

PracticumFit Proposal Summary
ACEPT General Meeting
11/2/18

Two main services offered with pricing

- Hosting a Directory, Hosting a match service
- Pricing is done regionally, but would be discounted if we developed a national system
- Have the capacity for a standardized application and reference submission, but not priced out

Directory

- Customizable and Searchable
- Sites and programs mutually select one another
- \$2,500 set up and \$1,000 annual fee

Match

- Raking and Match algorithm similar to the internship process
- Guarantee of privacy
- Student only fee options
 - \$50/student or \$60/student with waivers determined by regions or school
- Student and Site fee
 - \$35/student and \$90/site
- Regional Payment: paid in one lump sum annual by the region
- Minimum of 200 students, otherwise fees increase

Need to make a decision by June 15

ACEPT Match Survey Summary

53 respondents

Do you currently participate in the APPIC electronic match process?

No: 28 Yes: 25

In your opinion, would an electronic system similar to APPIC benefit your program?

No: 13 Yes: 39 Blank: 1 (stated they needed more info)

In your opinion, would an electronic match process similar to APPIC benefit students?

No: 12 Yes: 40 Blank: 1 (stated they needed more info)

Generally why respondents were against it:

- The system works well enough currently
- Sites lose some of the control
- Unfair to charge students or sites
- There is too much variability in training programs and a match won't fit the needs of all sites.
- It reduces a sites flexibility in forming the training cohort and makes the process less personal.
- May not be useful for sites that have less competition (like those in the suburbs).

- A match process does not allow students the opportunity to negotiate their choices around a professional position, which will limit them later on in their career.

Generally why respondents were for it:

- It would make the offer process more streamlined, more regulated, less stressful, and less time consuming
- Smaller sites might get more applications and have more visibility if part of a centralized process
- It would reduce the number of students and sites that go against the current process, thereby making it a more fair process
- It would allow for the best fit between site and student
- Would reduce student anxiety
- Would protect students from being “strong armed” by sites

What questions do you have for us regarding this process?

- What are the costs and who pays them?
- How do the academic programs feel and would they support the process?
- What is the benefit for agencies that have a more nuanced selection process based on a need for specific skill and fit with agency mission?
- Would there be a Phase II?
- When would it start?
- How would you address sites and/or academic programs that don't participate?
- How would you address master's training and other fields (such a social work)?
- What do students think of this?
- How much time will it take to administrate the match and who will be responsible?