

MULTI-CULTURAL FAMILY BASE

PRACTICE LEARNING EVALUATIONS 2007-2008

Section I: Numerical Ratings

(in which 5 is the highest and 1 the lowest rating)

1. STUDENT RESPONSES

a) Feedback on Student Unit

(including introductory visit, induction, resources and Student Group)

Total number of responses 164

Scale

% Responses

5	27.0%
4	40.0%
3	29.0%
2	4.0%
1	0%

b) Feedback on MCFB

(including introduction, range of learning opportunities, practical arrangements)

Total number of responses 97

Scale

% Responses

5	39.0%
4	32.0%
3	17.5%
2	4.0%
1	7.5%

c) Feedback on other network agencies

(including introduction, range of learning opportunities, practical arrangements, links)

Total number of responses 93

Scale

% Responses

5	39.0%
4	40.0%
3	10.5%
2	9.5%
1	1.0%

d) Feedback on effectiveness of development of assessment skills and links between theory & practice

NOTE: some of these evaluations relate to groups/supervision provided at Harmeny Residential School

Total number of responses 84

Scale

% Responses

5	33.5%
4	59.5%

3	7.0%
2	0%
1	0%

e) Supervision

Effectiveness of group supervision and its links with individual supervision.

Total number of responses: 68

Scale

5	28.0%
4	56.0%
3	14.5%
2	1.5%
1	0%

f) Feedback on Practice Teachers

(including level of support and challenges offered, assistance in development of SW skills/ understanding and in workload management; assessment and joint meetings)

Total number of responses 447

Scale

5	65.5%
4	29.0%
3	4.5 %
2	1.0%
1	0%

% Responses

2. TUTOR RESPONSES

(including communication with Unit, learning opportunities, joint meetings, organisation)

Total number of responses 161

Scale

5	71.0%
4	19.0%
3	6.5%
2	3.5%
1	0%

% Responses

Section II: Student Evaluation of Course Content

The following sessions were selected as **most helpful** (most popular listed first):

- Child Observation (13); Therapeutic Work (10); Assessment Frameworks (9); Art Therapy (8); Child Protection (7); Anti-Racist Practice/Anti-Discriminatory Practice (7); Law (5); Communication Using 3rd Object (4); Interventions (3).

Note: other sessions not listed on the evaluation form were also highlighted, as were some presented at Harmeny Residential School: Attachment; Solution-focused Theory; Identity; Group Work; Immigration.

Reasons for choices:

- Sessions which were deemed ‘relevant’, because they linked with the actual casework being undertaken or were considered as fundamental for future SW practice were particularly valued (20). Topics deemed ‘informative’ or ‘interesting’ were also singled out (12). New topics (9) and those which acted as a revision course or built on previous study were helpful (3). Credit was given to well-presented material (4) and those which aided the link between theory and practice (4). Also mentioned were those applicable to individual learning needs of a student (2) and those which provided useful material for essays/dissertations (2). Sessions which provoked discussion (3) and/or allowed for student participation were also listed (2).

The following were listed as **least helpful** (least popular given first):

- Law (3); Anti-Racist Practice/Anti-discriminatory Practice (2); Child Observation (2); Assessment Frameworks ; Communication Using 3rd Object; Child Protection; Attachment; Endings; Domestic Abuse; Gender; Police

Note: many specifically indicated that they would not assign any topics to this category as all were ‘helpful’ in some way or would be useful in future practice.

Reasons for choices:

- Speaker poorly informed/unable to answer questions (3); previous knowledge (2); no new material (2); not enough participation; not immediately relevant.

Some expressed regret that they had not been able to benefit from attendance at some of the sessions which would have been of interest to them.

Additional suggested topics (those which referred to topics which particular students had been unable to attend are omitted from this list):

- Implementing theory into practice; Working with Polish families; Working with Muslim families; Residential care; Team dynamics; Importance of multi-disciplinary working; Counselling Skills; Mental health – especially depression; psychodynamic approaches in therapeutic relationship building.
- Also: more practical exercises; how to write good case notes; examples of completed SBR.

Section III: Student Evaluation of Group Supervision and Practice Teaching

NOTE: some of the group supervision took place at Harmeny Residential School

Advantages of Group Supervision (in order of frequency of mention):

- Sharing/comparing ideas, opinions, problems and approaches (14); supportive environment and a good place to try out new ideas and get feedback (5); awareness of difficulties faced by others (4); helped to bolster confidence in

talking about cases; opportunities for involvement, including leading group and/or determining topic; small numbers.

Disadvantages of Group Supervision (in order of frequency of mention):

- Not always easy to discuss certain topics in a group situation (2); travel problems in getting to group – particularly if scheduled for early in day (2); tendency for discussion to drift from stated topic (2); some students did not engage, thus reducing value of group; students at different stages; nervousness resulting from pressure of being observed in this setting; some topics too simplistic/basic; other topics already covered at University; time-consuming; group too large.
- Suggestions for improvements: greater focus on support rather than tuition and feeling of being assessed all the time; some unstructured time to be included for more general discussion;

Practice Teachers

- *Positive Comments:* Practice teachers ‘very supportive’; ‘excellent’; provided constructive criticism. Qualities included: being a good listener; accessibility; good at challenging; encouraged debate; helped with personal and professional development.
- *Negative Comments:* situation adversely affected at one agency by illness of PT. Role not adequately clarified. Some unhelpful negative criticism.

Section IV: Practical Arrangements

On the Student Unit/MCFB (most frequently mentioned comments listed first)

- *Positive Comments:* Excellent placement at MCFB. Great learning opportunities in a supportive environment – plenty of variety. All staff very approachable and helpful. Link with Leith SW Centre very useful for statutory work.
- *Negative Comments:* Tasks not always fully explained and further questions not necessarily welcomed. Duty system difficult to manage and not relevant to learning: more would be learned from shadowing in a statutory setting. Induction information was out of date [*this has now been remedied*]. Student accommodation very inadequate [*much of this has now been remedied*] and better system of allocating desk space to newly arrived students needed. More phones plus a confidential space required. Supervision sometimes consisted of managing workload rather than educational issues. Some ambiguity over roles as student/worker. Arrangements for student involvement in Christmas meal not well handled.

On Individual Agencies

- *Positive Comments:* some placements highly rated as being relevant to learning needs. Spending a lot of time with service users was very beneficial.
- *Negative Comments:* not all staff at one agency seemed to be fully aware of student role. There seemed to be little relevance in the MCFB induction when no further time spent there. Not all students had benefit of attending a Student

Group. For particular reasons, physical conditions at one agency far from ideal in relation to personal space and one-to-one work.

Suggestions:

- Better system at MCFB for allocating desks: proper desk plan needed. 4-way meeting would have been better in middle rather than at end of placement. Helpful to be told if you are 'passing'. Induction pack could be improved. In early stages of placement visit other agencies and attend a Children's Hearing.

Section V: Summary of Comments from Tutors

(Most frequently mentioned comments listed first in each paragraph)

Positive Comments:

- The learning opportunities were highly commended: 'excellent'; 'very good'; 'varied'; 'challenging' being used to describe them. Many placements were described as allowing students to be suitably stretched.
- The quality of the practice teaching was highlighted. The PT's were considered to be both 'challenging' and 'supportive', with constructive criticism and appropriate reference to theory/practice. Many were also commended for the way in which they had helped individual students through personal or academic difficulties. There was clear evidence that students had learned a lot. This was aided by the fact that students from various Universities were brought together.
- Final Reports were of a high standard and gave a clear sense of students' development. Feedback from University Examination Boards was good. In one case the range of learning opportunities and quality of practice teaching at MCFB had been particularly commended. Appreciation expressed where students' future learning needs had been highlighted.
- Overall organisation of the placements was generally considered satisfactory.
- One new tutor commented that all positive feedback about MCFB had proved to be true.

Negative Comments:

- In one case it was thought the work on offer was not at a satisfactory level for a final year student.
- Not all agencies totally familiar with the paperwork and other requirements of Universities. Some initial problems in getting hold of guidelines etc.
- A few instances of communication breakdown/slow responses but all issues eventually resolved.
- One tutor expressed doubt about value of group work involvement – not least because of the difficulties caused by the rolling nature of student involvement. Also – hard to work out particular contribution of an individual student in these contexts.