

THE EVOLUTION OF A HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY STUDIES
INTERNSHIP COURSE: CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Karen Kopera-Frye, Jeanne Hilton, Stephan Wilson, and Ann Rice
University of Nevada-Reno

ABSTRACT. The format of experiential-based learning initiatives such as internship courses varies widely across disciplines and institutions. The field of family sciences would encourage best practices if there was a systematic dialogue and uniformity among techniques. However, specific experiences also need to be tailored to meet the needs of students. Thus, it is not surprising that we see a plethora of varying internship experience courses. This article describes our evolving Certified Family Life Education (CFLE) approved Human Development and Family Studies internship course. Challenges and issues faced in our redesigned course are discussed along with examples of potential solutions employed to meet challenges. Finally, recommendations are made for individuals who may be trying to set up such a course at their institution. We share this evolving internship course experience in an attempt to promote course uniformity and to attain an “evidence-based” approach across family science courses.

Internship courses and experiences vary dramatically across the nation. Presumably, these courses are a critical component of many family science programs; however, they lack uniformity across institutions (Smart & Berke, 2004). While each course should be suited to the distinctive needs of individual students and programs, some consistency across course delivery modalities could advance the field. Particular areas in which the courses are noticeably different include: models/theories of student learning guiding the courses, course curricular materials (e.g., textbooks, handbooks), intensity/degree of commitment required by students to the course, and formal aspects of the academic program in which the course resides (e.g., CFLE designation). These differences can affect how a particular internship course is configured. Assessment of such courses is also variable across institutions. Most institutions appear to be focused on producing a high quality course by repeated modifications to the course, thus often

KEY WORDS. Internship, Experiential learning, Scholarly learning, Teaching in family studies, CFLE

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to the first author: Karen Kopera-Frye, Ph.D., Associate Professor, University of Nevada-Reno, Department of Human Development & Family Studies/ Gerontology, MS 140, 1664 N. Virginia St., Reno, NV 89557-0140 (email: kfrye@unr.edu).

engaging in formative evaluation methods. Thus, it would be advantageous to the field if institutions started conversing more about their particular internship course configurations to attain a “best practices approach” in our scholarly teaching efforts (Kopera-Frye, Hilton, & Cavote, 2003).

Our intent is to trace the evolution of our developing internship course, not necessarily to showcase our method as “the best practice.” However, by beginning the dialogue about how we designed and implemented such a course and discussing consequent challenges faced in revising this course, we will have contributed to the knowledge base on internship experiences, thus making them a quality experience for students across institutions. Solutions we devised to various challenges which arose in adapting the course and recommendations for such courses are discussed.

Models of Student Learning

Multiple models have been offered in order to explain how students learn via internship experiences, some of which vary by specific discipline (e.g., Hutchings and CASTL) and others which are broader and can be adapted to specific disciplines (e.g., Kolb & Fry, 1975). These models of student learning and scholarly teaching have been invaluable resources in our understanding of how to configure, design, and revise internship courses. Many family science programs use the Kolb and Fry’s (1975) Experiential Learning Cycle model as a framework for the internship course. The model essentially describes four phases that individuals go through to benefit from experiential learning while incorporating notions of individual growth and development. The model emphasizes the intellectual and emotional connection between theory and practice as intrinsic to the value of the internship experience for students. The primary role of the student as an active learner (a student who desires gaining new information, seeks out this

knowledge, and transforms mistakes into learning opportunities) is emphasized over the passive learner approach (Bayley, 2004). Furthermore, learning is nurtured via the students' trial and error experiences among real-world contexts and in social interactions.

Kolb and Fry's four-stage cycle illustrates the development of knowledge, skills, concepts, and theories through classroom experiences which translate into the applied internship experience. The four stages or phases include: 1) involvement in novel experiences within the classroom context known as the concrete experiences phase; 2) an observation and reflection phase during which information is gained through assignments, observations at a site, discussions, fieldwork, etc.; 3) a third phase involving the formation of abstract concepts and generalizations, where information is analyzed, synthesized, and applied to knowledge within the family sciences field; and, 4) finally, active experimentation which involves application, testing, and evaluation of information in a real-world context. These phases have been distilled into essential abilities that students need to develop according to Sugarman (1985). For example, during the first phase, students are required to involve themselves fully, openly, and in an unbiased fashion in the experience. Mastery of this phase depends on the development of appropriate active listening skills in the student. In the second phase, students need to hone their observation skills in a hands-on experience in the field. Stage 3 requires students to link theory to what they are observing, and in stage 4 they are required to evaluate curriculum and programming in the community. This framework offers valuable pedagogical techniques which can be implemented in an internship course to foster optimal experiential learning, or deep learning.

While the stages above refer to the developmental growth levels among students upon completion of the internship experience, Shulman articulated the steps or processes which lead to

this growth. Essentially, Shulman (2002) proposed an enhanced version of Bloom's (1956) taxonomy to explain learning processes produced by scholarly teaching. His cyclical learning loop involved six elements which were linked to active learning by "pedagogies of engagement." The elements include: engagement and motivation, knowledge and understanding, performance and action, reflection and critique, judgment and design, and commitment and identity. The process of active learning begins with student engagement, which enhances knowledge and understanding. Once the student understands, he or she is now capable of acting or performing in some manner. Reflecting deeply on one's actions and experiences encourages the student to exercise judgment in new situations, thereby creating new internal working models in the face of uncertainty. Once this temporary conflict has been resolved, students become committed to the new model as demonstrated by their ability to articulate their beliefs, ideals, values, doubts, etc., as a function of these elements becoming incorporated into their identities. Thus, enhanced pedagogies involve transforming the learner from a passive recipient of information into a developed, complex, active learner. According to Shulman, one vehicle for producing this type of learning is service learning; however, one can see the parallels to internship experiences.

Hutchings (2000), a Carnegie Foundation senior scholar, offers a more global approach that can be applied to internship courses while emphasizing the power of a particular discipline to which faculty belong for shaping the way faculty design their approaches to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Hutchings (2000) developed a taxonomy of questions, based on the Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) initiative (1999), that emerged as critical to scholarly teaching and optimal learning. The four questions included: 1) "what works" in terms of documenting methods used in various courses to promote learning with an eye to the assessment function; 2) "what is" or what does a particular approach look like (e.g.,

understanding the dynamic classroom discussion of a sensitive topic)?; 3) what “visions of the possible” as proposed by Shulman, or “how” students accomplish the particular class learning objectives emerge?; and, 4) what theory-building is necessary to understand student learning processes?. Unfortunately, the last theme, formulating conceptual frameworks for shaping thinking and practice is underrepresented within the scholarly teaching movement. Instead of individually tailored separate pedagogies and approaches to engage optimal learning, a shared, synthesized, recognition of “evidence-based practices” could dramatically advance the field. This could be a welcome change within the areas of service-learning and internship experiences.

The processes of the creating, assessing, and delineating common elements in internship courses are currently receiving more attention than in the past (e.g., Association for Gerontology in Higher Education, 2007; McKinney, 2003; Whitbourne, Collins, & Skultety, 2001). In order to ensure the quality of experiential learning for students, assessment processes focused on the internship courses are becoming more common as institutions confront accountability of education standards. In a recent email survey conducted by East Carolina University (Carroll & Ballard, 2004), 68 (44% response rate) of 155 schools with a Family Science internship experience provided interesting attributes across courses. Almost half of the programs had a doctoral component, 47% were American Association of Family Consumer Sciences (AAFCS) accredited, 43% were CFLE approved, 79% of the programs required an internship experience (usually when the students were in their senior year), 78% of the courses were supervised by faculty, and the three most frequently noted purposes of the course were: application of theory to practice, followed by personal growth, and providing a bridge from school to work. Credit hours required, intensity of student involvement, evaluation and assessment methods varied dramatically among schools. The survey results highlight the basic common elements between

internship experiences in terms of structure of the experience, yet show marked variability in evaluative and assessment procedures.

The values of an internship experience as discussed by Mertesdorf (1994) are directly relevant to the approach we utilized in our internship course. In essence, this notion involves five values or purposes of the internship experience, including: 1) translation of theory into practice with incorporation of the Kolb and Fry (1975) model; 2) synthesis of existing and new information from prior courses culminating in this real-world, practical experience; 3) a safety net to allow for practice skills—while students may initially feel uncomfortable or anxious, the experiential learning model necessitates learning by trial and error within a secure environment in order to develop competency; 4) development of a professional role—students grow within the external setting from an initial phase of adaptation to a new setting, up through an emergent professional by the end of the experience; and, 5) opportunities for professional networking—the very nature of the internship setting is conducive to placing students where they are interested, can engage in professional mentoring by the site supervisors, and ideally, later serve as a prospective job opportunity.

In summary, each of these four models address different elements one needs to incorporate into their discipline-specific internship course: Kolb and Fry's model focuses on stages of student growth; Shulman's framework articulates the processes underlying this growth; Hutchings' guidelines propose critical questions to be addressed in an internship experience; and Mertesdorf's model highlights necessary purposes or values to be incorporated into such a course. herefore, one model alone is neither sufficient nor comprehensive enough to base a course on. Rather, they all highlight important considerations in formulating an internship course and/or service learning experience. However, none of the models articulate specific techniques

which can be used to verify the elements inherent in their models. Therefore, we utilized a combination of the Kolb and Fry and Mertesdorf models as our theoretical framework for our internship course and incorporated techniques in the course to evaluate the models' utility. Since we are a CFLE-approved HDFS program, we drew heavily from the work of O'Malley and Wilson (2004) in order to create student activities to support the values of Mertesdorf and optimal student growth vis a vis Kolb and Fry.

In order to implement Kolb and Fry's stages of student growth while incorporating Mertesdorf's values, we revised our internship course in the following ways. Initially, the course was simply fulfilling the required number of field hours, entailing Kolb and Fry's first stage of student growth, namely concrete experience. We revised our course to incorporate site experience student journaling to support Kolb and Fry's second stage, observation and reflection. In support of Kolb and Fry's third stage, forming abstract concepts, we instituted a final experience paper where the students are required to discuss developmental processes evidenced in their experience and address how they fared on achieving pre-field experience student learning goals. Kolb and Fry's final stage is testing concepts learned in new situations, both in the internship class and concepts from other prior courses. Students demonstrate this final stage by giving presentations on their experience to other faculty and other agencies in a site recognition event, in addition to only being eligible for this class in the last semester of their senior year (in prior years they could be a sophomore or higher standing and take this class).

Mertesdorf's values include the following: Translating theory to practice, synthesis of existing and new information, safety net environment to practice skills, developing a professional role, and opportunities for professional networking. We revised the internship course to include the following activities/techniques in support of these experiential learning based values. Since

we require this course as a culminating experience for our HDFS seniors, the foundational theoretical knowledge learned in prior classes is applied to their internship field setting by virtue of the service learning focus. We now employ the FLE Competency Matrix (See Figure 1) by having students plot their knowledge and skill levels at three points of time: first class, midsemester, and final week of class. In order to provide a safe environment for practice skills prior to the field, we have the students role play interactions with simulated difficult family members, discuss ethical issues, and self-assess their own particular biases and stereotypes in class before the field experience. Students are developing a professional role by recording in the daily site journals new behaviors learned, procedures learned, and reflect on their professionalism for each site visit. Finally, the opportunity for professional networking is supported by the service learning experience itself. We have instituted a final site supervisor evaluation form where preparedness of a student as an emerging professional is considered. Our outcome data indicate that our students are viewed as highly professional and often offered employment at the end of the course.

We recommend using a combination of models in order to make for an invaluable Family Science internship experience for the internship coordinator, student, and site supervisor. By creating formalized techniques and/or activities to support the elements proposed by the model(s) of choice, we can move the field from primarily a theoretical enterprise to a theoretically-supported, yet able to be implemented, best practices product.

Our internship experience—then and now

Student population. The University of Nevada-Reno (UNR) is a land-grant institution with a fall 2005 graduate and undergraduate student enrollment of 16,336. It is projected that our student enrollment numbers will increase to 20,629 by academic year 2010-11 based on the

current rate of 30% growth in admission activity within the past five years. UNR is also becoming more ethnically diverse, experiencing almost 31% increase in proportion of underrepresented college students since 2000, with students of color comprising approximately 16% of the total student undergraduate enrollment (UNR, 2006). Based on the Fall 06-Spring 07 academic year data, the Human Development and Family Studies department has seven teaching faculty, approximately 19 graduate majors, 155 undergraduate majors, and 64 minors. Students may choose from three areas of concentration: child and adolescent development, family studies, and adult development and aging. The internship experience is completed during one semester of the senior year (offered two times per year), with prerequisites including a practicum course, a family life education methods course, and competency areas designated by our CFLE program certification.

Structure of the internship. Until 2003, our internship coordinator (instructor of record for the class) was a staff member who held a BS in HDFFS, and also an active graduate student. Beginning in 2004, we hired a part-time faculty instructor who held a Ph.D. in HDFFS to teach and coordinate the internship. With continued growth in student enrollments, our student interns increased from 22 in the 2004 academic year to 37 in 2005. Students create a pre-internship proposal which must be approved by the coordinator prior to their registration in the course. There are great distances between rural communities in northern Nevada. Therefore, our site coordinator often has to travel great distances to visit the sites. Currently, the coordinator visits each site at least once during the 15-week semester internship experience. Students are required to complete 50 hours of experience per credit hour, with a minimum requirement of 150 hours across the 15 week semester for all students. They are also required to draft their student learning objectives, contact potential sites, and decide where they will do the work before the official

internship class begins. We are continually adding approved sites to a directory that we are creating. An approved site is one in which the coordinator has discussed the intern experience with the site supervisor. The site has been evaluated as to what it can offer, or has offered in the past, and the type of learning experience it can provide. The opportunities also are evaluated in the context of the CFLE competency areas (see Figure 1).

Course format. The in-class portion of the internship experience is conducted by the instructor/coordinator during the first four weeks of the semester covering seminars on expectations, professionalism, ethics, and diversity. The remaining weeks, except for the last week where student site presentations occur, are reserved for time in the field. The internship course is graded on a pass/fail basis only. Several artifacts of scholarly learning are required in the course. Students must complete the proposal internship form, maintain a reflective diary internship journal, and the creation of an internship portfolio. The internship portfolio contains the following documents: an approved Pre-internship contract, students' objectives and goals for the experience, documentation of hours, completed Family Life Education (FLE) substance area/competency areas matrix (see Figure 1), internship journal entries, and the site supervisors' final evaluation. The students are given a pre-internship handbook which discusses how to create a learning objective, why objectives are important to this course, questions to help them think about the type of site they wish to pursue for the internship, appropriate rules of dress and conduct, and directions on how to complete the pre-internship contract.

On the first day of class, students are given a syllabus and the student handbook detailing midterm and final evaluation of student performance, expectations at the site and in the classroom, timeline for required course assignments, sample journal entries, and expectations for the community partners, site supervisors, coordinator and student. The coordinator verifies

contact with the site supervisor and then sends the site supervisor a Site Supervisor Internship Handbook. This Handbook includes a welcome letter, a guide for orienting the students to the site and experience, roles and responsibilities of student, coordinator, community partner, and site supervisor, agency descriptive form (e.g., structure of agency), midterm and final evaluation forms to be completed by the site supervisor, and the FLE competency matrix. Both the student and site supervisor handbooks utilize much of the information provided in the Family Life Education Handbook by O'Malley and Wilson (2004). The evaluative processes and forms, as well as structure of the in-classroom portion of this internship course, are still being developed.

We have provided details regarding how the course currently is offered, but we know from the literature on formative assessment that programs should be continually monitored, assessed, revised, and reassessed in order to optimize the quality of the experience (Palomba & Banta, 1999). Therefore, our internship course is constantly evolving. For a number of years the course was taught by part-time instructors who were alumni of our program. Eventually, we learned that having a committed internship coordinator is vitally important to the integrity of the experience for students. We had a series of issues with inconsistency of course content and procedures when instructors changed. Consequently, the philosophical intent of the course was lost, and student and community supervisor expectations for the course needed to be changed from an experience that students dreaded to an opportunity for our students to grow professionally. Further, site visits were occurring erratically, if at all, and student experiences frequently were disappointing and deemed not worthwhile (e.g., student putting hours in at a site but not doing anything productive). Handbooks were not given out or not utilized and evaluation of student performance was hit or miss. We responded by developing a standardized and formalized syllabus, a consistent and improved structure for the course, procedures and forms,

and the student and site supervisor's handbooks. Further, we developed standardized site supervisor student evaluation forms obtained at mid- and final-semester. These changes have given structure to the course and have provided important guidelines for a positive internship experience for our students. Major revisions to the course have made a dramatic difference in students' experiences; however, challenges of a different nature are ongoing.

Current challenges

While utilizing theoretical frameworks for service learning has resulted in a much improved course, our course still has challenges. Most of the current challenges and/or issues with the internship course focus on structural aspects of the course experience and outreach community partnership issues. One ongoing challenge we faced was changing the reputation of this experience among both the students and site supervisors. The internship coordinator promotes ownership of this experience by the students, reinforcing the notion that this is "your internship" and not to be taken lightly. The completed pre-internship proposal requires the site supervisor and student to mutually agree on how students will achieve their proposed objectives and goals, thereby reinforcing Mertesdorf's developing a professional role by site supervisor role modeling. Both parties are then held accountable for achieving these prior agreed-upon objectives and goals. Students are given an unsatisfactory grade if their learning objectives and goals are not achieved; a given site is put on a conditionally approved list if the site does not allow the student to achieve their goals. If another student subsequently has trouble achieving their goals at that same site, the site is not offered to future students as an option; this allows opportunities for professional networking and offers only quality, well-matched sites for future employment of our graduates. Changing students' preconceptions from simply "putting in the

required hours of labor” to “a professional growth enhancing opportunity” was quite an endeavor by the coordinator and faculty, yet it has resulted in more positive student buy-in and motivation.

A related challenge continues to be the lack of growth stimulating experiences in the community settings. Since the reputation of the experience and misunderstandings continue to be a problem, site supervisors often have no idea what students are expected to gain from the internship opportunity. Prior to this change the coordinator had to speak with site supervisors to require them to enhance the student experience, without burning bridges in the community. Having the handbooks for both parties clarifying roles, responsibilities, and expectations for students and site supervisors facilitates this process, but it still requires creative effort to build working relationships with community agencies. However, this allows for Mertesdorf’s value of translating theory in foundational classes to practice in a community agency. Another challenge is our ongoing effort to develop the site resource directory, which is helpful in identifying inappropriate, as well as appropriate, placements for future students. This site directory is an example of Mertesdorf’s value involving creation of opportunities for professional networking.

A different kind of challenge is posed by the increasing numbers of majors in our program, and more specifically in this course (from 22 students to 37 in one year). This growth is expected to continue, and will put additional time demands on our coordinator, since multiple visits are often necessary for each student site. Possible solutions include training several coordinators in order to divide up the demands for site visits, keeping one coordinator but reducing the number of visits for each site, or by randomly visiting a selected number of sites. We are also concerned that the broader the program (our program has three concentration areas of study and ten competency FLE areas), the higher the likelihood of a mismatch of the student with the placement site. A mismatch may also be more likely if the quality of site visits declines

due to limited staff-time resources (as described above). When there is little structure, uniformity, and/or control, the probability for a student goal-placement mismatch is likely to increase. In addition limited, or lower quality supervision in any of the student placements can undermine the opportunity for students to achieve their goals, a potential problem if the coordinator cannot visit and monitor the sites.

An unrelated challenge that is problematic for our coordinator/instructor has been a scarcity of available materials to help students learn, especially in the area of professionalism. Our coordinator has used colleagues as a resource for recommended materials and speakers, but has had to scramble to find appropriate background information for our students. If there are topical resources, they often are discipline-specific (e.g., ethical guidelines of the American Psychological Association), and not specific for our interdisciplinary field. This issue forces the coordinators of such courses to piece together topical readings, yet, fosters differential instruction across programs because of this “homegrown” approach to curricular materials. The theoretical models discussed before are useful in the creation of techniques to validate the models; however, they do not offer specific materials for instructors to use. This is a significant weakness of all the models. Therefore, by creating this much-needed dialogue on best practices in internships through publications and presentations, it is hoped a more standardized set of curriculum materials and course techniques can be realized.

Two aspects of the course format involve challenges that may be specific to our institution and department. The first is that a grading schema of satisfactory and unsatisfactory doesn't seem to capture the dimensions/degrees of growth and development in professionalism that are intrinsic to the internship experience. What constitutes unsatisfactory versus satisfactory performance? Is showing up, completing writing requirements enough, or is there more? The

coordinator does not feel empowered to leverage a particular grade if the parameters for grading are nebulous. Also, is the 15-week semester experience thorough enough? Should this be a 2-semester course, or should it have a capstone conceptual-topic focused course (e.g., ethics) as a prerequisite? These challenges are still in the problem-solving phase in our department.

Finally, we face the question of how to organize our student products or artifacts of scholarly learning in a way that promotes deeper understanding and critical thinking. While the experiential learning component does indeed involve the interface of theory and application, our presentation of the experience and journal entries could be revised to include more challenging cognition. For example, it is meritorious to have the students create a portfolio of their experience; however, the journal is mostly comprised of observational/concrete entries. To illustrate, a student recently wrote, "I learned how to enter food recipients into the database today and reviewed the assessment sheets and intake forms the center uses..." Presumably by asking students to not only record observations and concrete behavioral actions, but include answers to some hypothetical questions like "how might you change the structure of the agency's programs and/or documentation to better serve the families?", critical thinking might be fostered. This notion of a more reflective journaling process is in line with Mertesdorf's values of synthesizing new and existing information as well as providing a safety environment to practice professional skills.

Several evaluation results from the Fall 2006 term are encouraging in light of our course modifications. Because there were different coordinators prior to 2005, the data are not available for those years. However, over the past two years, 60% of our 15 interns enrolled in 2006 were offered employment at their sites; up from 50% of 13 students in the prior year. Five new internship sites were added to our developing Internship Resource Directory during Fall 2006,

and three during 2005. Seventy-five percent of the 15 site supervisors requested more than one intern for upcoming placements in 2006, compared to approximately 30% (of 13 sites) in 2005. Finally, our student-completed knowledge and skill competency matrices (see Figure 1) indicated a 3-fold increase in knowledge and skill development from the initial class in 2005 to the last class in 2006.

Conclusion

Our internship course has been revised from prior years to support the theoretical student growth levels proposed by Kolb and Fry, in addition to the purposes and/or internship course values ala Mertesdorf. Our course now contains activities which assess whether our course has incorporated these valuable theoretical elements. We recommend other internship programs devise activities and methods to translate popular theoretical models of service learning into practice, in order to advance this area. The particular model or internship elements selected for a particular program should depend on any certifying bodies relevant to the program, value placed on the particular student learning climate, as well as the “best fit” for the program needs. We reviewed some of the challenges we faced in creating possible solutions for the sake of aiding other programs that may be experiencing similar issues. There are always new challenges to face that stimulate actions that result in an improved experience for our students. We conclude by offering some recommendations or “lessons learned” to other programs facing similar issues. First, it is prudent to take advantage of existing organizational materials and frameworks rather than reinventing the wheel. We have found Western Michigan University’s Department of Family and Consumer Sciences FLE substance area/competency matrix useful, and we collaborated on the FLE Handbook by O’Malley and Wilson; thus, we were able to pilot/utilize some of those measures and are open to sharing our materials and learning from others as well.

The site supervisor and student handbooks have been especially fruitful as organizing tools. In line with “best practices” methods of assessment, the internship experience needs to be assessed, modified if some aspects are not working, reassessed, and refined again in order to insure a quality experience. Revision of assessment procedures is part of the evolving nature of this course, and is ongoing. This flexibility and support from the coordinator, department chair, and faculty will go a long way in ongoing evolution and improvement of the course.

Consistency of stakeholders is critical to a quality experience for the students. By having committed coordinators, dedicated faculty, continual monitoring and assessment, and standard procedures and organization, the scholarly learning experience will continue to be nurtured for our students. We have had our challenges in turnover of staff, instructors, and sites; however, by organizing and maintaining consistency of materials, course content, site rapport, and outreach, threats to integrity of the experience have been minimized. Finally, it is important to be creative in maintaining community partnerships. Departments can conduct a recognition event for student supervisors and sites and/or faculty can contribute to the site resource directory by adding sites where they have done prior research, thus adding to the resource directory while maintaining a connection to the community site. Internship coordinators and faculty can also create ways of promoting the university program so our students have potential future jobs at these sites, thus developing an identity in the community marketplace, and maintaining good will.

References

- Association for Gerontology in Higher Education (February, 2007). *Organizing a service learning course*. Workshop offered at the annual meeting of the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education, Portland, OR.
- Bayley, B. (2004). Family life education and service learning: Putting theory into practice. *Family Focus*, 29(2), F16-17.
- Bloom, B. S. (1956). *The taxonomy of educational objectives: Cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay.
- The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL). (1999). *Informational program booklet*. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Carroll, E. B., & Ballard, S. M. (November, 2004). *From classroom to work: The role of internships in Family Science programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Orlando, FL.
- Hutchings, P. (2000). Opening lines: Approaches to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Ed. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved November 30, 2004 from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/elibrary/docs/approaching.htm>
- Kolb, D. A., & Fry, R. (1975). Toward an applied theory of experiential learning. In C. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of group processes* (pp. 33-58). London: John Wiley.
- Kopera-Frye, K., Hilton, J., & Cavote, S. (2003). Considerations in devising an undergraduate program assessment plan. *Journal of Teaching in Marriage and Family*, 3, 327-342.
- McKinney, K. (2003). Applying the scholarship of teaching and learning: How can we do better? *The Teaching Professor*, 17, 1-7.

- Mertesdorf, J. C. (1994). Internship: Emerging professionals in youth and human service agencies. *American Humanics*, 5, 6-9.
- O'Malley, A., & Wilson, J. (2004). *Family life education internship/practicum handbook*. Minneapolis, MN: National Council on Family Relations.
- Palomba, C. A., & Banta, T. W. (1999). *Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing, and improving assessment in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shulman, L. S. (2002). Making differences: A table of learning. *Change*, 34, 36-44.
- Smart, L. S., & Berke, D. L. (2004). Developing professional standards in family science internships. *Journal of Teaching in Marriage and Family*, 4(1), 101-126.
- Sugarman, L. (1985). Kolb's model of experiential learning: Touchstone for trainers, students, counselors and clients. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 64, 264-268.
- University of Nevada-Reno. (2006). President's Report. Retrieved July 13, 2006 from <http://www.unr.edu/legislature/enrollment.htm>
- Whitbourne, S. K., Collins, K. J., & Skultety, K. M. (2001). Formative reflections on service-learning in a course on the psychology of aging. *Educational Gerontology*, 27, 105-115.

FLE SUBSTANCE AREA/COMPETENCY MATRIX

Department of Family and Consumer Sciences, Western Michigan University
 Bryce Dickey, MS, CFLE; Karen Blaisure, PhD, CFLE; Lori Farrer, MA; Kristi Smith, MA, CFLE

	1. Families in Society	2. Internal Dynamics of Families	3. Human Growth & Development	4. Human Sexuality	5. Interpersonal Relationships	6. Family Resource Management	7. Parent. Education & Guidance	8. Family Law & Public Policy	9. Ethics	10. Methodology
A. Interpersonal Skills/ Professional Conduct										
B. Assessment and Evaluation Skills										
C. Writing and Materials Development										
D. Planning and Organization										
E. Program Development/ Information Application										

This matrix is to be used in conjunction with a journal, the FLE Substance Areas (available at http://www.ncfr.org/cfle/c_certification.htm) and the List of Competencies developed by the Family Studies Advisory Board O=OBSERVED E=EXPERIENCED