



## Evaluation pilot Summer school

**'Safeguarding young people in  
care' 2017**

## EVALUATION PILOT SUMMER SCHOOL 'SAFEGUARDING YOUNG PEOPLE IN CARE' 2017

This is an overview of the results of the evaluation of the pilot of the Summer course 'Safeguarding young people in care', an international summer school for social work students. Eighteen students who participated in the summer school of 2017 filled in an evaluation form consisting of both quantitative and qualitative questions (see appendix 1).

### QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The quantitative results show overall positive outcomes, with average grades ranging from 6,9 to 8,8 (see table 1).

**Table 1**

*Results from the first part of the written evaluation of the summer school*

Question	Mean grade (1-10)	Std. deviation	Range (min.-max.)
1. The way in which a <u>safe environment</u> was created	8.7	1	3 (7-10)
2. The way in which the <u>international character</u> of the summer school was used	6.9	1.4	6 (3-9)
3. Extent to which the <u>most important themes</u> with regard to sexuality in youth care were addressed in the summer school	8.6	1	3 (7-10)
4. <u>Level of difficulty</u> of the summer school	7.2	2.1	8 (2-10)
5. Extent to which <u>learning goals</u> of the summer school were realistic	7.2	1.9	7 (3-10)
6. Quality of <u>learning materials</u> (e.g. study manual, literature)	8.2	.9	3 (7-10)
7. Quality of the summer school <u>location</u>	8.8	1.1	4 (6-10)
8. Extent to which the summer school met my <u>expectations</u>	7.8	1.1	4 (6-10)
9. Extent to which the summer school met my <u>needs</u>	6.2	1.9	7 (2-9)
10. <u>Overall grade</u> summer school	7.4	.9	4 (5-9)

Students gave the highest grades to the following aspects of the summer school: the way in which a safe environment was created, the content (themes) of the summer school, the quality of the learning materials and the summer school location. These four questions were all evaluated with a grade above 8.0, on a scale from 1 to 10.

The mean grade is lowest (6.2) in response to question 9, 'Extent to which the summer school met my needs' (with a standard deviation of 1,927). This is caused by the fact that five students responded with 5 or lower (resp. 3, 2, 5, 3 and 5). Two of them mentioned in the remarks section that this was because of issues concerning the size of the accommodation, where there was 'too little room for some personal space', one of them stating that 'boat Hannus is really really bad'. The other three low grading students didn't support their grade with an explanation. The thirteen other students were far more positive (range from 6-8).

Although the level of difficulty of the summer school was evaluated with a mean grade of 7.2, the students' evaluations regarding this topic diverged a great deal (standard deviation 2.1). This was also the case in the responses to question 5, with a mean grade of 7.2 and a standard deviation of 1.9. For both questions, the deviation is caused mainly by two students who gave very low scores on both questions because they thought the summer school was 'too easy'. (They responded with resp. 2 and 3 to question 4, and both with 3 to question 5.). The other students, however, responded with grades ranging from 6 to 10.

## QUALITATIVE RESULTS

The students were asked to answer eight qualitative questions (see appendix 1). In the following paragraphs, the answers of the students to these questions are summarized.

## LEARNING RESULTS

In answer to question 1, 'What was the most important thing you learned during the summer school?', students responded that they learned to recognize signals of abuse (N=6), work with the Flag system (N=4), trust their own feelings in relation to subjects concerning sexuality (N=3), and dare to talk about sexuality (N=3). This last subject was mentioned even more in the answers to question 2 ('How did the summer school change the way you will operate in practice from now on?'). Students said that they now find it easier or know better how to talk about sexuality (N=8), are more confident to do so (N=6), and will pay more attention to signals of abuse in the future (N=6).

Two questions proved difficult to answer. The first problematic question was question 3, 'How did the summer school contribute to your professional development?'. The answers of students to this question were sometimes a little vague ('learned a lot') or similar to the answers to question 1, 2, and 3. Overall, students felt they had become more aware of the importance of the subject sexuality within their professional field and of the importance of recognizing the signals of abuse.

The second question that was hard to answer addressed the personal learning goals of the students (question 4). The answers to this question showed that most of the students had no clear vision about what their learning goals were. Therefore, there wasn't much information to be retrieved from the answers to this question.

## PROGRAM OF THE SUMMER SCHOOL

When asked which parts should be kept in the program of the summer school (question 5), the answers of the students diverged widely; almost every element of the program was mentioned at least once. However, two parts of the program were mentioned quite often: the visit to Payoke (an Antwerp institution for victims of human trafficking, N=10) and the lecture of Sanne Lichthart ('expert by personal experience' from the Netherlands, who told about her experiences with sexual abuse in youth care during her childhood, N=8). Furthermore, four students thought Liesbeth Wingerdbloei's lecture about treating traumatized children should remain a part of the program and four others said the same about the visits of 'experience experts'.

There were only a few things that should be dropped from the program, according to the students (question 6). Some of them noted that there were too many lectures, which they found a bit boring. (When asked for suggestions, the students came up with 'more doing and less talking' and with 'shorter days and/or more breaks'). According to five students, the 'developing wheel' was too long and chaotic, but they all emphasized that this element should not be removed, but just changed. They suggested shortening it or applying a somewhat different approach (there were no suggestions on how this should be done). Two students thought Niels Grandals lecture was too easy, and two others mentioned that the boat in which they slept should be dropped (a theme that also came up in responses to other questions).

In response to question 7 ('Which suggestions do you have for improvement of the summer school?'), the following suggestions were mentioned by three or more students:

- More visits to institutions (N=5)
- More attention to the differences between countries (different system, laws etc.) (N=4)
- More attention and time for the social processes within the group (N=4)
- More experience experts (N=3)
- Another accommodation (N=3)

### ADVICE TO FUTURE STUDENTS

Finally, the students were asked whether they had any advice for students who are going to follow the summer school in the future (question 8). Eight students said something like: just do it! Others advised being open when you participate in the summer school and sharing your personal experiences.

### CONCLUSION

Overall, the students were positive about the summer school. However, they had some recommendations. One issue had to do with the accommodation. Multiple students thought the accommodation was not suitable because of the limited space. Secondly, students stated that some parts of the program should change (the length and approach of the developing wheel, the difficulty level of Niels' lecture) and some should stay (visit to Payoke, lectures of Sanne Lichthart and Liesbeth Wingerdbloei). Students also suggested more visits to institutions and more lectures from or talks with experienced experts, although they also noted that the number of lectures was high and that the program would benefit from more activities. In addition, they advised paying more attention to the differences between countries (systems, laws), and they advised paying more attention to the group processes and the social environment during the summer school.

**APPENDIX 1**

**EVALUATION:**

Please indicate how much you value the following aspects of the summer school by giving grades between 1 (bad) and 10 (excellent)

<b>Summer school</b>	<b>Grade</b>
1. The way in which a <u>safe environment</u> was created	
2. The way in which the <u>international character</u> of the summer school was used	
3. Extent to which the <u>most important themes</u> with regard to sexuality in youth care were part of the summer school	
4. <u>Difficulty level</u> of the summer school	
5. Extent to which <u>learning goals</u> of the summer school were realistic	
6. Quality of <u>learning materials</u> (e.g. study manual, literature)	
7. Quality of the summer school <u>location</u>	
8. Extent to which the summer school met my <u>expectations</u>	
9. Extent to which the summer school met my <u>needs</u>	
10. <u>Overall grade</u> summer school	

**Remarks:**.....  
 .....

**QUALITATIVE QUESTIONS:**

1. What was the most important thing you learned during the summer school?
2. How did the summer school change the way you will operate in practice from now on?
3. How did the summer school contribute to your professional development?
4. To what extent did you achieve your own learning goals?
5. Which parts of the summer school should be kept in future summer school programs?
6. Which parts should be left out?
7. Which suggestions do you have for improvement of the summer school?
8. What will be your advice for future students who consider participating in the summer school?

**SAFEGUARDING YOUNG  
 PEOPLE IN CARE**

