

# Collaborative Development of Field Evaluation

- UC Berkeley School of Social Welfare
- San Francisco Unified School District

American Council for School Social Work,  
New Orleans, LA  
January 31, 2017

# Opportunity

- Rapid growth of school social work services in SFUSD
  - 5 school social workers in 2001
  - 100+ school social workers now
  - Property Tax Initiative to fund children services (Prop. H)
- SFUSD emphasis on mezzo/collaborative methods of providing services

□ Ayasse, R.H; Stone, S.I, (2015)

# Research

- UC Berkeley outreach
- Collaborated with SFUSD to study the effectiveness of their school social work services
- Study of school social work services in of schools SFUSD found significant impact on school achievement

- Stone, S., Shields, J. P., Hilinski, A., & Sanford, V. (2013)

- Ayasse, R.H; Stone, S.I, (2015)

# Focus on Measurable Outcomes for SW Education

- CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) - Pupil Personnel Services Credential (PPSC)
  - 33 Standards – require evidence of candidate achievement
- CSWE
  - 10 Core Competencies
    - “outcome performance approach” requiring “measurable practice behaviors”

# Learn What Skills?

- CSWE?
- CA CTC?
- Agency tasks?
- Those taught in University?

# Need for More and Better Skilled School Social Workers

- SFUSD unable to retain Counselors with MA (MFT in CA) due to poor fit between training and professional preparation and job duties
- SFUSD reluctant to hire new MSW's due to lack of experience in mezzo/collaborative methods
- School Social Work MSW field placements' emphasis on providing individual and small group counseling

# Collaborative Task

- Convene group of experienced School Social Workers / Field Instructors
- Goal:

**UC Berkeley MSW PPSC holder to be prepared to work in any school social work position in SFUSD upon graduation from our program.**

# Collaborative Process

## □ Focus Groups:

- Identify Important skills for School Social Workers
- Match with CSWE competencies
- Identify observable behaviors indicating “excellence” and “lack of competence” in each area
- Apply tool
- Refine it



# Questions to SFUSD SSW's:

- WHAT skills and knowledge does a person need in order to be an effective school social worker in SFUSD?
  
- HOW do we prepare an MSW student to fill that role?
  - Scaffolding activities
  - Micro, Mezzo , and Macro practice opportunities

# Evaluation of Candidate

- HOW will we KNOW if the candidate has acquired the necessary skills?
  
- Who determines what is necessary?
  - UCB Field Competencies
  - CSWE Competencies
  - SFUSD SW's list of skills
  - PPSC Standards
  
- Scales of Observable behavior generated by SFUSD SSW's

## UCB and CSWE Field Competencies

### □ Ability to form professional relationships with a range of individuals, groups, and communities

Become proficient in forming professional relationships with a broad range of clients and their caregivers and/or families, forming professional relationships with a variety of colleagues, professionals, and community groups, and in interacting effectively with collaborative treatment planning

### □ CSWE: Educational Policy 2.1.10(a)–(d)

Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

## CTC PPSC Standards and Outcome Measures developed w/ SFUSD Field Instructors

### Outcome Measure of Competence Scale:

0= Not competent

5= Beginning MSW level

10 = Advanced - High level skill

### 2) Consultation with teachers/staff CTC Standard 10 – Consultation

*(Developed scale)*

0= Does not ever consult with teachers regarding students' needs

5= Recognizes need for consultation and consults with teachers most times when it is appropriate or necessary

10= Consults with teachers and other school staff on a regular basis and develops a collaborative relationship with them to address students needs, appropriate to the developmental level and needs of the students.

# Revised After Pilot Phase

## *Consultation with teachers/staff, parents, or other collaterals*

CTC Standard 10 – Consultation; and Standard 7 – Family-School Collaboration

**0=** Does not ever consult with teachers, parents/caregivers, and/or other community providers regarding students' needs. **Develops conflictual relationships with consultees and/or displays excessive anxiety in those relationships.**

**5=** Recognizes need for consultation and consults with teachers, parents/caregivers, and/or other community providers most times when it is appropriate or necessary. **Is comfortable, confident, and professional in consultee relations**

**10=** Consults with teachers, other school staff, parents/caregivers, and/or other community providers on a regular basis and develops a collaborative relationship with them to address students needs, appropriate to the developmental level and needs of the students. **Demonstrates professional self assurance and is sought out by others for help and support**

# Formative vs Summative Evaluation

## □ Formative:

*Monitor student learning* and provide ongoing feedback

Used by instructors to improve their teaching and by students to improve their learning

## □ Summative:

*Evaluate student learning* at the end of an instructional period (Grades)

Compared to a standard or benchmark

Kealy (2010)

# Formative and Summative Values

## □ Formative:

- The criteria for perfect “10” provided a vision to be strived for and an incentive for ongoing professional development.

## □ Summative:

- The criteria for “o” provided some clarity about what would be grounds for failing a student. (A Grade of “Unsatisfactory”)

# Data: School Years 12-13 and 13-14

| <b>PPSC Evaluation Standard</b>   | <b>School Year<br/>2012-13<br/>Item Average Score,<br/>N=15</b> | <b>School Year<br/>2013-14<br/>Item Average Score,<br/>N=24</b> |
|---|---|---|
| <b>1) Engagement with clients</b>   | <b>6.60</b>   | <b>8.08</b>   |
| <b>2) Consultation with teachers/staff</b>                                | <b>6.53</b>   | <b>7.92</b>   |
| <b>3) Assessment of clients</b>   | <b>6.47</b>   | <b>7.68</b>   |
| <b>4) Treatment planning with clients</b>                                 | <b>6.20</b>   | <b>7.43</b>   |
| <b>5) School-wide intervention planning</b>                               | <b>5.86</b>   | <b>7.72</b>   |
| <b>6) Evaluation of services provided to clients</b>                      | <b>6.47</b>   | <b>7.90</b>   |
| <b>7) Evaluation of mezzo and/or school-wide<br/>intervention efforts</b> | <b>5.92</b>   | <b>7.31</b>   |
| <b>8) Termination and transition skills</b>                               | <b>6.00</b>   | <b>7.15</b>   |
| <b>9) Oral and Written communication skills</b>                           | <b>7.03</b>   | <b>8.42</b>   |
| <b>10) Collaboration and coordination skills</b>                          | <b>6.40</b>   | <b>8.18</b>   |
| <b>11) Professional conduct</b>   | <b>7.60</b>   | <b>8.65</b>   |
| <b>12) Self- reflective practice</b>                                      | <b>8.13</b>   | <b>8.60</b>   |
| <b>Average Score across Competencies</b>                                  | <b>6.65</b>   | <b>7.92</b>   |

# Students' Self-Ratings on CTC Standards

- 2012-13 School Year the students' cumulative average score of their achievement

**= 5.4 of 7.**

- In 2013-14 their cumulative average score

**= 6.8 of 7.**



# Preliminary Conclusions

- Measures are perceived as valid by a wide variety of School Social Workers across districts
- Did not remove “Halo Effect”
- May have led to early identification of lack of competency
- Observable trends and needs for attention
- Inter –rater variations

# Formative Value for Field Instructors

- Creating specific and observable rating criteria helped to assess their students' performance and to structure learning activities in the field
- Assigning the interns tasks that would more properly prepare them for their post MSW careers required a new level of thought and creativity

# Value and Enhanced Validity of Evaluation Tool

- Developed a shared definition of what we are measuring
- Incorporated multiple perspectives of the role of a social worker
- Engaged the gatekeepers of the profession in the process of co-creation and execution of the evaluation process

# Continuous Collaboration and Expansion

- Reviewed evaluation tool's content and process with each student and Field Instructor
- Engaged other districts and field sites in utilization of tool
- Expanded process to other SW specialties in the University

# Next Steps

- Re- Assess School Social Worker Tasks and Most Frequent and/or Time Intensive Student Needs
- Identify Desired Specific and Measurable Outcomes
- Evaluate which Tasks and Interventions lead to those Outcomes
- Refine Process for Teaching and Evaluating Targeted Intervention Skills

# References

- Ayasse, R.H., (2016) “Engaging Field Instructors to Develop Measurements of Student Learning Outcomes in School Social Work Settings” Field Educator, Vol 6.1, fieldeducator.simmons.edu
- Ayasse, R.H; Stone, S.I, (2015) *The Evolution of School Social Work Services in an Urban School District* Children & Schools; doi: 10.1093/cs/cdv025
- Bogo, M., Regehr, C., Power, R., & Regehr, G. (2007). *When values collide: Field instructors' experiences of providing feedback and evaluating competence.* The Clinical Supervisor, 26(1-2), 99-117. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J001v26n01\\_o8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J001v26n01_o8)
- Harlen, Wynne & James, Mary (1997) *Assessment and Learning: differences and relationships between formative and summative assessment,* Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 4:3, 365-379, DOI: 10.1080/0969594970040304
- Kealey, Edith (2010) *Assessment and Evaluation in Social Work Education: Formative and Summative Approaches,* Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 30:1, 64-74, DOI:10.1080/08841230903479557
- Stone, S., Shields, J. P., Hilinski, A., & Sanford, V. (2013). *Association between addition of learning support professionals and school performance: An exploratory study.* Research on Social Work Practice, 23(1), 66-72. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049731512464581>