

**OUTCOME EVALUATION OF STUDENT GOAL AND OBJECTIVE ATTAINMENT
AS PERCEIVED BY FIELD SUPERVISORS IN ALL PLACEMENTS 2010-2011
(Spring Block 2011, Fall 2010-Spring 2011 Concurrent, and Summer 2011 Block)**

Introduction

The Council on Social Work Education has an increased emphasis on assessment of educational attainment of program outcome objectives reflected in its Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) which guides accrediting decisions relating to social work programs. A program can use a number of different approaches in exploring how well it has achieved its educational objectives with students. In other words a program must demonstrate that its graduates have acquired the expected competencies it has set for them to achieve.

While the instrument used to evaluate students in field internship at UW-Superior is certainly directly tied to the program's objective learning outcomes for students, it was not specifically designed originally with program assessment in mind. To be able to use this field work evaluation instrument as part of the overall program assessment plan, including achievement of student learning outcomes, the UW-Superior Social Work Program decided to make an alternative use of the assessment instruments that agency field supervisors completed in regard to specific UW-Superior social work interns during the internship experience. As persons evaluating the interns along each of the dimensions established as outcome criteria for the program, these supervisors can legitimately be considered outside social work experts, while also being persons not directly affiliated with the program as either staff or students. These completed student field evaluations offer the program a unique opportunity to also use supervisor ratings as an outcome measure relating to aggregate student achievement at the time of the senior capstone experience.

The data from each field group has been aggregated for the entire field group at the midway and final points of the field experience. Originally each student was scored by his or her field supervisor on a four point scale; the supervisor also had the option to indicate that something did not apply in the specific internship situation or that there was not enough information at the time to respond to the item. The scale was as follows: "1" = below expected level; "2" = at expected level; "3" = above expected level; and "4" = exceptional.

Bench marks were established by Program faculty; these indicated that program objectives had been met successfully by each field group at acceptable levels. They were:

- At the midway point, 90% of all students in each field group were to have a score of "2" (at expected level) or higher on each evaluation item.
- At the final point, 90% of all students still needed to have at least a score of "2" (at expected level) for each evaluation item and 70% of all students were to have scores of "3" (above accepted level) or "4" (exceptional).

Subjects and Surveys Returned for 2010-2011:


There were 22 students in field placements during 2010-2011; there were four in fall 2010-spring 2011 concurrent placements, six in the spring 2011 block placement, and twelve in summer 2011 block placements. There were no fall block placements during this academic year.

- 1) There were 21 midway evaluations completed with agency supervisors and placed in field files; for the one student for whom the midway scores were missing, a final set of scores was in the file.

- 2) The scores for two students were missing when final scores were aggregated. There were only twenty final completed student evaluations in field files. Both those sets of missing scores were for students for whom there was a set of midway scores.
- 3) It should be noted that not all supervisors responded to all items for each student. For each of the items noted under this objective, there some evaluations on which there were no notations on the survey made in relation to the student's progress. This means that some of the items had low return rates. This was an issue throughout the report, and those items with the low return rates are printed in **red**.
- 4) If the author had not looked at each item as a percent of the persons who actually responded to the item, but rather had used the entire 22 people in the pool as the divisor, the benchmarks would have not been scored nearly as positively (say 19 of 20 responses, rather than scoring this as 19 of 22 possible responses with two missing).

Table One: Student Learning Objective One

Benchmarks	Midway N = 21	Final N = 20	Effectively Demonstrates Field Competency Objective 1: To make use of effective communication to employ a planned change approach which supports client interventions across systems levels (individuals, families, small groups, agencies, and community);
"2" or >	20/20 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can effectively use communication to employ a planned change approach with individuals which supports assistance for the individual across multiple system levels.
"3" or >		20/20 (100%)	
"2" or >	16/16 (100%)	19/19 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can effectively use communication to employ a planned change approach with families which supports assistance for the family across multiple system levels.
"3" or >		16/19 (84%)	
"2" or >	19/19 (100%)	19/19 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can effectively use communication to employ a planned change approach with small groups which supports assistance for the small group across multiple system levels.
"3" or >		17/19 (89%)	
"2" or >	19/19 (100%)	19/19 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can effectively use communication to employ a planned change approach within an agency which supports assistance for the agency across multiple system levels.
"3" or >		16/19 (84%)	
"2" or >	19/19 (100%)	18/18 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can effectively use communication to employ a planned change approach within the community which supports assistance for the community across multiple system levels.
"3" or >		15/18 (83%)	

NOTE: Scores based on lower return rates are written in red. Items that do NOT meet benchmark expectations are in recorded in pale pink squares. 

2010-2011: Midway Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 1

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 1.

2010-2011: Final Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 1:

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 1.
- More than 70% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "3" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 1.

Table Two: Student Learning Objective 2

Benchmarks	Midway N = 21	Final N = 20	Effectively Demonstrates Field Competency Objective 2: With diverse, misunderstood and/or oppressed populations, to use both ethnic- sensitive (including a specific focus on First Nations people) and socially-sensitive (including a specific focus on persons with developmental disabilities, persons with mental health issues, and aging people) generalist practice approaches;
"2" or >	20/20 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can appropriately use an ethnic-sensitive generalist approach with diverse, misunderstood and/or oppressed populations.
"3" or >		19/20 (95%)	
"2" or >	18/18 (100%)	19/19 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can appropriately use an ethnic-sensitive generalist approach with First Nations people.
"3" or >		15/19 (79%)	
"2" or >	18/20 (95%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can appropriately use a socially-sensitive generalist approach with diverse, misunderstood and/or oppressed populations.
"3" or >		17/20 (85%)	
"2" or >	16/16 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can appropriately use a socially-sensitive generalist approach with persons with developmental disabilities.
"3" or >		16/20 (80%)	
"2" or >	20/20 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can appropriately use a socially-sensitive generalist approach with persons with mental health issues.
"3" or >		17/20 (85%)	
"2" or >	17/17 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can appropriately use a socially-sensitive generalist approach with aging people.
"3" or >		15/20 (75%)	

2010-2011: Midway Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 2

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all these indicators associated with objective 2.

2010-2011: Final Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 2:

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 2.

- More than 70% of the students were rated by supervisors at the “3” or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 2.

Table Three: Program Student Learning Objective 3

Benchmarks	Midterm N = 21	Final N =20	Effectively Demonstrates Field Competency Objective 3: To demonstrate how ecological and empowerment frameworks, as well as other theoretical frameworks, can be employed to inform practice decisions across system levels;
"2" or >	19/19 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can demonstrate how the ecological framework can be employed to inform practice decisions across multiple system levels.
"3" or >		19/20 (95%)	
"2" or >	19/19 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can demonstrate how empowerment frameworks can be employed to inform practice decisions across multiple system levels.
"3" or >		19/20 (95%)	
"2" or >	18/18 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can demonstrate how at least one other theoretical framework can be employed to inform practice decisions across multiple system levels.
"3" or >		19/20 (95%)	

2010-2011: Midway Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 3

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all these indicators associated with objective 3.

2010-2011: Final Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 3:

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 3.
- More than 70% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "3" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 3.

Table Four: Student Learning Objective 4

Benchmarks	Midterm N = 21	Final N = 20	Effectively Demonstrates Field Competency Objective 4: To appraise the structure of organizations, service delivery systems, and communities and, under supervision, advocate for organizational and community change based on the principles of social and economic justice;
"2" or >	18/18 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can appraise the structure of organizations.
"3" or >		19/20 (95%)	
"2" or >	19/19 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can appraise the structure of service delivery systems.
"3" or >		17/20 (85%)	
"2" or >	19/19 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can appraise the structure of communities.
"3" or >		17/20 (85%)	
"2" or >	17/17 (100%)	18/18 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can, under supervision, advocate effectively for organizational change based on the principles of social and economic justice.
"3" or >		16/18 (89%)	
"2" or >	15/15 (100%)	18/18 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can, under supervision, advocate effectively for community change based on the principles of social and economic justice.
"3" or >		17/18 (94%)	

2010-2011: Midway Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 4

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all these indicators associated with objective 4.

2010-2011: Final Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 4:

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 4.
- More than 70% of the block students were rated by supervisors at the "3" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 4.

Table Five: Student Learning Objective 5

Benchmarks	Midterm N = 21	Final N = 20	Effectively Demonstrates Field Competency Objective 5: To integrate knowledge of the history of the social work profession and current social welfare structures, fiscal imperatives, policies, and issues with the ability to analyze their impacts upon client systems, human service agencies and systems, and social work practitioners;
"2" or >	18/18 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can integrate knowledge of the history of the social work profession with the ability to analyze its impact upon client systems, human service agencies and systems, and social work practitioners.
"3" or >		18/20 (90%)	
"2" or >	20/20 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can integrate knowledge of the current social welfare structures (including fiscal imperatives, policies, and associated issues) with the ability to analyze their impacts upon client systems, human service agencies and systems, and social work practitioners.
"3" or >		19/20 (95%)	

2010-2011: Midway Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 5

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all these indicators associated with objective 5.

2010-2011: Final Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 5:

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 5.
- More than 70% of the block students were rated by supervisors at the "3" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 5.

Table Six: Student Learning Objective 6

Benchmarks	Midterm N = 21	Final N = 20	Effectively Demonstrates Field Competency Objective 6: To apply critical thinking skills in problem solving with social work values and ethics, human diversity issues, the dynamics of discrimination and oppression, social and economic justice, and interactions among systems;
"2" or >	21/21 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can apply critical thinking skills in problem solving with social work values and ethics.
"3" or >		19/20 (95%)	
"2" or >	21/21 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can apply critical thinking skills in problem solving with human diversity issues.
"3" or >		18/20 (90%)	
"2" or >	20/20 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can apply critical thinking skills in problem solving the dynamics of discrimination and oppression.
"3" or >		19/20 (95%)	
"2" or >	21/21 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can apply critical thinking skills in problem solving with social and economic justice issues.
"3" or >		18/20 (90%)	
"2" or >	21/21 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can apply critical thinking skills in problem solving interaction among systems.
"3" or >		17/20 (85%)	

2010-2011: Midway Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 6

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all these indicators associated with objective 6.

2010-2011: Final Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 6:

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 6.
- More than 70% of the block students were rated by supervisors at the "3" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 6.

Table Seven: Student Learning Objective 7

Benchmarks	Midterm N = 21	Final N = 20	Effectively Demonstrates Field Competency Objective 7: To distinguish their personal values in relation to professional social work ethics, especially the values of self-determination, empowerment, and regard for diversity;
"2" or >	21/21 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can demonstrate that his or her personal values are compatible with those of the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics.
"3" or >		18/20 (90%)	
"2" or >	21/21 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can promote social work values, especially the values of self-determination, empowerment, and regard for diversity.
"3" or >		18/20 (90%)	

2010-2011: Midway Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 7

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all these indicators associated with objective 7.

2010-2011: Final Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 7:

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 7.
- More than 70% of the block students were rated by supervisors at the "3" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 7.

Table Eight: Student Learning Objective 8

Benchmarks	Midterm N = 21	Final N = 20	Effectively Demonstrates Field Competency Objective 8: To understand and apply the values base and ethics of the profession to practice situations across systems levels;
"2" or >	20/21 (95%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can apply understanding of the value base of the profession of social work to practice situations with individuals.
"3" or >		18/20 (90%)	
"2" or >	18/18 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can apply understanding of the value base of the profession of social work to practice situations with families.
"3" or >		16/20 (80%)	
"2" or >	21/21 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can apply understanding of the value base of the profession of social work to practice situations with small groups.
"3" or >		17/20 (85%)	
"2" or >	21/21 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can apply understanding of the value base of the profession of social work to practice situations within an agency setting.
"3" or >		19/20 (95%)	
"2" or >	18/18 (100%)	19/20 (95%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can apply understanding of the value base of the profession of social work to practice situations within a community setting.
"3" or >		17/19 (89%)	

2010-2011: Midway Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 8

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all these indicators associated with objective 8.

2010-2011: Final Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 8:

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 8.
- More than 70% of the block students were rated by supervisors at the "3" or greater level of competence in relation to all of the indicators associated with objective 8.

Table Nine: Student Learning Objective 9

Benchmarks	Midterm N = 21	Final N = 20	Effectively Demonstrates Field Competency Objective 9: To evaluate the impact of professional use of self in practice situations across systems levels;
"2" or >	20/20 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can evaluate the impact of professional use of self in practice situations with individuals.
"3" or >		19/20 (95%)	
"2" or >	18/18 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can evaluate the impact of professional use of self in practice situations with families.
"3" or >		18/20 (90%)	
"2" or >	20/20 (100%)	19/19 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can evaluate the impact of professional use of self in practice situations with small groups.
"3" or >		16/19 (84%)	
"2" or >	20/20 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can evaluate the impact of professional use of self in practice situations within agency settings.
"3" or >		19/20 (95%)	
"2" or >	17/17 (100%)	18/18 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can evaluate the impact of professional use of self in practice situations within community settings.
"3" or >		17/18 (94%)	

2010-2011: Midway Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 9

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all these indicators associated with objective 9.

2010-2011: Final Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 9:

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 9.
- More than 70% of the block students were rated by supervisors at the "3" or greater level of competence in relation to all of the indicators associated with objective 9.

Table Ten: Student Learning Objective 10

Benchmarks	Midterm N = 21	Final N = 20	Effectively Demonstrates Field Competency Objective 10: To identify and make appropriate use of supervision and consultation;
"2" or >	21/21 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates an understanding of what constitutes appropriate use of supervision and consultation.
"3" or >	/	20/20 (100%)	
"2" or >	21/21 (100%)	20/20 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can make appropriate use of supervision and consultation.
"3" or >	/	20/20 (100%)	

2010-2011: Midway Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 10

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all these indicators associated with objective 10.

2010-2011: Final Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective 10:

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective 10.
- On both indicators under this objective 70% or fewer of the block students were rated by supervisors at the "3" or greater level of competence.

Table Eleven: Student Learning Objective II

Benchmarks	Midterm N = 21	Final N = 20	Effectively Demonstrates Field Competency Objective II: To conduct research to evaluate their own social work interventions and those of others, as well as to evaluate agency and community practice.
"2" or >	21/21 (100%)	19/19 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can conduct research to evaluate my own social work interventions.
"3" or >		16/19 (84%)	
"2" or >	20/20 (100%)	19/19 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can conduct research to evaluate the social work interventions of others.
"3" or >		18/19 (95%)	
"2" or >	20/20 (100%)	19/19 (100%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can conduct research to evaluate agency and community practice.
"3" or >		15/19 (79%)	

2010-2011: Midway Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective II

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all these indicators associated with objective II.

2010-2011: Final Benchmark Ratings: Student Learning Objective II:

- More than 90% of the students were rated by supervisors at the "2" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective II.
- More than 70% of the block students were rated by supervisors at the "3" or greater level of competence in relation to all indicators associated with objective II.

Summary of the Outcomes

- At the midway measuring point, benchmarks were achieved on eleven objectives and all of their sub-objectives.

This means at midway through the internship 90% or greater of the aggregated group were scored at the “expected level” or higher (“2” or greater).

- At the final point, achievement benchmarks set at 2 or greater were achieved on all eleven objectives and all of their sub-objectives.

This means that at the final point of the internship, 90% or greater of the aggregated group were scored at the “expected level” or higher (“2” or higher).

- At the final point, achievement benchmarks set at 3 or 4 at a rate of 70% or greater were achieved on all eleven objectives and all of their sub-objectives.

This means that at the final evaluation point 70% or more of the aggregate group scored at the “above expected” and “excellent” (“3” or higher).