data from the 2014 annual survey, the faculty section of the 2014 annual survey was completed by deans or program directors about their faculty; the 2015 field education survey was sent to and completed by individual field directors or coordinators when possible.

Compared with full-time faculty demographics in the 2014 annual survey, full-time respondents for the 2015 field education survey were more likely to be female, older, and less likely to identify with historically underrepresented groups (see Table 4). In the last row of Table 4, historically underrepresented groups refers to African American/Other Black, Chicano/Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Other Latino/Hispanic, American Indian/Native American, Asian American/Other Asian, Pacific Islander, Other, and Multiple Race/Ethnicity.

Table 4. Demographic Characteristics of Full-Time Survey Respondents and Faculty

Demographic Category	2015 Field Education Survey		2014 Annual Survey (Full-Time Faculty)	
	Number	%	Number	%
Sex				
Male	34	12.6	1,527	28.9
Female	236	87.4	3,748	71.0
Other	—	—	0	0
Unknown	—	—	5	0.1
Respondents/programs reporting	270		517	
Age group				
Under 35 years	13	4.8	303	5.7
35–44 years	54	20.1	1,213	23.0
45–54 years	71	26.4	1,274	24.1
55–64 years	97	36.1	1,532	29.0
65 years or older	34	12.6	655	12.4
Unknown	—	—	303	5.7
Respondents/programs reporting	269		517	
Racial/Ethnic identification				
White (non-Hispanic)	207	77.5	3,604	68.3
African American/Other Black	36	13.5	839	15.9
Chicano/Mexican American	5	1.9	62	1.2
Puerto Rican	2	0.7	66	1.3
Other Latino/Hispanic	5	1.9	163	3.1
American Indian/Native American	3	1.1	56	1.1
Asian American/Other Asian	3	1.1	338	6.4
Pacific Islander	1	0.4	13	0.2
Other	2	0.7	40	0.8
Multiple Race/Ethnicity	3	1.1	52	1.0
Unknown	—	—	47	0.9
Respondents/programs reporting	267		517	
Proportion identifying with historically underrepresented groups	60	22.5	1,629	30.9

Note. Eight survey respondents were part-time. They were excluded from this table.

Regarding highest earned degrees held by full-time survey respondents, Table 5 shows the largest difference between the field education survey respondents and comparable findings from the 2014 annual survey. Full-time respondents to the field education survey were more likely to report the MSW as their highest earned degree than were full-time faculty in the 2014 annual survey. Although 89% of full-time faculty hold an MSW, only 27% hold it as their highest earned degree, compared with 66.7% of field education survey respondents.

Table 5. Highest Degree Held by Full-Time Respondents and Faculty

Highest Earned Degree	2015 Field Education Survey		2014 Annual Survey (Full-Time Faculty)	
	Number	%	Number	%
Baccalaureate in social work	1	0.4	—	—
Baccalaureate in discipline other than social work	0	0	—	—
Master's in social work	182	66.7	1,418	27.0
Master's in discipline other than social work	2	0.7	106	2.0
Doctorate in social work (advanced practice focused)	8	2.9	262	5.0
Doctorate in social work (research focused)	49	17.9	2,704	51.4
Doctorate in discipline other than social work	27	9.9	706	13.4
Law	—	—	39	0.7
Medicine	—	—	6	0.1
Other	4	1.5	18	0.3
Unknown	—	—	1	< 0.1
Respondents/programs reporting	273		514	

Note. Eight survey respondents were part-time. They were excluded from this table.

Table 6. Annual Salary Ranges of Respondents

Salary Range	Number	%
Less than $40,000	9	3.1
$40,000–$49,999	43	14.7
$50,000–$59,999	78	26.6
$60,000–$69,999	59	20.1
$70,000–$79,999	53	18.1
$80,000–$89,999	27	9.2
$90,000–$99,999	11	3.8
$100,000–$109,999	9	3.1
$110,000 or more	4	1.3
Respondents reporting	293	

In the 2014 CSWE annual survey, 328 programs reported a median salary of $60,000 for their directors of field education (middle 50% range = $51,515 to $70,159). Table 7 shows the reported salary ranges by broad Carnegie Classification categories. These broad categories include a number of subcategories; for an expanded reference list of the Carnegie Classification categories and link to the classifications, see Appendix A. Field education survey respondents at doctorate-granting universities tended to report higher salary ranges (see Tables 6 and 7).

Table 7. Annual Salary Range of Respondents by Institution's Carnegie Classification

Salary Range	Carnegie Classification					
	Doctorate-Granting Universities		Master's Colleges and Universities		Baccalaureate Colleges	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Less than $50,000	5	6.0	29	18.8	17	31.5
$50,000–$59,999	13	15.7	46	29.9	19	35.2
$60,000–$69,999	18	21.7	32	20.8	9	16.7
$70,000–$79,999	26	31.3	20	13.0	6	11.1
$80,000 or more	21	25.3	27	17.5	3	5.6
Respondents reporting	83		154		54	

Table 8. Length of Work Career

Work Career	Median	Middle 50% Range	Respondents Reporting
Years in social work education following receipt of most relevant degree	15.0	7.4–20.0	302
Total years as field director/coordinator	6.0	2.5–10.3	302
Years as field director/coordinator at current institution	5.0	2.0–10.0	299

Students and Placement Structure

The next section of the survey addressed the number of students enrolled in the social work program (see Table 9), structure of field placements, and alternative placement structure. In reporting student enrollment and students in field, programs were asked to separate students who were in a primarily face-to-face social work program from those in a primarily online setting.

Table 9. Student Enrollment in Social Work Programs

Enrollment	Total	Median	Middle 50% Range	Respondents Reporting
In program				
BSW full-time students	26,594	89.5	50.0–150.0	230
BSW part-time students	2,092	10.0	5.0–35.0	83
MSW full-time students	22,876	100.0	59.3–200.8	128
MSW part-time students	9,445	45.0	17.5–100.0	106

Table 10. Students Engaged in Field Education in 2014–2015 Academic Year

Enrollment	Total	Median	Middle 50% Range	Respondents Reporting
In field education				
BSW, primarily face-to-face	11,463	34.0	18.0–64.0	239
BSW, primarily online	132	11.0	4.3–15.3	12
MSW, primarily face-to-face	24,351	115.0	58.0–230.0	129
MSW, primarily online	1,337	45.0	27.0–89.8	20

Overall, 40.4% (11,595) of full-time and part-time baccalaureate students and 79.5 (25,688) of full-time and part-time master's students were engaged in field education during the 2014–2015 academic year (see Table 10). Regarding students who are primarily online, the 2014 annual survey found that 1.8% (9) baccalaureate programs and 11.8% (27) master's programs were fully online, with an additional 32.9% (162) and 46.5% (106), respectively, offered partially online.

Field Placement Structure
More than half (51.6%) of survey respondents reported that field experience for BSW students was typically scheduled over the full academic year at their institutions. Fewer respondents reported field experience starting in the spring term (12.3%), fall term (5.6%), and summer term (0.8%). Almost three fourths (73.9%) of survey respondents reported that field experience for MSW students was typically scheduled over the full academic year at their institutions, with fewer scheduling a new or beginning field experience in the spring term (2.8%), fall term (1.4%), and none during summer term (see Table 11).

Table 11. Scheduling of Field Experience for Students Over the Academic Year

Scheduling	Number	%
BSW students		
One full academic year, concurrent with full-time course work	130	51.6
Block placement—one semester/quarter in fall	14	5.6
Block placement—one semester/quarter in spring	31	12.3
Block placement—one semester/quarter in summer	2	0.8
Other	75	29.8
No BSW program	35	
Respondents reporting	287	
MSW students		
One full academic year, concurrent with full-time course work	105	73.9
Block placement—one semester/quarter in fall	2	1.4
Block placement—one semester/quarter in spring	4	2.8
Block placement—one semester/quarter in summer	0	0
Other	31	21.8
No MSW program		132
Respondents reporting	274	

Twenty-four (8.4%) of 286 respondents reported that it was typical standard practice for students to be intentionally placed in two or more agencies for a given field experience in an academic year, as in rotation among programs or agencies.

Uniquely Designed Field Experiences
Participants were asked about the frequency with which they provide alternative, unique field placement experiences to respond to student requests and needs, such as modified block placements, international, out-of-state, or out-of-sequence placements. Most survey respondents (81.9%) reported that less than 6% of their students completed uniquely designed field experiences. More than half (54.4%) of respondents reported that less than 6% of their students completed field experiences involving nonweekday business hours. More than two thirds (71.2%) of respondents reported that less than 6% of their students completed field experiences in their workplaces. Most of the respondents (83.6%) reported that less than 6% of their students had disruptions in their field placements that required re-placement (see Table 12).

Table 12. Types of Field Education Experience

Type of Field Education Experience	Number	%
Students completing uniquely designed experience (e.g., modified block internship, international/out of state, out of sequence)		
Less than 6%	236	81.9
6–10%	28	9.7
1120%	11	3.8
More than 20%	13	4.5
Respondents reporting	288	
Students completing experience involving nonweekday business hours		
Less than 6%	155	54.4
6–10%	58	20.4
11–20%	31	10.9
More than 20%	41	14.4
Respondents reporting	285	
Students completing experience in their workplaces		
Less than 6%	203	71.2
6–10%	39	13.7
11–20%	31	10.9
More than 20%	12	4.2
Respondents reporting	285	
Students whose placements were disrupted and required re-placement		
Less than 6%	239	83.6
6–10%	39	13.6
11–20%	8	2.8
More than 20%	0	0
Respondents reporting	286	

Staffing and Resources

About two thirds (67.8%) of survey respondents reported that the position of field director/coordinator was full-time at their institutions. Almost one third (29.3%) reported the position was part-time within a full-time appointment; a few (2.8%) reported the position was part-time. Most survey respondents reported that the position of field director or coordinator was a faculty position (84.4%), more than half (55.7%) of those held an academic rank (i.e., professor, associate professor, assistant professor), and others were considered clinical or practice faculty; 15.6% respondents reported that the position was designated as administrative/professional rather than faculty. More than one third (40.6%) of survey respondents reported that the position of field director/coordinator was contracted annually, about another third (36.0%) reported that the position was tenure track, and the remaining 23.4% of respondents reported that the position was long-term contracted (i.e., 3 years or longer) (see Table 13).

Table 13. Characteristics of Field Education Position

Characteristic	Number	%
Field education director or coordinator		
Full-time	192	67.8
Part-time	8	2.8
Part-time within full-time appointment with other duties assigned	83	29.3
Respondents reporting	283	
Field education director or coordinator		
Faculty with clinical or practice designation	81	28.7
Faculty with academic rank	157	55.7
Administrative/professional (no faculty designation)	44	15.6
Respondents reporting	282	
Field education director or coordinator		
Tenure track	100	36.0
Contracted annually	113	40.6
Long-term contracted (3 years or more)	65	23.4
Respondents reporting	278	

The median reported size of the core field education team was one full-time member (see Table 14).

Table 14. Size of Core Field Education Team

Number of	Brick-and-Mortar Program		Online Program, If Any	
	Median	Middle 50% Range	Median	Middle 50% Range
Full-time	1.0	0–2.0	1.0	1.0–3.0
Part-time at about four fifths or .80	0	0–0	1.0	1.0–1.0
Part-time at half time or .50	00–1.0	—	—	
Part-time at about one fifth or .20	0	0–1.0	1.0	1.0–1.0
Respondents reporting	270		5	

A median of one member of 275 respondents' brick-and-mortar field teams placed students in agencies for field education experiences (middle 50% range = 1.0 to 2.0). A median of 1.4 members of five respondents' online field teams placed students in agencies for field education experiences (middle 50% range = 1.0 to 2.0).

For their brick-and-mortar programs, survey respondents reported a median of one full-time field education employee and a median of 33.5 BSW students being placed. Survey respondents reported a median of 1.5 full-time field education employees and a median of 117.0 MSW students being placed (see Table 15).

Table 15. Overall Full-Time Employee to Student Ratios for Student Placements in Brick-and-Mortar Programs

Employee/Student Type	Full Time Employee to Student Ratios		
	Median	Middle 50% Range	Respondents Reporting
Full-time employees, BSW program	1.0	1.0–1.0	233
BSW students being placed	33.5	18.0–62.3	220
Full-time employees, MSW program	1.5	1.0–3.0	126
MSW students being placed	117.0	65.0–230.0	122

No survey respondents reported primarily online BSW programs. Five respondents reported a median of 1.5 full-time field education employees, and three respondents reported a median of 69.3 MSW students being placed (see Table 16).

Table 16. Overall Full-Time Employee to Student Ratios for Student Placements in Online Programs

Employee/Student Type	Full Time Employee to Student Ratios		
	Median	Middle 50% Range	Respondents Reporting
Full-time employees, BSW program	—	—	0
BSW students being placed	—	—	0
Full-time employees, MSW program	1.5	1.3–3.0	5
MSW students being placed	69.3	45.0–63.0	3

Additional Field Personnel

For their brick-and-mortar programs, survey respondents reported a median of 3.0 adjuncts filling the field liaison role. These additional field team members contributed a median of 38.0 hours for BSW programs and a median of 100.0 hours for MSW programs (see Table 17). Only two participants responded to these items regarding online programs (see Table 18).

Table 17. Contributions of Other Members of Field Team in Brick-and-Mortar Programs

Other Members of Field Team	Contribution		
	Median	Middle 50% Range	Respondents Reporting
Adjuncts filling field liaison role	3.0	1.1–8.0	144
Hours contributed by additional personnel for BSW program	38.0	10.0–200.0	43
Hours contributed by additional personnel for MSW program	100.0	20.0–600.0	34

Table 18. Contributions of Other Members of Field Team in Online Programs

Other Members of Field Team	Contribution		
	Median	Middle 50% Range	Respondents Reporting
Adjuncts filling field liaison role	17.5	5.0–17.5	2
Hours contributed by additional personnel for BSW program	—	—	0
Hours contributed by additional personnel for MSW program	15.0	—	1

Survey respondents were asked, "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 'brick and mortar' [or online] program?" Respondents were requested to count all personnel, including relevant teaching, research, and field faculty, plus part-time or adjunct faculty, and to use an FTE formula that made sense for their setting.

One third (33.8%) of survey respondents estimated less than 1.5 FTEs of faculty/staff are assigned to any field education functions. An additional 19.2% of respondents estimated 1.5 to 2.4 FTEs, and 10.8% of respondents estimated 2.5 to 3.4 FTEs. More than half (54.4%) of survey respondents estimated less than 1.5 FTEs of faculty/staff placed students in field education experiences. An additional 20.7% estimated 1.5 to 2.4 FTEs placed students in field education experiences. Survey respondents estimated a median of 1.5 FTEs would be adequate for placement of BSW students, and a median of 3.0 FTEs would be adequate for placement of MSW students to result in timely and effective placements (see Table 19).

Table 19. Full-Time Equivalents of Field Staff

Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs)	Brick-and-Mortar Program		Online Program, If Any	
Faculty/Staff assigned to any field education functions	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1.5 FTEs	88	33.8	1	20.0
1.5–2.4 FTEs	50	19.2	1	20.0
2.5–3.4 FTEs	28	10.8	1	20.0
3.5–4.4 FTEs	17	6.5	1	20.0
4.5–5.4 FTEs	15	5.8		
5.5–6.4 FTEs	11	4.2		
6.5–7.4 FTEs	8	3.1		
7.5–8.4 FTEs	12	4.6	1	20.0
8.5–9.4 FTEs	2	0.8		
9.5–0.4 FTEs	7	2.7		
10.5–11.4 FTEs	6	2.3		
11.5–12.4 FTEs	5	1.9		
12.5 or more FTEs	11	4.2		
Respondents reporting	260		5	

Table 19. Full-Time Equivalents of Field Staff (continued)

Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs)	Brick-and-Mortar Program		Online Program, If Any	
Faculty/Staff who place students in agencies	**Number**	**%**	**Number**	**%**
Less than 1.5 FTEs	142	54.4	1	20.0
1.5–2.4 FTEs	54	20.7	3	60.0
2.5–3.4 FTEs	20	7.7		
3.5–4.4 FTEs	15	5.7		
4.5–5.4 FTEs	7	2.7		
5.5–6.4 FTEs	11	4.2		
6.5–7.4 FTEs	3	1.1	1	20.0
7.5 or more FTEs	9	3.4		
Respondents reporting	261		5	
FTEs assigned to field office perceived as adequate for timely and effective placement	**Median**	**Middle 50% Range**	**Median**	**Middle 50% Range**
For BSW program	1.5	1.0–2.0	—	—
Respondents reporting	214	0		
For MSW program	3.0	1.5–5.0	3.0	2.3–3.5
Respondents reporting	118		5	

Table 20 displays respondents' reported FTEs by collapsed categories and by their institutions' Carnegie Classifications. Lower reported numbers of FTEs were associated with baccalaureate colleges, and higher numbers of FTEs were associated with doctorate-granting institutions. Online programs were not included in this table because of inadequate sample size.

Table 20. Full-Time Equivalents of Field Staff for Brick-and-Mortar Programs by Institutional Carnegie Classification

Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs)	Doctorate-Granting Universities		Master's Colleges and Universities		Baccalaureate Colleges	
Faculty/Staff Assigned To Any Field Education Functions	**Number**	**%**	**Number**	**%**	**Number**	**%**
Less than 1.5 FTEs	10	14.5	48	36.1	28	50.0
1.5–2.4 FTEs	10	14.5	29	21.8	11	19.6
2.5–5.4 FTEs	19	27.5	33	24.8	8	14.3
5.5 or more FTEs	30	43.5	23	17.3	9	16.1
Respondents reporting	69		133		56	
Faculty/Staff who place students in agencies						
Less than 1.5 FTEs	18	25.4	86	64.7	36	65.5
1.5–2.4 FTEs	15	21.1	29	21.8	10	18.2
2.5 or more FTEs	38	53.5	18	13.5	9	16.4
Respondents reporting	71		133		55	

More than half of survey respondents had an administrative assistant or office professional assistance for field education functions: 3.0% had more than one FTE, 11.9% had one full-time assistant, and 40.5 had less than full-time assistance. The remaining 44.6% had no such assistant.

More than a quarter (26.6%) of survey respondents had student aide(s) specifically assigned to field office functions, with a median contribution of 10.0 hours per week. More than half (52.4%) of respondents had access to part-time student aide(s), with a median contribution of 3.0 hours per week (see Table 21).

Table 21. Nonfaculty Field Staff

Staff	Number	%
Is an administrative assistant or office professional assigned to field education functions?		
No	120	44.6
Yes, less than full-time	109	40.5
Yes, one full-time dedicated to field	32	11.9
Yes, more than one (including at least one FTE) dedicated to field	8	3.0
Respondents reporting	269	
Is there a student aide or aides specifically dedicated to field office functions?		
Yes	72	26.6
No	199	73.4
Respondents reporting	271	
If yes, hours per week contributed (median)	10.0	
Respondents reporting	70	
Is there access to one or more part-time student aides not specifically dedicated to field office functions?		
Yes	141	52.4
No	128	47.6
Respondents reporting	269	
If yes, hours per week contributed (median)	3.0	
Respondents reporting	122	

Field Education Curriculum Structures: Field Seminar
The survey asked participants whether the program requires a field education seminar concurrent with field practicum. Almost all (96.6%) survey respondents reported that a field education seminar was required in BSW programs. Most (88.1%) of respondents reported that a field education seminar was required during the MSW foundation year, and more than three quarters (76.6%) of respondents reported that a seminar was required during the MSW concentration year (see Table 22).

Table 22. Field Education Seminar

Seminar Required	Number	%
BSW program		
Yes	229	96.6
Number of respondents reporting	237	
MSW foundation year		
Yes	111	88.1
Number of respondents reporting	126	
MSW concentration year		
Yes	95	76.6
Respondents reporting	124	

Survey respondents reported a median of 2.0 or 50.0% full-time faculty who were tenure track or contracted primarily for teaching or research and had a workload assignment that included the field liaison role.

Field Education Curriculum Structures: Field Liaison Models
Through a series of questions, participants were asked about who handles field liaison duties; in response to various faculty and staff categories, participants were given the response options of *yes, no,* or *please explain, if helpful.* Survey respondents described their programs' faculty liaison models as including teaching and research faculty (47.9%), using only field faculty/staff (42.1%), adjunct faculty (43.1%), or blended faculty/adjunct (35.5%) (see Table 23).

Table 23. Field Liaison Models

Models	Number	%
Faculty liaison model: Faculty (including teaching and research faculty) monitor students and communicate with placement agency and supervisor		
Yes	128	47.9
No	102	38.2
Explanation of model provided	37	13.9
Respondents reporting	267	
Faculty liaison model: Only field faculty/staff monitor students and communicate with placement agency and supervisor		
Yes	112	42.1
No	130	48.9
Explanation of model provided	24	9.0
Respondents reporting	266	
Adjunct faculty liaison model: Adjuncts monitor students and communicate with placement agency and supervisor		
Yes	115	43.1
No	133	49.8
Explanation of model provided	19	7.1
Respondents reporting	267	
Blended faculty and adjunct liaison model		
Yes	94	35.5
No	156	58.9
Explanation of model provided	15	5.7
Respondents reporting	265	

Field Education Curriculum Structures: Field Liaison Faculty
Participants were asked to report the number of full-time faculty (tenure track or with a contract with primary responsibility for teaching or research) and adjuncts in field liaison roles.
• Average number of full-time faculty in field liaison role: 2.0
• Average percent of full-time faculty in field liaison role: 50.0%
• Average number of adjuncts in field liaison role (brick-and-mortar program): 7.9
• Average number of adjuncts in field liaison role (online program): 17.5

Field Team Activities
Participants were asked whether a series of activities are required or expected of the field director/coordinator or other field faculty or professional staff. The proportion of activities required/expected of the field director/coordinator ranged from 84.3% for troubleshooting or resolution creation to 42.6% for recruitment of field liaisons. The proportion of activities required/expected of other field faculty/staff ranged from 44.9% for troubleshooting or resolution creation to 8.7% each for overseeing contracts and supervision of field staff/faculty (see Table 24).

Table 24. Activities Required/Expected of Field Team

Activity	Field Director/ Coordinator		Other Field Faculty or Professional/Administrative Staff	
	Number	%	Number	%
Placing students with agencies	255	81.7	84	26.9
Re-placing students	253	81.1	81	26.0
Developing new placements	261	83.7	81	26.0
Outreach to agencies	259	83.0	105	33.7
Troubleshooting or resolution creation	263	84.3	140	44.9
Teaching field education seminars	210	67.3	126	40.4
Teaching social work courses other than field education	193	61.9	92	29.5
Orientation and training for agency field instructors	259	83.0	93	29.8
Recruitment of field liaisons	133	42.6	29	9.3
Orientation, supervision, and evaluation of field liaisons	177	56.7	37	11.9
Consultation with field liaisons about problems	192	61.5	80	25.6
Evaluation of field education programs and activities	249	79.8	62	19.9
Student orientations	250	80.1	96	30.8
Participation on social work program committees	243	77.9	113	36.2
Participation on social work program curriculum committee	221	70.8	74	23.7
Participation on college/ university committee(s)	209	67.0	72	23.1
Participation in student retention processes	174	55.8	64	20.5
Participation in admissions processes	201	64.4	83	26.6
Administration of field education awards	143	45.8	36	11.5
Planning continuing education events for field instructors, field liaisons, or social work professionals	206	66.0	58	18.6
Creating/editing school documents	222	71.2	48	15.4

Table 24. Activities Required/Expected of Field Team (continued)

Activity	Field Director/ Coordinator		Other Field Faculty or Professional/Administrative Staff	
	Number	%	Number	%
Scholarly research, publications, and presentations	142	45.5	54	17.3
Serving as field liaison	190	60.9	127	40.7
Submitting practicum grades	219	70.2	111	35.6
Advising students on field-education-related matters	257	82.4	125	40.1
Advising prospective students on field-education-related matters	253	81.1	78	25.0
Advising students on course selection, degree requirements, or career planning	210	67.3	83	26.6
Assisting with development of atypical course and field education schedules due to transfer credits or leaves of absence	175	56.1	41	13.1
Developing policies and procedures to guide employment-based field practica	221	70.8	30	9.6
Serving on management/leadership team	158	50.6	30	9.6
Overseeing contracts	188	60.3	27	8.7
Supervising field staff/faculty	160	51.3	27	8.7
Developing field manual	252	80.8	41	13.1
Participating in policy development	226	72.4	71	22.8
Working with college administrative offices, including registrar and admissions	147	47.1	41	13.1
Participating in outcomes assessments	232	74.4	77	24.7
Participating in technology development and management of data and data systems	155	49.7	52	16.7
Other	31	9.9	17	5.4
Number of respondents	312		312	

Participants were asked how they address student safety in the field education program. Most survey respondents (82.7%) reported that student safety was addressed during field seminars, followed by field manuals (77.6%) and agency orientations (74.7%). Five respondents reported that student safety was not addressed (see Table 25).

Table 25. How Student Safety Is Addressed by Field Education Programs

Methods	Number	%
Student safety not addressed	5	1.6
Student handbook	138	44.2
Field manual	242	77.6
Student orientation at college/university	171	54.8
Field seminar or other seminar	258	82.7
In courses	156	50.0
Agency orientation	233	74.7
Formal agency agreement with college/university	101	32.4
Field instructor training	203	65.1
Student learning contract	88	28.2
Liaison site visit	181	58.0
Respondents reporting	312	

Additional Comments
Finally, survey respondents were given the opportunity to offer comments on any other aspect of field education administrative models, staffing, or resources. The following is a summary of the comments:

- Field instructors/liaisons are too occupied with fulfilling their work duties to have the opportunity to improve their professional skills.

- Field education staff at smaller social work programs do not have resources to attend CSWE field conferences/workshops.

- Staffing resources have not kept pace with increasing student enrollment; some field education programs have seen their staffing resources reduced.

- Survey respondents want to see research by CSWE regarding

  - the trend toward employment-based internships and

  - the impact of online field education programs and their student placement needs on brick-and-mortar field education programs and local agencies.

- If field education is the signature pedagogy in social work education as stated in Educational Policy 2.2 of the 2015 *CSWE Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards*, survey respondents want to see it valued at least on an equal basis as classroom education and staffed by field education faculty, not supplemental nonfaculty personnel.

- Survey respondents want CSWE to impose standards on social work programs regarding

  - the field director's and other field staff's release time and

  - field education faculty/staff to student ratio as a means of providing a floor for time and resources for quality placements.

Next Steps

The field education survey contains a wealth of data about field education directors/coordinators, staffing, resources, and models. This report is only a first summary of the survey findings, and it is expected that the survey authors along with COFE will be mining this data for some time; additional reports, including a special report on the opinion section of the survey will be made available over the course of the next year.

Additionally, COFE members will be considering the implications of these findings in relation to the council charge and recommendations from the 2014 CSWE Summit on Field Education as they set their agenda for the coming years. Although this survey provides insight into a number of field education areas that were previously unexplored, important information is still lacking in some areas. It is hoped that COFE will be able to continue surveying field directors/coordinators on a regular basis to provide necessary data to inform field education excellence.

Appendix A

The following tables show the characteristics of the institutions of the field education survey respondents. Where possible in this section, comparison with the institutions that participated in the 2014 CSWE Annual Survey of Social Work Programs was provided to assess the representativeness of the field education survey sample.

Table A1. Participating Institutions by Program Level

Program Level	2015 Field Education Survey		2014 Annual Survey	
	Number	%	Number	%
BSW	174	55.8	323	58.0
MSW	40	12.8	60	10.8
Co-located	98	31.4	174	31.2
Total	312		557	

Table A2. CSWE Membership Regions

CSWE Region	States/Territories in CSWE Region
New England	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont
Northeast	New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands
Mid-Atlantic	Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia
Southeast	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee
Great Lakes	Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin
South Central	Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas
Mid-Central	Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska
Rocky Mountains	Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming
West	American Samoa, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada
Northwest	Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington

Table A3. Participating Institutions by CSWE Membership Region

Program Level	2015 Field Education Survey		2014 Annual Survey	
	Number	%	Number	%
New England	19	6.1	34	6.1
Northeast	31	9.9	56	10.1
Mid-Atlantic	42	13.5	69	12.4
Southeast	65	20.8	109	19.6
Great Lakes	67	21.5	118	21.2
South Central	29	`9.3	57	10.2
Mid-Central	22	7.1	43	7.7
Rocky Mountains	11	3.5	19	3.4
West	18	5.8	34	6.1
Northwest	8	2.6	18	3.2
Total	312		557	

Table A4. Participating Institutions by Auspice

Auspice	2015 Field Education Survey		2014 Annual Survey	
	Number	%	Number	%
Public	169	54.2	305	54.8
Private/Religion Affiliated	111	35.6	194	34.8
Private/Other	32	10.3	58	10.4
Total	312		557	

Table A5. Participating Institutions by Institutional Ethnic/Sex Identification

Ethnic/Sex Identification	2015 Field Education Survey		2014 Annual Survey	
	Number	%	Number	%
Coeducational	264	84.6	464	83.3
Women's	6	1.9	12	2.2
Historically Black College or University				
Coeducational	22	7.1	43	7.7
Women's	0	0	1	0.2
Hispanic-Serving Institution	15	4.8	29	5.2
Tribal College	2	0.6	3	0.5
Other	3	1.0	5	0.9
Total	312		557	

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching devised a categorization system for colleges and universities. On October 8, 2014, the foundation transferred responsibility for the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education to Indiana University Bloomington's Center for Postsecondary Research. The classification retained the Carnegie name after the Center for Postsecondary Research assumed responsibility on January 1, 2015. For more information about the new classifications visit the website [http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/] (see Table A6).

Table A6. Basic Carnegie Classification

Category Abbreviation	Category Name and Description
Doctorate-Granting Universities	**Institutions that awarded at least 20 research doctoral degrees**
RU/VH	Research universities (very high research activity)
RU/H	Research universities (high research activity)
DR/U	Doctoral/research universities
Master's Colleges and Universities	**Institutions that awarded at least 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees**
Master's/L	Master's colleges and universities (larger programs)
Master's/M	Master's colleges and universities (medium programs)
Master's/S	Master's colleges and universities (smaller programs)
Baccalaureate Colleges	**Institutions where baccalaureate degrees represent at least 10% of all undergraduate degrees and where fewer than 50 master's degrees or 20 doctoral degrees were awarded**
Bac/A&S	Baccalaureate colleges—Arts and sciences
Bac/Diverse	Baccalaureate colleges—Diverse fields
Bac/Assoc	Baccalaureate/associate's colleges

Table A7. Participating Institutions by Carnegie Classification

Carnagie Classification	2015 Field Education Survey		2014 Annual Survey	
	Number	%	Number	%
RU/VH	35	11.2	55	9.9
RU/H	35	11.2	69	12.4
DRU	18	5.8	36	6.5
Master's Colleges & Universities				
Master's/L	110	35.3	189	33.9
Master's/M	34	10.9	66	11.8
Master's/S	19	6.1	33	5.9
Baccalaureate Colleges				
Bac/A&S	17	5.4	34	6.1
Bac/Diverse	40	12.8	68	12.2
Bac/Assoc	1	0.3	2	0.4
Associate's Colleges	1	0.3	1	0.2
Special-Focus Institutions and				
Tribal Colleges	2	0.6	4	0.7
Total	312		557	

Note: RU/VH=research universities (very high research activity); RU/H=research universities (high research activity); DR/U=doctoral/ research universities; Master's/L=master's colleges and universities (larger programs); Master's/M=master's colleges and universities (medium programs); Master's/M=master's colleges and universities (medium programs); Master's/S=master's colleges and universities (smaller programs); Bac/A&S=baccalaureate colleges—arts and sciences; Bac/Diverse=baccalaureate colleges—diverse fields; Bac/ Assoc=baccalaureate/associate's c