

# CE Session Evaluation Form

**Please print your name here:**

*The Council on Social Work Education, provider #1163, is approved by the Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) Approved Continuing Education (ACE) Program (https://www.aswb.org/ace). The Council on Social Work Education maintains responsibility for the program. ASWB Approval Period: 1/23/2018 - 1/23/2021. Social workers should contact their regulatory board to determine course approval for continuing education credits. You are required to submit this completed evaluation form to obtain CE credit for this session.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Track: Field Education (Interactive Workshop)** |
| **Session # 757** | **Field Education, Technology, and the Revised Code of Ethics: Preparing Our Students**Georgia Brown, Florida Atlantic UniversityAllan E. Barsky, Florida Atlantic University |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** Sunday, November 11, 2018 | **Time:** 8:45 AM | **Room:** Asia 4, Lobby/Third Level (Dolphin, Walt Disney World Resort) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Part 1: Learning ObjectivesPlease evaluate whether objectives were met. After this session, participants will be able to:** |
| **\*\*\*Rating Scale: 1 poor/strongly disagree -- 4 excellent/strongly agree\*\*\*** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **N/A** |
| Identify best practices in the use of technology in social work field education. |   |   |   |   |   |
| Analyze ethical issues related to the use of technology and confidentiality, informed consent, boundary issues, interprofessional practice, social justice, and competence. |   |   |   |   |   |
| Educate students and field instructors about the new practice standards and ethical codes related to social work and technology. |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Part 2: Session Content** |
| **\*\*\*Rating Scale: 1 poor/strongly disagree -- 4 excellent/strongly agree\*\*\*** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **N/A** |
| 1. The session content was appropriate to my education, experience and/or licensure level. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. The session content was relevant to my practice. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. The session content was current. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4. The session content was presented effectively. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5. Handouts and/or teaching aids (if they were available) enhanced the session content. |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Part 3: Presenters** |
| **\*\*\*Rating Scale: 1 poor/strongly disagree -- 4 excellent/strongly agree\*\*\*** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **N/A** |
| 1. The presenter/s were knowledgeable about the session content. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. The presenter/s' presentation was clear and effective. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. The presenter/s were responsive to participants. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4. The presenter/s used technology effectively (if applicable). |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Part 4: CE Administration** |
| **\*\*\*Rating Scale: 1 poor/strongly disagree -- 4 excellent/strongly agree\*\*\*** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **N/A** |
| 1. Questions or concerns were addressed effectively and in a timely manner. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. The location was suitable to the presentation. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. The facilities were conducive to learning. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4. The instructions for requesting accommodations for a disability were clear. |   |   |   |   |   |

**Signature:**

*Please submit any additional comments on the reverse side of this form.*