Overview of Evaluation Methods

In order to evaluate the field program, I completed the following tasks:

- Analyzed all Learning Education Activity final evaluations between Fall 2014 and Summer 2016,
- Analyzed all Field Supervisor surveys collected between Fall 2014 and Summer 2016,
- Reviewed student course evaluations for the four field liaisons,
- Reviewed the previous field manual and created draft updated manual, and
- Reviewed student hire data.

Strengths

Overall

Overall, agencies report that they are pleased with our students and that they are prepared for their internships. When asked about our overall functioning of our field program, over 90% of the responding field supervisors agreed or strongly agreed with each of nine statements (see attachment). This included statements related to student preparedness, whether or not the placement option (block or concurrent) worked well for them, to the extent that we solicit feedback from the agency. This is consistent with what I typically hear from agencies when I call them or see them – that they appreciate the extent that our students are prepared and that they appreciate the ways in which we connect with them regularly during the internship.

Students also report being satisfied with the field instruction and field seminar structure. There are definitely suggestions for improvements but overall they provide high ratings for their experience and find the weekly or bi-weekly meetings, journaling and activities to be useful.

Student Preparedness and Success

In addition to the field supervisors typically finding our students as prepared, they are also evaluating the students fairly highly at the conclusion of the internships. The average rating for each of the 9 practice behavior areas in the EPAS is between “above expected level” and “exceptional”. The top two areas are the demonstration of core generalist skills (engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation) and demonstration of professional behavior; each reporting a mean of 3.7-3.9 (range: 1=below expected level to 4=exceptional). Our program should be very proud of that. The following chart identifies each of the competency areas and their corresponding mean on the final LEA evaluations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Behavior</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply Social Work Ethical Principles</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply Critical Thinking</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage Diversity and Difference</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Human Rights and Social Justice</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in Research Informed Practice</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply Knowledge of HBSE</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also continue to have a high hire rate for our students at the completion of their internship. This has been in some of the most difficult agencies to get a placement in (such as local medical system) and which also seem to be extremely desirable positions due to salary and benefit levels. In 2015-16, of the 44 students seeking employment at the conclusion of their internship, 30 were hired into the profession immediately upon completion (68%).

**Contact with Field Coordinator and Liaison**

When asked about their engagement with the Field Coordinator and Field Liaison, over 90% of the responding field supervisors agreed or strongly agreed with all of the statements regarding their support and work with the agency, although there did appear to be some confusion between the differing roles. The high satisfaction ranged from initial contact and review of the field program and internship criteria, to ongoing support and problem solving during the internship. It is important to note, however, that there were 2-3 highly unsatisfied agency supervisors, particularly with the work of the Field Liaison.

**Areas of Development**

The areas of development appears to be primarily in the area of communication and clarification of roles and responsibilities; both between the Field Coordinator and Liaison as well as to the agency supervisor. There was definitely dissatisfaction by a few different agency supervisors with the coordination and support from our field program, particularly in the lack of consistent contact from the Field Liaison. This responsibility lies with the entire field program, though.

There also continues to be some frustration with the development of Learning Education Activities that relate to the work of the agency. The LEA has already been modified this year to make it even easier to use but additional thought should be put into how to share sample learning activities.

**Goals**

After reviewing all of the feedback, there are two primary goals:

- Update the Field Manual and post on UWS website
  - Clarifying the expectations of Field Coordinator, Field Liaison, student and Agency Supervisor.
  - Updating all policies and procedures
  - Streamlining information and removing attachments that seem unnecessary
- Create online orientation and training for agency supervisors
  - Include information on differing roles and responsibilities
  - Clear expectations on supervisor expectations
  - Assist in the development of LEA activities that are relevant to the agency
  - Provide certificate for completing the training, which could be used for CEUs
  - Expectations for scoring the LEAs
- Establish UWS account for MN Caregiver Study to allow for possible placements with local hospital system