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STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL INNOVATION
GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP

- Social Innovation
  - Local Internship
  - Overseas Internship
  - 3-Campus

- Global Citizenship
  - Overseas Internship
  - 3-Campus
  - Global Citizenship Summer Institute
  - Exchange Program
ASSESSMENT COMPONENT FOR INTERNSHIP

50%  
Conventional methods for assessment

50%

- Supervisor's Evaluation
- Integrated Essay
- Reflective Journal
- Presentation
LITERATURE ON EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

✓ While a truly comprehensive, reliable, valid and cost-effective measure of practical experiences does not exist, a combination of evaluation methods is recommended (Schwabbauer, 2000).

✓ The qualitative nature of performance assessment is more prone to measurement errors than standard written assessment (Sharifzadeh et al., 2011).

✓ To determine effectiveness of an internship, Narayanan et al. (2010) has developed a Process Model.

✓ Embo et al (2014) develop the Midwifery Assessment and Feedback Instrument to: a) improve educational structure, b) promote an active role of students and supervisors for individual learning process, c) promote continuous supervision and d) integrate formative and summative assessment.
### PROCESS MODEL

#### ANTECEDENTS
- **Employing firm’s preparedness for the internship**
  - Awareness of university’s interests
  - Prior ties
  - Careful screening or matching*
  - Similarity in strategies
- **Internal organizational context**
  - Size*
  - Resources available
- **Internship structure formality**
  - Project definition*
  - Selection of students*
  - Matching the project with students*
- **Student’s ability to transfer and apply university knowledge to internship**
  - General academic preparedness *
  - Internship readiness
    - Awareness and choice about project
    - Choice about faculty advisor
- **University’s preparedness for the internship**
  - Awareness of company’s interests
    - Prior ties
    - Careful screening or matching*
    - Similarity in strategies
  - Internal organizational context
    - Size
    - Degree
    - Program design
  - Internship structure formality
    - Faculty preparedness
    - Faculty selection role*
    - Selection of students*
    - Matching the project with students*

#### PROCESSES
- **Employing firm’s interaction with university and student**
  - Communication with and commitment to the university
    - Arms length or embedded
  - Managing the process
    - Feedback to student and supervisory support*
- **Student’s commitment to the internship**
  - Motivation
    - Task and knowledge challenges
    - Initial student learning*
  - Communication
    - With faculty and employer
- **University’s interaction with employing company and student**
  - Communication with and commitment to the employer
    - Arms length or embedded*
  - Managing the process
    - Feedback to student and faculty mentoring*

#### OUTCOMES
- **Employing firm’s tangible benefits and enhanced capabilities**
  - Proximal
    - Project completion*
    - Project productivity
    - Potential recruitment
    - Initial inflow of ideas
    - Student satisfaction*
  - Distal
    - Continued inflow of ideas
    - Stronger linkages with academic institution
- **Student’s skill development and career enhancement**
  - Proximal
    - Student satisfaction*
    - Student placement
  - Distal
    - Career prospects
- **University’s enhanced capabilities and facilitation of student development**
  - Proximal
    - Student satisfaction*
    - Student placement
    - Quality of student programs
  - Distal
    - Inflow of research ideas
    - Stronger linkages with employing firm
    - Reputation for student placement

---

**FIGURE 1**

Internship Model. (Items marked by an asterisk have corresponding measures in the empirical model.)
### MIDWIFERY ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT

Table 1  
The MAFI-framework, results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Learning effect</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Educational structure | Competences are the learning outcomes | Promotes:  
- the setting of realistic outcomes  
- focus on competency development | Competences are:  
- complex  
- too time consuming | - Time  
- Training  
- Limited number of competences |
| 2. Learning and guidance process | 1. Learners write reflections after performances under a competence-structure  
2. Learners ask feedback  
3. Supervisors read reflections  
4. Supervisors give and write feedback | Promotes:  
- active involvement in learning  
- student-centred supervision  
- a 2-way feedback process | Lack of:  
- observation  
- reading time  
- negative feedback, especially on professional behaviour | - Observation to validate reflections  
- Active students  
- Motivation to write negative feedback |
| 3. Documenting competency development | Collected evidence is available for learners and supervisors at all stages of the internship | Facilitates:  
- the continuous self-directed learning process  
- supervision (i.e. how does the learner use feedback?) | Bias in information:  
- learners are selecting positive feedback writers  
- inconsistent feedback between supervisors | - Effective feedback culture |
| 4. Integrating learning and assessment | Written feedback can be judged against the concrete criteria of the checklist | Facilitates:  
- formative assessment  
- summative assessment | Lack of:  
- supervisors’ involvement in summative assessment  
- assessment dialogues | - Explicit roles in learning and assessment  
- Systematically planned assessment meetings |
Data was drawn from the Term-time Internship 2014-15

- Time Frame:
  - April 2014 to Oct 2015, one full day per week, total 23 weeks.

- Participants:
  - 89 students
  - 37 Community Partners

- Organisation breakdown:
CONTROVERSY IN "SUPERVISOR’S EVALUATION"

- Multiple evaluators
- Job tasks varied
- Nature of organisation differed
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1- How consistent is Supervisor’s Evaluation?
   - Supervisor is to evaluate according to 9 Assessment Criteria
   - Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Less than satisfactory, Unacceptable
   - How well does the average of the 9 criteria match the final score?

2- Would interns’ overall impression of internship related to the final grade?
   - All interns have to fill in a self-evaluation form
   - Overall speaking, this internship is a fruitful one: Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly disagree, N/A
   - Students usually enjoy their internship experience more if they have a good relationship with supervisors and they think the internship is a fruitful one.
## HOW ACCURATE IS SUPERVISOR’S EVALUATION?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisor Final Grade (A=5)</th>
<th>9 Assessment Criteria Average (Excellent=5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.22494382</td>
<td>4.200749064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.459109372</td>
<td>0.491472497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.8998513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference df</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
<td>0.737854422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</td>
<td>0.231282992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
<td>1.662354029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.462565984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>1.987289865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CORRELATION BETWEEN SUPERVISOR’S SCORE VS INTERNS’ IMPRESSION OF THEIR INTERNSHIP
## Correlation Between Supervisor's Score vs Interns' Impression of Their Internship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IS THE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA CLEAR TO THE SUPERVISOR?
QUALITATIVE DATA: STUDENTS’ CONCERNS

• “differences in marking between students working in different companies or NGOs”
• “working time of each internship is different”
• “grading is too subjective”
• “supervisor subjective grading accounts for half the grade, interns need to accept unreasonable requests”
• “supervisors have too great power over students”
CONCLUSION

• By including all the three important factors (the roles of the student, University and Community Partner) will help understand and evaluate the internship experience thoroughly and comprehensively (Narayanan et al., 2010).

• From Quantitative data: Supervisors are generally fairly consistent with their evaluation and there is no correlation between interns’ impression on CP and their final grade.

BUT

• From Qualitative data: Students reveal unfairness in the system.
FUTURE INVESTIGATION

a) Students’ satisfaction and learning outcome? It is interesting to correlate our students fieldwork grade with other academic deliverables and their GPA.

b) I think it will be interesting to study the subjective experiences of interns so as to 1) scaffold their learning better and 2) document/evaluate the learning outcome better.

c) Y2k kids call for new job skill sets or communication needs/adjustment in the workforce?
SUGGESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

• “faculty may consider impose some mechanism to prevent interns from being overly used by CP” – student’s feedback
• Academic Staff to evaluate using Summative Evaluation?
• Supervisors only give feedback instead of a grade?

