



**University  
Partnership  
Program**



# **Ohio's Child Welfare University Partnership Program 2022-2023 Evaluation Report**

**Prepared by:**

**Kellana Hindert, Ph.D., MBA, PMP**

**Kieran Arens, MSW**

 **KELLANA HINDERT & ASSOCIATES**

**OUCAS**

OHIO'S UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM  
FOR CHILD AND ADULT SERVICES

**Report released to Ohio Department of Children and Youth: Jan. 19, 2024**

# Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
Introduction and Background .....	5
Mission and Objectives .....	5
Program Structure and Roles .....	6
Methodology, Samples, and Data Sources .....	9
Surveys.....	9
UPP Database .....	9
Continuous Quality Improvement .....	10
Scanning.....	10
Interpreting.....	11
Learning .....	11
Plan .....	11
Do.....	12
Study.....	12
Act.....	16
Reach and Access .....	16
UPP Graduate On-the-Job Performance.....	21
Question: How do UPP employees perform on the job compared to non-UPP employees? ..	22
Other Supervisor Feedback on UPP Employees.....	24
Former UPP Student Outcomes and Perspectives .....	24
Former UPP Students Who Chose Not to Pursue a Career in Child Welfare.....	25
Former UPP Students Who Have Completed Their Commitment .....	26
Former UPP Students Who Are Currently in Their Commitment Period .....	28
Former UPP Students Who Pursued but Could Not Secure Employment .....	30
Current UPP Student Perspectives .....	30
Overall UPP Experience .....	31
Field Experience Feedback .....	33
Career Plan .....	35
Campus Coordinator Program Perspectives.....	36
New UPP Universities.....	37
Campus Coordinator Onboarding .....	37
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI).....	38
Existing UPP Universities .....	39
Satisfaction with Campus Coordinator Role.....	39
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI).....	40
University Instructional Delivery.....	41
CW1 .....	41
In-Person.....	41
Remote .....	41
CW2 .....	42
In-Person.....	42
Remote .....	42

Caseworker Core Content Fidelity .....	42
Methodology .....	42
Benchmarks .....	43
Core Content .....	43
Time Spent.....	44
Reading Assignments .....	44
Course Assignments .....	45
Ohio UPP and Nationwide Title IV-E Programs.....	46
Prevalence and Scale of Programs .....	46
Eligibility Requirements.....	47
Stipends .....	48
Paybacks .....	49
Existing Employees .....	49
Recommendations .....	49
References .....	51
Appendix A: UPP Main and Regional Campuses.....	53
Appendix B: UPP Placements and Employments by Ohio County since 2004 .....	55
Appendix C: UPP Supervisor Survey.....	56
Appendix D: Former UPP Student Survey.....	59
Appendix E: UPP Current Student Survey.....	62
Appendix F: UPP Campus Coordinator Survey .....	65
Appendix G: National Survey of IV-E Stipends & Paybacks .....	67

## Executive Summary

---

The Ohio Child Welfare University Partnership Program (UPP) was established in 2002 to provide Ohio's Public Children Services Agencies (PCSAs) with educated, trained, and experienced child welfare caseworkers. Ohio's University Consortium for Child and Adult Services' (OUCCAS) evaluation team used a mixed-methods research approach to understand the reach and impact of UPP in the 2022-2023 academic year.

During the year, UPP enrolled a total of 70 students and graduated a total of 55 students from eight universities across the state. As of 2023, the program has reached 72 (81.8%) counties through student participation in internships and 67 (76.1%) counties through student employment at agencies for a combined impact in 78 (88.6%) of Ohio's counties. Additionally, four new universities have joined the program, which will increase its reach and student access.

Consistent with the past several years, supervisors rated recent UPP employees as more competent on a 5-point scale than recent non-UPP employees in the areas of 1) Entering data into the Ohio Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (Ohio SACWIS) (4.00 vs. 2.30); 2) Thinking critically (4.00 vs. 2.70); 3) Conducting a Safety Assessment (3.50 vs. 2.30); 4) Conducting a Family Assessment (3.40 vs. 2.20); 5) Conducting a Family Case Plan (3.10 vs. 1.90); 6) Maintaining confidentiality (4.00 vs. 2.90); 7) Engaging clients (3.70 vs. 2.60); 8) Ability to handle stress (3.50 vs. 2.40); and 9) Conducting a Safety Plan (3.20 vs. 2.30).

Like supervisors, many former UPP students gave positive feedback about their program experience. Over 92% of former UPP students who have completed their commitment and 88.8% of those who are currently in their commitment period strongly agreed or agreed that UPP prepared them for their child welfare job. Additionally, 91.7% of current UPP students reported that their internship experience positively impacted their decision to pursue child welfare as a profession.

Although UPP is highly rated in terms of preparing students for child welfare work by supervisors and former UPP students alike, Ohio is not immune to the nationwide trends of workforce shortages and instability (Phillips et al., 2022; The Quality Improvement Center for

Workforce Development, 2020, 2021, 2022a, 2022b; National Child Welfare Workforce Institute, 2019). Once employed, some (55% of respondents who have completed their UPP work commitment) former students reported challenges related to high caseloads, inadequate pay, and poor supervision, all of which contributed to their plans to leave the profession.

Most current students were very satisfied or satisfied with the program in the areas of 1) Campus Coordinator (91.6%); 2) Recruitment (90.0%); 3) Student Incentive (90.0%); 4) Field Experience (86.6%); 5) Coursework (85.0%); 6) Seminar (78.3%); 7) Required Readings (76.7%); and 8) Employment Assistance (71.7%).

UPP compares positively with the 77 other Title IV-E programs across the nation in terms of the number of participating universities (ranking in the Top 3), offering junior, bachelor, and master's level participation, and having a centralized administration. Other programs offer students tuition payment, mileage reimbursement, and other benefits.

Most (87.5%) existing (original eight) campus coordinators strongly agreed or agreed that they feel satisfied in their role as campus coordinators, while 50.0% of new campus coordinators reported that they feel prepared to perform the duties of their role. All campus coordinators reported that their universities had a diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) policy or initiative, with four reporting that their school of social work has a specific DEI policy or representation on a committee.

All existing universities except for one (87.5%) offered at least one in-person learning opportunity for both Child Welfare 1 (CW1) and Child Welfare 2 (CW2) courses during the academic year. And 75.0% of the universities provided at least one remote learning opportunity for both CW1 and CW2 during the academic year. Average student enrollment was relatively consistent across courses and modalities (range 14.8 - 16.6). Instructor fidelity to Ohio Child Welfare Training Program (OCWTP) Caseworker Core remained consistent with recent years' scores at 93.8% across the eight universities.

Looking forward, opportunities for program improvement include 1) Tracking national initiatives on child welfare workforce issues; 2) Considering a mentorship program for students

in the final year of their tenure; 3) Providing additional data-entry and role support for campus coordinators; 4) Assessing the program structure and benefits offered by similar Title IV-E programs; and 5) Focusing on improvements to Caseworker Core fidelity.

## **Introduction and Background**

---

The University Partnership Program (UPP) is part of Ohio’s commitment to improving outcomes for children and families by strengthening its child welfare workforce. It is a unique and beneficial partnership among the Ohio Department of Children and Youth (ODCY), twelve of Ohio’s public and private university schools of social work, Ohio’s University Consortium for Child and Adult Services (OUCCAS), the Public Children’s Services Association of Ohio (PCSAO), and Ohio’s 85 Public Children Service Agencies (PCSAs).

The partnership has three primary purposes:

1. To identify future child welfare professionals and prepare them for entry-level positions in PCSAs.
2. To help professionalize the field of Child Welfare; and,
3. To reduce the time newly hired caseworkers spend on on-the-job training.

## **Mission and Objectives**

UPP provides public children services agencies with a workforce of newly graduated individuals who have fieldwork experience and are trained in Ohio’s mandated Core training. The program intends to positively affect the recruitment and retention of quality staff and reduce the expenditure of time and money on training new workers. The Partnership Committee agreed on the following mission statement to guide its work:

The mission of the University Partnership Program is to develop creative child welfare leaders, policymakers, managers, and direct service practitioners who have the capacity for critical thinking, and to promote best practices and the highest quality service to children, families, and communities. The program accomplishes this through the coordinated and integrated provision of quality social work education and training.

The objectives include four ways in which the program supports the public child welfare system:

1. Ensuring, in accordance with Ohio House Bill 448, all newly employed caseworkers would have or achieve, within five years of employment, a degree in a job-related human services field.
2. Reducing staff turnover in public child welfare agencies.
3. Maximizing the use of resources for in-service training.
4. Creating career ladders and ongoing professional development.

The program was piloted starting in July 2002, with two universities participating. Over the next seven years, the number of participating universities grew to eight that currently have ongoing programs.

## **Program Structure and Roles**

Each university employs a dedicated campus coordinator. All participating universities are required to offer two child welfare courses that contain the same content as the mandatory Caseworker Core training provided to all new child welfare caseworkers in the State of Ohio. The child welfare courses are taught by instructors at each university. Course instructors may be the UPP campus coordinator or a professor within a university's social work department. UPP graduates who complete the child welfare coursework are eligible to receive a waiver for participation in seven of the eight modules of Caseworker Core (UPP offers modules 1-2 and 4-8). This reduces training and onboarding time for UPP graduates hired at PCSAs.

The campus coordinator is responsible for program management at the university, the education and training of students, coordination of agencies and field instruction for the field placement experience, and employment coaching of students prior to graduation and hire. The position requires a master's degree in social work (MSW), minimum licensure of Licensed Social Worker (LSW) in the State of Ohio, and at least five years of experience in child welfare or working with children and families. The responsibilities of UPP Program Management include:

- Recruitment, screening, and assessment of students' learning needs and professional interests in public child welfare.
- Selection and orientation of students to the University Partnership Program.
- Supportive/advising services to UPP students to evaluate individual education and job skill needs.
- Establishment and promotion of UPP partnerships with PCSAs.
- Participation in the Ohio Child Welfare Training Program (OCWTP) State University Partnership Program work teams.
- Compiling aggregate information on students' learning needs to enhance curriculum development, field-based education, and other program elements.
- Manage, monitor, track, report, and evaluate UPP activities as prescribed by ODCY.
- Enter accurate and timely UPP student data into the learning management system for tracking and reporting purposes.

The responsibilities of Education and Training of Students include:

- Development of an individualized learning plan that identifies learning competencies.
- Establishment of an evaluation plan to determine each student's progress and success in mastering competencies.
- Providing instruction of the equivalent OCWTP caseworker core training within the delivery of two standardized child welfare (UPP) university courses.
- Offering a UPP seminar for UPP students to provide a transfer of learning between the classroom and field placement activities.
- Conducting regularly scheduled PCSA field placement site visits each semester with students and field instructors to evaluate students' progress, curriculum, field experiences, activities, and evaluation.

The responsibilities of Agencies and Field Instruction coordination include:

- Orienting and training PCSA field instructors to ensure high-quality university field education experiences.



- Coordinating field activities with classroom learning through consultation with PCSA field instructors.
- Providing consultation to PCSAs to ensure they are ready to successfully receive and prioritize students into employment in a direct client service or supervisory capacity upon graduation.
- Evaluating UPP students' progress and conducting individual meetings/conferences once per semester to discuss progress, experiences, positives/negatives, and concerns.
- Leading one regularly scheduled meeting per semester with field instructors to evaluate instructor experience, curriculum, field experiences, and activities.

Employment coaching responsibilities include:

- Supervising resume development, the employment application process, and providing hire recommendations.
- Assisting UPP students with job preparation and job placement at graduation.
- Monitoring commitment to employment.

UPP students are placed at PCSAs for their university field placement. Bachelor of Science in Social Work (BSSW) students are required to be in field placement 16 hours a week, while Master of Social Work (MSW) students need 24 hours of field placement. Each PCSA is responsible for providing an orientation to their agency and an appropriate workspace. Each student must be supervised by a social worker of a matched degree, i.e., BSSW student = BSSW degreed supervisor, MSW student= MSW degreed supervisor. The supervisor must complete the university field placement orientation, provide one hour of dedicated supervision weekly, utilize the university-required learning agreement, arrange learning activities, meet with the campus coordinator once each semester, and attend university field placement instructor meetings once each semester.

Students are assigned to field instructors who provide guidance during their field placement experience and provide feedback to campus coordinators about their student's performance. These field instructors are typically supervisors at the county agency with the required degree.

Students in the program are required to complete two child welfare courses as part of their education, participate in a field placement at one of Ohio's PCSAs, gain employment at one of Ohio's PCSAs within six months of graduation, and complete one or two years of employment at the PCSA (depending on the length of program commitment). Students receive a one-time incentive of \$5,000 upon hire in exchange for their commitment. Students who complete a 2-year program (Junior/BSSW or BSSW/Master's) are eligible for a one-time incentive of \$10,000 upon hire. If a student fails to complete the required time commitment, they must repay some or all the incentive to the UPP.

## **Methodology, Samples, and Data Sources**

---

OUCAS' evaluation team, Kellana Hindert and Associates, LLC (KHA), conducted a mixed-methods evaluation, collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data.

### **Surveys**

From March through May 2023, KHA administered electronic surveys to currently enrolled students, former students who graduated between 2003-2023, supervisors at county agencies, and campus coordinators. For the purposes of this report, field instructors are identified as those who directly supervise UPP students during their field experience. In contrast, supervisors are employees at county agencies who manage caseworkers who are former UPP students. All stakeholders were emailed communications containing a survey link and a QR code. Supervisors were compensated with a \$25 Starbucks electronic gift card for participating. Current students, former students, and supervisors were identified by querying the UPP database and by consulting campus coordinators. Stakeholders were surveyed on various topics, including their program experiences, employment preparation, post-graduation outcomes, and job performance.

### **UPP Database**


The UPP database is a comprehensive source of UPP student data spanning from the time of a student's initial engagement with the program through their employment at an Ohio PCSA.

Dating back to 2004, the database contains a wide variety of descriptive data, event data, and contact information.

## Continuous Quality Improvement

When OUCCAS commenced as the vendor for OCWTP statewide training coordination in 2020, it set a standard for a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process to be deployed to identify and address issues. The CQI process describes how UPP evaluation report recommendations are addressed throughout each year. OUCCAS' CQI process includes procedures for sensing and responding. Both operations are illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1 - How a Learning Organization Operates



Source: University of Cincinnati's Statewide Coordination of the Ohio Child Welfare Training Program Proposal, August 2020.

The first step for a learning organization is to engage in organizational sensing, which consists of three operations Scanning, Interpreting, and Learning.

### Scanning

Scanning is the process of being connected to system operations with the intent of understanding known and important issues while also uncovering problems of which ODCY or UPP stakeholders might be unaware. The evaluation team's scanning process included

administering surveys to current UPP students, former UPP students, UPP campus coordinators, and county agency supervisors.

### Interpreting

Upon completion of scanning, the evaluation team interpreted the collected data. Interpreting is a process of taking all raw data produced by scanning and fitting it into an organized set of ideas that drive a program or organization. The evaluation team sorted the collected qualitative data into broad categories. Categories and sentiments were then combined to draw conclusions about operations. Finally, quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistical methods.

### Learning

Once data were interpreted, the evaluation team created a comprehensive report to document learnings. Learning is a process whereby the interpreted data are used to understand system or program operations better.

After key learnings were summarized and issues identified, the sensing cycle ended, and responding procedures began. The evidence-based response framework chosen by OUCCAS is the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle. PDSA prompts the resolution of suboptimal processes or outcomes by guiding stakeholders to carry out the following iterative sequence of steps:

### Plan

Planning entails facilitating an open idea-generation process to address issues based on the best available information. In Fall 2022, OUCCAS's Assistant State Director of UPP held a series of meetings with key UPP stakeholders using the recommendations from the 2021-22 UPP Evaluation Report as a catalyst for discussion and decision-making. The output of those sessions was a strategic plan of action to make UPP more expansive, diverse, and impactful. The strategic plan also included owners for each action step to promote accountability.

## Do

The “Do” stage of the cycle is when planned actions are implemented, typically on a small scale, with the understanding that the change will not be executed permanently unless it is validated. Individuals and teams who owned strategic action areas implemented these changes between Fall 2022 and Spring 2023.

## Study

Each year the evaluation team will conduct a study of operations and document the effectiveness and efficiency of planned changes in the UPP Evaluation Report, paying attention to whether actions worked as expected and the possible presence of unexpected effects. Each year’s learning-based recommendations will reflect the outcomes of actions. The findings from this year’s evaluation are as follows (Table 1):

**Table 1. Recommendations, Planned Actions, and Current Evaluation Findings**

<b>Recommendations from the 2021-22 UPP Evaluation Report</b>	<b>Actions Taken by the Program during FY 2023</b>	<b>Current Evaluation Findings</b>
<b>Recommendation 1: Utilize Regional Campuses for Recruitment at All Universities.</b> Currently, six of eight (75%) universities have regional campuses, but only three (50%) are recruiting students from those campuses. UPP leadership should support and encourage the participation	1. A UPP workgroup was formed to address this issue.	1. All (100%) main and regional campuses that have social work programming are recruiting students into UPP.  2. Five regional campuses do not have social work programming; therefore, students are not available for recruitment

<p>of all regional campuses, which are predominantly located in small and rural counties.</p>		<p>to UPP on those campuses (<a href="#">Appendix A</a>).</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 2: Enhance Support for Field Instructors and Agencies.</b> Field instructor engagement and agency support are integral to UPP, especially with respect to expanding into smaller and rural counties.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A UPP workgroup was formed to address this issue.</li> <li>2. Per the program request, the evaluation team surveyed students about their field experiences to provide better feedback to field instructors.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development of a 3-hour continuing education unit (CEU) for field instructors is in progress and will be presented at the end of July.</li> <li>2. Per the Assistant State Director, UPP does not have the budget to implement an incentive program for field instructors. The incentive program was discussed with several directors and field instructors during agency or regional training center meetings; however, no one expressed an interest in providing an incentive program. Franklin County Children Services provides an incentive</li> </ol>

		<p>program for their field instructors.</p> <p>3. Initial results from the field experience survey are included in this report's <a href="#">Field Experience Feedback</a> section.</p> <p>Student feedback will be collected annually and reported back to field instructors.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 3: Track and Measure Changes in Student Body Diversity.</b></p> <p>Campus coordinators decided that ensuring a diverse student body is important to the success and sustainability of UPP. It will be important to measure and monitor changes in the demographic composition of UPP students in the coming years.</p>	<p>1. No planned action during this time.</p>	<p>1. The UPP database has transitioned to the Child and Adult Protective Services Learning Management System (CAPS LMS). A workgroup still needs to be formed to address this issue.</p> <p>Diversity data have been collected in the UPP database.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 4: Minimize Remote Learning.</b></p> <p>Feedback regarding the negative impact of remote</p>	<p>1. Per the program’s request, the evaluation team surveyed campus coordinators to assess</p>	<p>1. Survey results are in this report's <a href="#">University Instructional Delivery</a> section. UPP is limited in</p>

<p>learning was more salient this year (2021-22), as reflected in the frequency of student anecdotes expressing challenges and the decrease in satisfaction with relevant aspects of the student experience.</p>	<p>the instructional delivery options across UPP universities.</p>	<p>impacting this outcome as the universities control instructional delivery methods. Each university provides instructional design assistance and teaching education to campus coordinators to improve their efficacy.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 5: Track Attrition to Improve Programming and Retention.</b> UPP should consider dedicating resources to track students who don't become employed at a PCSA, aren't seeking employment, or aren't pursuing higher education. Connecting with these former students to document their reasons for leaving the program will help the program improve and inform future retention efforts.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Per the program's request, the evaluation team surveyed former UPP students to understand these issues.</li> <li>2. A Licensed Independent Social Worker (LISW) Training Workgroup was also formed to address the provision of LISW training supervision to UPP graduate employees.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Survey results are detailed in this report's <a href="#">Former UPP Student Outcomes and Perspectives</a> section.</li> <li>2. The program is also providing weekly training supervision to UPP-employed graduates who currently do not have a Licensed Independent Social Worker with Supervision Designation (LISW-S) licensed supervisor available to them.</li> </ol>



<p><b>Recommendation 6: Focus on Improvements to Caseworker Core Fidelity.</b> Based on the assessment of program fidelity, UPP leadership has several considerations to improve adherence and close gaps.</p>	<p>1. No changes to the Fidelity process were made as changes to Caseworker Core are looming.</p>	<p>1. Fidelity to Caseworker Core remained consistent with last year's scores.</p>
--	---	--

**Act**

Acting on study findings calls for implementing a change, exploring a new course of action, or reverting to the status quo. Action steps will include consideration of recommendations from the current report alongside other programmatic priorities.

**Reach and Access**

This year UPP enrolled 70 students and graduated 55 students across eight universities, with 32 graduates employed at an Ohio PCSA and 19 graduates seeking employment or pursuing higher education (Table 2).

**Table 2. UPP Student Enrollments and Graduates 2022-23\***

University Name	Number of Students Enrolled	Number of Students Who Graduated	Number of Graduates Employed n (%)	Number of Graduates Seeking Employment or Pursuing Higher Education n (%)
Cleveland State	9	8	3 (37.5)	0 (0.0)
Ohio University	10	8	7 (87.5)	1 (12.5)


<b>The Ohio State University</b>	19	16	8 (50.0)	5 (31.3)
<b>University of Akron</b>	9	9	6 (66.7)	3 (33.3)
<b>University of Cincinnati</b>	9	10	1 (10.0)	9 (90.0)
<b>University of Toledo</b>	4	0	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
<b>**Wright State University</b>	6	0	4 (N/A)	0 (0.0)
<b>Youngstown State University</b>	4	4	3 (75.0)	1 (25.0)
<b>Totals</b>	70	55	32 (58.2)	19 (34.5)

\*As of 6.13.23, per the UPP database

\*\* Missing graduate data

Since 2004, UPP has reached 72 (81.8%) counties through student participation in internships and 67 (76.1%) counties through student employment at Ohio agencies (Figure 2, Table 3, and [Appendix B](#)) for a combined impact in 78 (88.6%) of Ohio’s counties.

**Figure 2. UPP Placements and Employments by Ohio County since 2004\***



\* Based on data reported in the UPP Database as of June 13, 2023

**Table 3. UPP Placements and Employments by County since 2004\***

<b>County</b>	<b>Placements</b>	<b>Employments</b>
Adams	0	0
Allen	7	1
Ashland	3	4
Ashtabula	4	2
Athens	58	12
Auglaize	1	1
Belmont	10	2
Brown	6	1
Butler	38	20
Carroll	1	1
Champaign	4	2
Clark	26	11
Clermont	4	2
Clinton	1	1
Columbiana	1	2
Coshocton	2	2
Crawford	1	0
Cuyahoga	104	40
Darke	0	0
Defiance	0	0
Delaware	12	5
Erie	1 <sup>†</sup>	0
Fairfield	25	25
Fayette	2	0
Franklin	194	156
Fulton	2	1
Gallia	2	0
Geauga	1	9

<b>Greene</b>	29	22
<b>Guernsey</b>	3	6
<b>Hamilton</b>	91	58
<b>Hancock</b>	3	2
<b>Hardin</b>	0	3
<b>Harrison</b>	1	1
<b>Henry</b>	1	0
<b>Highland</b>	0	3
<b>Hocking</b>	10	1
<b>Holmes</b>	0	0
<b>Huron</b>	1	0
<b>Jackson</b>	1	1
<b>Jefferson</b>	0	2
<b>Knox</b>	2	1
<b>Lake</b>	4	5
<b>Lawrence</b>	2	0
<b>Licking</b>	2	2
<b>Logan</b>	2	1
<b>Lorain</b>	2	7
<b>Lucas</b>	89	54
<b>Madison</b>	6	3
<b>Mahoning</b>	38	17
<b>Marion</b>	4	3
<b>Medina</b>	10	8
<b>Meigs</b>	0	0
<b>Mercer</b>	1	1
<b>Miami</b>	10	6
<b>Monroe</b>	3	3
<b>Montgomery</b>	71	52
<b>Morgan</b>	0	0

<b>Morrow</b>	0	0
<b>Muskingum</b>	25	5
<b>Noble</b>	0	0
<b>Ottawa</b>	7	0
<b>Paulding</b>	0	1
<b>Perry</b>	3	1
<b>Pickaway</b>	0	2
<b>Pike</b>	1	0
<b>Portage</b>	5	5
<b>Preble</b>	6	1
<b>Putnam</b>	0	0
<b>Richland</b>	11	6
<b>Ross</b>	9	3
<b>Sandusky</b>	2	0
<b>Scioto</b>	5	1
<b>Seneca</b>	2	2
<b>Shelby</b>	5	2
<b>Stark</b>	31	27
<b>Summit</b>	72	50
<b>Trumbull</b>	32	26
<b>Tuscarawas</b>	1	2
<b>Union</b>	6	4
<b>Van Wert</b>	0	1
<b>Vinton</b>	5	2
<b>Warren</b>	21	14
<b>Washington</b>	10	0
<b>Wayne</b>	12	6
<b>Williams</b>	0	0
<b>Wood</b>	7	3
<b>Wyandot</b>	2	1

<b>Grand Total</b>	1176	727
--------------------	------	-----

\* Based on data reported in the UPP Database as of June 13, 2023

†2022-23 was the first year that Erie County had a UPP placement

Table 4 displays county size categories taken from the Child Protection Oversight & Evaluation (CPOE) report (source: Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS)). While 100% of large, metro, and major metro counties have hosted at least one student intern and 86.3% of medium and 85.7% of medium-small counties have hosted at least one student intern, only 56.0% of small counties have had a student placement. Similarly, only 52.0% of small counties have hired a UPP graduate, while rates are higher for medium-small counties (78.6%), medium counties (72.7%), and large, metro, and major metro counties (100%).

**Table 4. Number and percentages of counties with at least one placement or employment by CPOE size**

County Size	# of Counties	# of Counties with at Least 1 Placement	% of Counties with at Least 1 Placement	# of Counties with at Least 1 Employment	% of Counties with at Least 1 Employment
Small	25	14	56.0%	13	52.0%
Medium-Small	14	12	85.7%	11	78.6%
Medium	22	19	86.3%	16	72.7%
Large	12	12	100.0%	12	100.0%
Metro	12	12	100.0%	12	100.0%
Major Metro	3	3	100.0%	3	100.0%
All Counties	88	72	81.8%	67	76.1%

## UPP Graduate On-the-Job Performance

UPP graduate on-the-job performance continues to be a key indicator of program impact. UPP students who have graduated and are employed at PCSAs are referred to as “UPP employees” in this section. The evaluation team surveyed ([Appendix C](#)) county agency supervisors to understand how new UPP employees performed on the job compared to new non-UPP

employees. Survey responses were received from 10 of the 20 supervisors (50.0%) whose information was provided by campus coordinators. Supervisors who responded tended to be from larger counties, with half (50.0%) employed in major metro counties while none (0.0%) were employed in small or medium-small counties (Table 5). Supervisors received a \$25 electronic Starbucks gift card for their participation.

**Table 5. County Supervisors by CPOE County Size**

County Size	# of Supervisors
Small	0
Medium-Small	0
Medium	1
Large	2
Metro	2
Major Metro	5
All Counties	10

### Question: How do UPP employees perform on the job compared to non-UPP employees?

Supervisors rated the skills competency of employees on the following Likert scale:

- 1 – Poor, no evidence of skill; Not competent
- 2 – Fair, lacks clear evidence of skill; Limited Competence
- 3 – Good, some evidence of skill; Emerging Competence
- 4 – Very Good, clear evidence of skill; Competent
- 5 – Excellent, ample evidence of skill; Very Competent

According to supervisor ratings (Table 6), UPP employees were more competent than non-UPP employees in all areas of inquiry: 1) Entering data into the Ohio Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (Ohio SACWIS) (4.0 vs. 2.3); 2) Thinking critically (4.0 vs. 2.7); 3) Conducting a Safety Assessment (3.5 vs. 2.3); 4) Conducting a Family Assessment (3.4 vs. 2.2); 5) Conducting a Family Case Plan (3.1 vs. 1.9); 6) Maintaining confidentiality (4.0 vs. 2.9); 7)

Engaging clients (3.7 vs. 2.6); 8) Ability to handle stress (3.5 vs. 2.4); and 9) Conducting a Safety Plan (3.2 vs. 2.3).

Supervisors rated UPP employees more highly than non-UPP employees by a substantial margin, with the average rating differential for all skills being at least 0.90. The greatest rating differential was seen for “Entering data into [Ohio] SACWIS,” with UPP employees being rated, on average, 1.70 points higher than non-UPP employees. Additionally, all the average skill ratings for non-UPP employees fell below the midpoint on the Likert scale (3.00), while none of the average skill ratings for UPP employees did so. This performance benefit has been documented over several years.

**Table 6. Supervisor Ratings of UPP Employee and Non-UPP Employee Skills**

<b>Skill</b>	<b>UPP Employee Average Rating</b>	<b>Non-UPP Employee Average Rating</b>	<b>Average Rating Differential</b>
<b>Entering data into [Ohio] SACWIS</b>	4.0	2.3	1.7
<b>Thinking critically</b>	4.0	2.7	1.3
<b>Conducting/Completing a Safety Assessment</b>	3.5	2.3	1.2
<b>Conducting/Completing a Family Assessment</b>	3.4	2.2	1.2
<b>Conducting/Completing a Family Case Plan</b>	3.1	1.9	1.2
<b>Maintaining confidentiality</b>	4.0	2.9	1.1
<b>Engaging clients</b>	3.7	2.6	1.1
<b>Ability to handle stress</b>	3.5	2.4	1.1
<b>Conducting/Completing a Safety Plan</b>	3.2	2.3	0.9



## Other Supervisor Feedback on UPP Employees

Overall, supervisors expressed positive sentiments about UPP and the students who were sent to their agencies. Three supervisors explained that they enjoy working with and mentoring the students. Three also said that the program produces quality candidates for employment.

## Former UPP Student Outcomes and Perspectives

KHA administered a survey ([Appendix D](#)) to 849 former UPP students who graduated between 2003 and 2023 to gather feedback on their experiences with the program, ascertain their employment status, and understand their on-the-job experiences. A total of 95 former UPP students replied to the survey, 46 (48.4%) of whom received bachelor's degrees and 49 (51.6%) of whom received master's degrees. The employment statuses of respondents are listed in Table 7, with the majority having completed their employment commitment period or currently being in their commitment period (64.2%), followed by 30.5% who chose not to pursue a career in child welfare.

However, the employment statuses of bachelor's degree recipients are distributed differently from those of master's degree recipients. While 76.1% of bachelor's degree recipients completed or are currently in their commitment period, only 53.0% of master's degree recipients did or are doing the same. Similarly, only 17.4% of bachelor's degree recipients chose not to seek employment in child welfare, while nearly half (42.8%) of master's degree recipients made that choice.

**Table 7. Former UPP Student Employment Status vs. Level of Education**

Employment Status vs. Level of Education	Bachelor's Degree Recipient	Master's Degree Recipient	Total
	n (%)		
Employed and have completed their commitment	31 (67.4)	21 (42.8)	52 (54.7)

<b>Graduated but chose not to seek employment in Child Welfare</b>	8 (17.4)	21 (42.8)	29 (30.5)
<b>Employed and are still in their commitment period</b>	4 (8.7)	5 (10.2)	9 (9.5)
<b>Graduated but could not find employment in Child Welfare</b>	3 (6.5)	2 (4.1)	5 (5.3)
<b>Total</b>	46 (100.0)	49 (100.0)	95 (100.0)

### Former UPP Students Who Chose Not to Pursue a Career in Child Welfare

Former UPP students who chose not to pursue a career in child welfare gave a wide variety of reasons for that choice, though three reasons stood out as the most cited. First, was poor working conditions within the field, cited by 32.0% of the 25 respondents to this question. Specific examples of this included high caseloads, long hours, systemic issues, and the prevalence of mental health issues, such as depression and anxiety, among current staff.


Tied for second were low pay and pursuing other interests, each mentioned by 24.0% of respondents. Two individuals specifically noted that the pay is low relative to other areas of social work. Other reasons that former UPP students gave for not pursuing a job in child welfare included starting a family, wanting to pursue a higher degree, finding an overall better job elsewhere, being blocked by a hiring freeze, witnessing poor training of caseworkers, and seeing caseworkers spend a majority of their time on paperwork.

When prompted to provide additional feedback about UPP and their work experience in child welfare, eight former UPP students touched on four key issues. More than half (62.5%) of those respondents praised UPP as a whole and the quality learning opportunities it provides. One person specifically said that UPP allowed them to make an informed decision about whether to work in child welfare. Another 50.0% of respondents explained that their time in UPP has been helpful in jobs outside of PCSAs. Two former UPP students (25.0%) shared challenges they had at the agencies, noting low staffing levels and a need for more dedication to retaining employees. Finally, 12.5% of respondents suggested incorporating additional training about adoption.

## Former UPP Students Who Have Completed Their Commitment

Respondents who have completed their commitment overwhelmingly felt that UPP prepared them for their child welfare job, with 92.3% reporting that they “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with that sentiment (Figure 3). This percentage was similar for both bachelor’s degree recipients (90.3%) and master’s degree recipients (95.2%).

**Figure 3. Preparedness for a Child Welfare Job – Completed Commitment (n = 52)**




However, more than half of all respondents who have completed their commitment period (55.1%) indicated that they plan to leave their child welfare job over the next year (Figure 4). Again, this portion was similar for both bachelor’s (56.7%) and master’s (52.6%) degree recipients.

Former UPP students indicated that various factors are contributing to their intention to leave child welfare, and most respondents endorsed multiple reasons (Table 8). The most frequently endorsed reason was “Caseload too high” (59.3%). Following that were “Inadequate pay” (33.3%) and “Organizational climate” (33.3%). “Poor supervision” was the least frequent response, with 18.5% of respondents

**Figure 4. Plans to Leave Child Welfare Job - Completed Commitment (n = 49)**

Do you plan to leave your job in child welfare over the next year?



selecting it. Other reasons (51.9%) for leaving included the PCSA’s relationship with the Juvenile Court, the PCSA’s senior management, negative impacts on their mental health, and returning to school for a master’s degree.

Notably, bachelor’s degree recipients endorsed “inadequate pay” (52.9%) at a much higher rate than master’s degree recipients did (0.0%).

**Table 8. Reasons for Planning to Leave Child Welfare – Completed Commitment (n = 27)**

<b>Reasons for Planning to Leave Child Welfare</b>	<b>n (%)</b>
<b>Caseload too high</b>	16 (59.3)
<b>Organizational climate</b>	9 (33.3)
<b>Inadequate pay</b>	9 (33.3)
<b>Poor supervision</b>	5 (18.5)
<b>Other</b>	14 (51.9)


When asked to provide additional feedback about UPP and their work experience in child welfare, former UPP students’ responses were mixed. Half (50.0%) of the fourteen respondents who provided additional comments praised the program, while 42.9% offered criticisms or suggestions for improvement, and 7.1% explained that supervisors are critical for successful internships.

For example, some respondents (28.6%) said that UPP helped them get, feel prepared for, and succeed in their child welfare jobs. However, another respondent explained that they were not adequately warned about or prepared for the realities of casework, such as high caseloads, late nights, and stress. Additionally, one former UPP student explained that telling the court that they went through UPP gave them more credibility while testifying; however, another respondent stated that their education and skills were often not respected by the courts or by child protective services (CPS). Others offered suggestions, including linking former UPP students with current students and having PCSAs promote the program more internally.

## Former UPP Students Who Are Currently in Their Commitment Period

Almost all nine respondents who are currently in their commitment period indicated that UPP prepared them for their child welfare job, with 88.8% reporting that they “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with that sentiment (Figure 5). There were not enough respondents in this category to discern any patterns in the responses from bachelor’s degree recipients compared to master’s degree recipients.

**Figure 5. Preparedness for a Child Welfare Job – Ongoing Commitment ( $n = 9$ )**




Nonetheless, almost half of all respondents who are currently in their commitment period (44.4%) indicated that they plan to leave their child welfare job over the next year (Figure 6).

Of the four respondents who indicated that they intend to leave child welfare over the next year, all of them reported that they plan to do so immediately upon completing their commitment (Table 9).

**Figure 6. Plans to Leave Child Welfare Job - Ongoing Commitment ( $n = 9$ )**

Do you plan to leave your job in child welfare over the next year?



**Table 9. Timing for Planning to Leave Child Welfare – Ongoing Commitment**

<b>Timing for Planning to Leave Child Welfare</b>	<b>n (%)</b>
<b>Immediately upon completion of the commitment</b>	4 (100.0)
<b>Before fulfilling the commitment</b>	0 (0.0)
<b>Neither</b>	0 (0.0)
<b>Total</b>	4 (100.0)

Respondents in this section indicated that a variety of factors are contributing to their intention to leave child welfare (Table 10). The most frequently endorsed response was “Caseload too high” (75%), followed by “Inadequate pay” (50.0%), “Poor supervision” (50.0%), and “Organizational climate” (25.0%). One former UPP student added that they plan to leave because they are not able to cope emotionally with clients’ volatility.

**Table 10. Reasons for Planning to Leave Child Welfare – Ongoing Commitment**

<b>Reasons for Planning to Leave Child Welfare</b>	<b>n (%)</b>
<b>Caseload too high</b>	3 (75.0)
<b>Poor supervision</b>	2 (50.0)
<b>Inadequate pay</b>	2 (50.0)
<b>Organizational climate</b>	1 (25.0)
<b>Total</b>	4 (100.0)


Respondents touched on several issues when prompted to provide additional feedback about UPP and their work experience in child welfare. One respondent stated, “UPP was my favorite part of my college experience.” Three individuals provided suggestions for improving UPP, including ensuring consistency across universities, making sure that students are completing pertinent work, incorporating more examples into learning, providing more exposure to the paperwork that will be required as a caseworker, continuing to incorporate real-life scenarios, and providing additional training on how to handle traumatic events. Finally, one respondent

addressed their work experience, describing a lack of support and guidance because of how busy other workers are with their own cases.

## Former UPP Students Who Pursued but Could Not Secure Employment

Most respondents (60.0%) who were formerly enrolled in UPP but were unable to find employment in child welfare nonetheless reported that they were “Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied” with their UPP experience (Figure 7). Both respondents (40.0%) who indicated that they are “Dissatisfied” with their UPP experience were master’s degree recipients, while the remaining respondents received bachelor’s degrees.

Figure 7. Satisfaction with UPP (n = 5)



Three respondents provided additional feedback about UPP or their work experience. One individual expressed a desire for higher pay for direct service jobs in the field. Two former UPP students explained why they were dissatisfied with UPP. One said they felt pushed into the program only to be unable to secure employment. The other expresses frustration at being refused a job at the understaffed agency they had interned at after being given positive feedback regarding their work as an intern.

## Current UPP Student Perspectives

---

The evaluation team administered a survey ([Appendix E](#)) to current UPP students to gather feedback on their experiences with the program, their field placement experience, and their

future career plans. Survey data were collected from 65 of 70 (92.9%) UPP students enrolled in the 2022-23 cohort (Table 11). The student sample was a mix of Juniors (9.2%), Seniors (72.3%), and Master of Social Work students (18.5%) who are enrolled at the eight existing universities.

**Table 11. UPP Student Survey Respondent Student Status**

Student Status	n (%)
Senior	47 (72.3)
Master's	12 (18.5)
Junior	6 (9.2)
Total	65 (100.0)

## Overall UPP Experience

Overall, students responded positively to the question, “Please rate your overall satisfaction with your experience in the following categories” (Table 12). Most students were “Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied” with the program in the areas of 1) Campus Coordinator (91.6%); 2) Recruitment (90.0%); 3) Student Incentive (90.0%); 4) Field Experience (86.6%); 5) Coursework (85.0%); 6) Seminar (78.3%); 7) Required Readings (76.7%); and 8) Employment Assistance (71.7%).

**Table 12. Current Student Satisfaction by Program Area**

Program Area (n = 60)	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
	n (%)				
Campus Coordinator	41 (68.3)	14 (23.3)	3 (5.0)	1 (1.7)	1 (1.7)
Recruitment	33 (55.0)	21 (35.0)	5 (8.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.7)
Student Incentive	36 (60.0)	18 (30.0)	5 (8.3)	1 (1.7)	0 (0.0)
Field Experience	41 (68.3)	11 (18.3)	4 (6.7)	3 (5.0)	1 (1.7)



<b>Coursework</b>	24 (40.0)	27 (45.0)	6 (10.0)	2 (3.3)	1 (1.7)
<b>Seminar</b>	28 (46.7)	19 (31.6)	8 (13.3)	2 (3.3)	3 (5.0)
<b>Required Readings</b>	21 (35.0)	25 (41.7)	13 (21.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.7)
<b>Employment Assistance</b>	27 (45.0)	16 (26.7)	15 (25.0)	2 (3.3)	0 (0.0)

Student responses regarding which experiences were most helpful in their UPP field placement/internship pertained to 1) the people who supported students (67.3%), 2) specific hands-on experiences that students had (36.5%), or 3) elements of UPP outside of field placements/internships (13.5%). Regarding the people who supported them, students specifically highlighted the beneficial nature of shadowing (28.8%), supervision (15.4%), support and communication from UPP staff (15.4%), the opportunity to talk to active caseworkers (13.5%), and a positive agency culture (5.8%). Hands-on experiences that students found beneficial included getting to engage with multiple departments (13.5%), practicing documentation (9.7%), being in court (3.8%), engaging with clients (3.8%), using the virtual reality goggles (3.8%), and gaining a general expectation for what to expect from working in child welfare (11.5%). Students also praised the following elements of UPP that do not directly pertain to field placements/internships: employment post-graduation (3.8%), the coursework (1.9%), the seminars (1.9%), and the learning labs (1.9%).

Student responses regarding what additional experiences would have made their UPP field placement/internship better were exceptionally diverse, with no more than four students (11.4%) agreeing on any one experience. Nonetheless, the responses can be broadly categorized as relating to 1) hands-on experiences (34.3%), 2) the people who support students (25.7%), 3) general and logistical aspects of the field placement/internship (20.0%), and 4) elements of UPP outside of field placements/internships (20.0%). Students specifically requested more opportunities to gain hands-on experience with the following: a variety of agency departments (11.4%), client engagement (5.7%), documentation (5.7%), and seeing a case through to its conclusion (2.9%). Regarding the support they receive from other people, students requested more opportunities to meet with fellow students (11.4%), better

supervision (8.6%), better communication with UPP staff (5.7%), more opportunities to shadow (2.9%), and a more welcoming agency culture (2.9%). General and logistical changes that students suggested included being placed at a different agency (5.7%), requiring more time in the field placement/internship (5.7%), providing additional compensation (2.9%), and adding additional structure to the field placement and the learning goals therein (2.9%). Finally, student suggestions regarding elements of UPP outside of field placements/internships included updating course content to match current ODCY expectations (5.7%), offering in-person classes (5.7%), offering remote classes (2.9%), and offering additional classes or trainings to MSW students regarding supervisor or management roles (2.9%).

### Field Experience Feedback


Current students' feedback remained positive when asked about various specific elements of their field experience.

All respondents (100.0%) reported that their UPP field placement/internship met the requirements of their learning plan (Figure 8).


Additionally, most students (81.7%) indicated that their impression of the culture at their placement agency is “Positive” or “Very Positive” (Figure 9). The students who responded differently provided additional context about their agency’s culture. Two students noted that the interpersonal dynamics at their agency were challenging due to staff not being welcoming or supportive. One student observed that being a person of color exacerbated this issue. Another stated that their supervisor was not familiar with how to train students.

**Figure 8. Satisfaction of Learning Plan Requirements (n = 60)**

**Did your UPP field placement/internship meet the requirements of your learning plan?**




**Figure 9. Current Student Impression of Agency Culture (n = 60)**



Students also reported positively on their experiences with supervision. Most students (85.0%) indicated that they were “Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied” with the quality of supervision that they received during their field placement (Figure 10). Only 8.4% of students said they were “Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied” with it. Those respondents were asked to explain how their supervision could be better. Two students explained that they simply did not receive supervision. Another added that their field instructor was exceptionally difficult to meet with and often interrupted or cut short their supervision time. A fourth clarified that their supervisor was not a good fit personally. Finally, a student suggested that more time could be spent discussing policies, ethics, and how to navigate incoming cases.


**Figure 10. Current Student Satisfaction with Supervision (n = 60)**



Most students (87.7%) also reported that they “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” that they receive adequate support from their campus coordinator (Figure 11). Those who responded otherwise

elaborated that their campus coordinator needed to have better communication with their Field Supervisor, that their campus coordinator was difficult to contact, and that they received very little support during their time as a UPP student.

**Figure 11. Current Student Perception of Campus Coordinator Support (n = 65)**




## Career Plan


Almost all current students (91.7%) reported that their UPP field placement/internship positively impacted their decision to pursue child welfare as a profession (Figure 12). Further, most students (86.7%) indicated that they feel “Prepared” or “Very Prepared” to enter the child welfare workforce (Figure 13), thus suggesting that UPP is not only encouraging students to pursue careers in child welfare but is also giving them the tools to do so confidently.

**Figure 12. UPP Impact on Decision to Pursue CW Career (n = 60)**

Did the UPP field placement/internship experience positively impact your decision to pursue child welfare as a profession?



**Figure 13. Current Student Preparedness to Enter CW Workforce (n = 60)**



Three of those who said that their UPP field placement/internship did not positively impact their decision to pursue a job in child welfare elaborated that it was largely due to difficulties with the agency, such as not providing sufficient opportunities to engage with the work or meet UPP requirements. Two students stated that they have decided not to pursue child welfare post-graduation, and a third said they are still deciding.

Students who indicated that they did not feel prepared to enter the child welfare workforce explained that they did not receive sufficient depth and/or breadth of experience during their field experience. One commented that they did not get enough experience engaging with clients or conducting home visits.

## **Campus Coordinator Program Perspectives**

---

The evaluation team surveyed campus coordinators ([Appendix F](#)) to assess their experiences in the role, examine their compensation package, and document the diversity policies and instructional delivery options at their respective universities. This year UPP welcomed four new universities to the program. The campus coordinators for these universities received program education and training but had yet to begin recruiting students. Universities are identified by program status in Table 13.

**Table 13. University UPP Status**


<b>University</b>	<b>Program Status</b>
<b>Bowling Green University</b>	New
<b>Central State University</b>	New
<b>Cleveland State University</b>	Existing
<b>Miami University</b>	New
<b>Ohio University</b>	Existing
<b>The Ohio State University</b>	Existing
<b>Rio Grande University</b>	New
<b>University of Akron</b>	Existing
<b>University of Cincinnati</b>	Existing
<b>University of Toledo</b>	Existing
<b>Wright State University</b>	Existing
<b>Youngstown State University</b>	Existing

## **New UPP Universities**

### **Campus Coordinator Onboarding**

One campus coordinator from each of the four newly added UPP universities responded to the survey. Half (50.0%) answered that they “Strongly Agree” that they “feel prepared to perform [their] duties as a campus coordinator” (Figure 14). The remaining 50.0% of respondents indicated that they “Neither Agree nor Disagree” with that statement, indicating that some campus coordinators may benefit from additional guidance on their responsibilities.

**Figure 14. Preparedness to perform duties as Campus Coordinator – New UPP Universities  
(n = 4)**



This split was reflected in campus coordinators’ written responses regarding improvements to onboarding as well. Two offered no suggestions for improvement, with one stating that onboarding “went well.” However, another noted they have challenges using the databases, even after reading the manual. The fourth suggested giving campus coordinators additional time to review the curriculum prior to teaching the course.

**Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)**

Campus coordinators from all four newly added UPP universities described some sort of DEI committee, policy, and/or training at their university (Table 14).

**Table 14. DEI Policies – New UPP Universities**

<b>University</b>	<b>DEI Website (if provided or available online)</b>	<b>Additional DEI Description (if provided)</b>
<b>Bowling Green State University</b>	<a href="https://www.bgsu.edu/equity-diversity-and-inclusion.html">https://www.bgsu.edu/equity-diversity-and-inclusion.html</a>	“The university has a DEI website that services the whole university. The College of Health & Human Services has a DEI committee composed of representatives from all disciplines within the college, including social work.”
<b>Central State University</b>	N/A	“All staff and faculty are required to complete a DEI Training.”

<b>Miami University</b>	<a href="https://www.miamioh.edu/diversity-inclusion/programs-resources/index.html">https://www.miamioh.edu/diversity-inclusion/programs-resources/index.html</a>	N/A
<b>Rio Grande University</b>	N/A	“DEI is embedded in signature assignments throughout the curriculum.”


**Existing UPP Universities**

These eight universities have been with the program since 2004 and have experienced campus coordinators.

**Satisfaction with Campus Coordinator Role**

Most campus coordinators at existing UPP universities (87.5%) reported that they “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” that they feel satisfied in their role as campus coordinators (Figure 15). Only one respondent (12.5%) reported that they “Strongly Disagree.”

**Figure 15. Satisfaction with Campus Coordinator Role (n = 8)**



When asked what would improve their satisfaction with their role or the program in general, suggestions for improvement included salary adjustments (50.0%), providing campus coordinators with clerical support (25.0%), improving the data system (12.5%), and allowing campus coordinators to spend more time focusing on recruitment rather than instruction (12.5%). Other respondents praised the support provided by the Assistant State Director of UPP



(12.5%), the curriculum changes (12.5%), the expansion of the program to more campuses (12.5%), and their position generally (12.5%).

### Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)

All existing UPP universities (100.0%) have a DEI committee, policy, and/or training at their university (Table 15).

**Table 15. DEI Policies – Existing UPP Universities**

University	DEI Website (if provided or available online)	Additional DEI Description (if provided)
<b>Cleveland State University</b>	<a href="https://www.csuohio.edu/sbs/sbs">https://www.csuohio.edu/sbs/sbs</a> Racial Equity Institute: <a href="https://levin.csuohio.edu/di/diversity-institute">https://levin.csuohio.edu/di/diversity-institute</a>	“CSU has a Diversity Committee. The Diversity Committee uses strategies to include various seminars, Brown Box movie review, and discussions. Book reviews and discussions regarding DEI topics.”
<b>Ohio University</b>	<a href="https://www.ohio.edu/chsp/about-overview/diversity-equity-inclusion">https://www.ohio.edu/chsp/about-overview/diversity-equity-inclusion</a> <a href="https://www.ohio.edu/diversity">https://www.ohio.edu/diversity</a>	N/A
<b>The Ohio State University</b>	<a href="https://csw.osu.edu/about/diversity/">https://csw.osu.edu/about/diversity/</a> <a href="https://odi.osu.edu/">https://odi.osu.edu/</a>	OSU aligns itself with [the Council on Social Work Education] (CSWE) and the [Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards] (EPAS).
<b>University of Akron</b>	<a href="https://www.uakron.edu/socialwork/about-us/">https://www.uakron.edu/socialwork/about-us/</a> <a href="https://www.uakron.edu/ie/">https://www.uakron.edu/ie/</a>	“Our college has a Diversity Committee, and they are currently working to infuse DEI across the college. University-wide, we have a diversity advisory council, and we are working on a variety of efforts across the campus.”
<b>University of Cincinnati</b>	<a href="https://cahs.uc.edu/about/diversity-inclusion.html">https://cahs.uc.edu/about/diversity-inclusion.html</a> <a href="https://www.uc.edu/about/equity-inclusion/equity-inclusion.html">https://www.uc.edu/about/equity-inclusion/equity-inclusion.html</a>	N/A
<b>University of Toledo</b>	<a href="https://www.utoledo.edu/diversity/">https://www.utoledo.edu/diversity/</a>	N/A

<b>Wright State University</b>	<a href="https://www.wright.edu/inclusive-excellence">https://www.wright.edu/inclusive-excellence</a>	The university has a DEI academy, and “all syllabi contain DEI information, with ongoing class discussions.”
<b>Youngstown University</b>	<a href="https://ysu.edu/office-diversity-equity-and-inclusion">https://ysu.edu/office-diversity-equity-and-inclusion</a>	N/A

## University Instructional Delivery

---

In response to some student feedback concerning challenges with remote instruction in a previous evaluation report, the team queried campus coordinators about instructional delivery at their universities to assess students’ options. All universities except for one (87.5%) offered at least one in-person learning opportunity for both Child Welfare 1 (CW1) and Child Welfare 2 (CW2) during the academic year. Additionally, 75.0% of the universities provided at least one remote learning opportunity for both CW1 and CW2 during the academic year. Average student enrollment was relatively consistent across courses and modalities (range 14.8 - 16.6).

### CW1

#### In-Person

Most (87.5%) campus coordinators reported that CW1 is taught in person at their university at least once per academic year (range zero to two). In-person enrollment in CW1 ranged from six to 25, with an average enrollment of 15.7 students.

#### Remote

Many (75%) campus coordinators reported that CW1 is taught remotely at their university at least once per academic year (range zero to five). Remote learning enrollment in CW1 ranged from nine to 25, with an average enrollment of 16.6 students. One campus coordinator noted that their university uses a hybrid teaching approach, not a strictly remote one.

## CW2

### In-Person

Most (87.5%) campus coordinators reported that CW2 is taught in person at their university at least once per academic year (range zero to one). In-person enrollment in CW2 ranged from six to 25, with an average enrollment of 14.8 students.

### Remote

Many (75.0%) campus coordinators reported that CW2 is taught remotely at their university at least once per academic year (range zero to four). Remote learning enrollment in CW2 ranged from nine to 25, with an average enrollment of 15.3 students. One campus coordinator noted that their university uses a hybrid teaching approach, not a strictly remote one.

## Caseworker Core Content Fidelity

---

UPP leadership desired to understand to what degree there is fidelity across UPP universities' child welfare courses to OCWTP Caseworker Core.

### Methodology

Child Welfare 1 and 2 course syllabi from the eight UPP universities and the recommended syllabi provided to the universities by the Institute for Human Services (IHS) were examined to determine the degree to which there is fidelity to Caseworker Core. To assess fidelity between UPP Child Welfare 1 and 2 courses (CW 1 and CW 2) and Caseworker Core, the evaluation team assessed four dimensions for compliance to Caseworker Core as identified by IHS, the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS), and UPP campus coordinators in 2018: Core content equivalency, time spent on content, reading assignments, and course assignments. Core content equivalency was measured by comparing the consistency with which UPP universities covered the learning objectives identified in the master syllabi. Similarly, compliance with time spent on content was assessed by comparing the number of weeks each Core was taught with the master syllabi. Specifically, Core 1 = 4 weeks (12 hours), Core 2 = 2

weeks (6 hours), Core 4 = 5 weeks (12 hours plus Learning Lab), Core 5 = 4 weeks (6 hours plus Learning Lab), Core 6 = 5 weeks (18 hours), Core 7 = 3 weeks (18 hours), and Core 8 = 5 weeks (18 hours). Core 3 (Module 8) legal aspects of family-centered child protective services were covered briefly in both courses; full weeks were not dedicated to this content in the master syllabi. A total of 91 readings were required, with 49 assigned in CW1 and 42 assigned in CW2. Readings needed to complete a required assignment were included in the total count of required readings. Seven and six assignments were required for CW1 and CW2, respectively.

## Benchmarks<sup>1</sup>

Key benchmarks and UPP universities’ compliance with each benchmark were aggregated by course for the 2022-23 academic year (Table 16).

**Table 16. Key Benchmarks and Compliance**

Required	Benchmarks	Child Welfare 1 Compliance	Child Welfare 2 Compliance	Overall Compliance
Time Spent	90.0%	97.3%	95.5%	96.4%
Reading Assignments	75.0%	96.6%	96.1%	96.4%
Course Assignments	75.0%	94.4%	93.6%	94.0%
Core Content Equivalency	90.0%	89.3%	87.7%	88.5%

The syllabi review determined that there was an overall 93.8% fidelity to OCWTP Caseworker Core across the eight UPP universities.

## Core Content

The UPP universities nearly met the 90.0% benchmark for core content equivalency in 2022-23. Core content or learning objectives that were partially covered or excluded are listed below.

---

<sup>1</sup> All content fidelity scores are based on each university’s syllabi for CWI and CWII. Syllabi for the 2022-23 academic year remained unchanged from the previous year due to the impending rollout of Caseworker Core 2.0, therefore scores across components are the same as last year. UPP plans on implementing changes to the Master Syllabus for the 2023-24 academic year.

### Child Welfare 1:

- Safety Factors specific to abuse and neglect
- Child Development
- Identify how cultural variables may affect the engagement of individuals and families

### Child Welfare 2:

- Requirements specific to case reviews and Semiannual Administrative Reviews (SAR)
- The long-term impact of separation, placement, and lost history on children
- Understanding of the responsibility of systems to children in care
- How children's developmental level affects their perception of separation and placement
- Understanding loss for children during the removal process
- Trauma-informed practices to assist children through the process of traumatic separation
- Benefits and challenges with kinship care

## Time Spent

Six of the eight (75.0%) universities followed a course schedule that was consistent with the recommended weeks spent per Core. In 2022-23, seven of the eight (87.5%) universities aligned their course schedule with the recommended schedule per the master syllabi.

## Reading Assignments

Compliance with reading assignments exceeded the 75.0% benchmark. Three universities were missing one or more required readings. Readings could have been excluded because the related course assignment or content was not fully covered. One required article was not uploaded to the UPP SharePoint site but was listed in the master syllabus. Few universities required additional readings.

## Course Assignments

Seven of the eight (87.5%) universities assigned all 13 of the required assignments (Table 17). Half (50.0%) of the universities assigned additional quizzes, exams, peer discussions, and homework assignments in their courses. Safety assessment, safety planning, and family risk assessment learning labs were included as part of five universities' CW1 course or UPP seminar.

**Table 17. Required Assignments and Requirements**

<b>Child Welfare I</b>	
<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Number of Universities Requiring Each Assignment 2022-23</b>
Transcending Difference Tool Kit Family	7
Self-Reflection Paper	7
Safety Assessment	8
Safety Planning	8
Family Assessment	8
Engaging Family Quiz or Paper	8
Core 7 Quiz	7
<b>Child Welfare II</b>	
<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Number of Universities Requiring Each Assignment 2022-23</b>
Small Group Presentation	7
Note Taking Guide	7
Investigation Quiz	8
Effective Use of Home Visits	7
Family Case Planning	8
Separation, Loss, and Reunification Quiz	8

## Ohio UPP and Nationwide Title IV-E Programs

---

OUCAS and UPP leadership desired to gain a broader perspective on UPP's program attributes relative to similar programs in other states. By understanding where UPP exceeds or trails other programs' recruitment strategies, incentives, and outcomes, UPP can gain insight into its strengths and identify potential new strategies to increase its recruitment. To this end, the evaluation team acquired a summary of a national survey of eligibility requirements, stipends, and paybacks for Title IV-E programs comparable to UPP ([Appendix G](#)).

### Prevalence and Scale of Programs

The summary, created by the University of Houston, includes data from 77 programs across 36 states. It identifies four states that have no such program, but it does not include any data on the remaining ten states, including Ohio. The data includes programs that offer full- and part-time Bachelor of (Science in) Social Work (B(S)SW) and Master of Social Work (MSW) degrees. Note that part-time programs were not consistently designated, so data for those programs is only presented here when it was explicitly designated as pertaining to a part-time program.

On average, each state with a Title IV-E program has 6.5 universities that participate. Several states have only one participating university, while Pennsylvania has the most universities, with 17. Three states also run programs statewide without requiring that students attend any particular university. Ohio is well above average in this regard, with 12 participating universities. This gives a much broader pool of students the opportunity to be recruited and enroll, compared to other states.

Additionally, many states have multiple, independent programs that each operate out of a different university or set of universities. Often, each of these programs has different eligibility requirements, incentives, and payback structures. In contrast, Ohio's program is centralized so that it is uniform across all participating universities. This makes it easier for children services agencies to make hiring decisions and policies based upon students' participation because they do not have to account for program variation.

## Eligibility Requirements

The eligibility requirements employed vary widely across different programs. Some only require students to express an interest in child welfare work and commit to the paybacks. Meanwhile, others employ various combinations of grade point average (GPA) cutoffs, field placement restrictions, background checks, additional course requirements, additional training, residency requirements, application processes that include multiple interviews, and/or the job requirements of the job the student would have upon graduating. The number of programs that employ each eligibility requirement is listed in Table 18. In Ohio, UPP students must apply to the program, take child welfare-specific coursework, and complete their field placement at a PCSA.

**Table 18. Nationwide IV-E Program Eligibility Requirements**

Eligibility Requirement	# of Full-Time BSW Programs	# of Part-Time BSW Programs	# of Full-Time MSW Programs	# of Part-Time MSW Programs
	n (%)			
<b>Application to Program</b>	21 (34.4%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (19.3%)	1 (3.8%)
<b>Academic Standing/GPA</b>	18 (29.5%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (15.8%)	3 (11.5%)
<b>Field Placement Location</b>	10 (16.4%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (12.3%)	1 (3.8%)
<b>Currently Employed at CW Agency</b>	3 (4.9%)	1 (25.0%)	11 (19.3%)	3 (11.5%)
<b>Background Check(s)</b>	7 (11.5%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (10.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>Take Specified CW Course(s)</b>	7 (11.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.5%)	1 (3.8%)
<b>Priority Given to Current Employees</b>	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (10.5%)	3 (11.5%)
<b>Attend CW Training(s)</b>	7 (11.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>In-State Residency</b>	3 (4.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>Meet Job Requirements</b>	2 (3.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>Total Programs</b>	61 (100.0%)	4 (100.0%)	57 (100.0%)	26 (100.0%)



## Stipends

The types and sizes of stipends provided to students are similarly diverse. While one full-time BSW program will pay 75% of an existing employee’s salary in addition to full tuition, fees, book reimbursement, and an additional stipend for an entire year, another offers only a \$2,250 stipend per semester for two semesters. The number of programs that provide funding for each expense is listed in Table 19. It should be noted, however, that many of the stipend uses, including those listed as “full tuition” were limited in duration, often only being available to students in their final two to four semesters of their program. In Ohio, UPP students receive a one-time \$5,000 tuition reimbursement for each year of participation in the program (up to two years) upon being hired by a PCSA.

**Table 19. Nationwide IV-E Program Stipend Uses**

Paid for by Stipend	# of Full-Time BSW Programs	# of Part-Time BSW Programs	# of Full-Time MSW Programs	# of Part-Time MSW Programs
	n (%)			
<b>Full Tuition (for the relevant year(s))</b>	24 (39.3%)	0 (0.0%)	24 (42.1%)	6 (23.1%)
<b>Stipend Only</b>	24 (39.3%)	1 (25.0%)	15 (26.3%)	7 (26.9%)
<b>Fees</b>	15 (24.6%)	1 (25.0%)	19 (33.3%)	6 (23.1%)
<b>Partial Tuition</b>	11 (18.0%)	2 (50.0%)	13 (22.8%)	4 (15.4%)
<b>Books</b>	9 (14.8%)	1 (25.0%)	13 (22.8%)	5 (19.2%)
<b>Additional Discretionary Stipend</b>	10 (16.4%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (17.5%)	3 (11.5%)
<b>Travel/Mileage</b>	5 (8.2%)	1 (25.0%)	6 (10.5%)	2 (7.7%)
<b>Continued Salary/Benefits (for existing employees)</b>	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>Social Work-Specific Fees</b>	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>Total Programs</b>	61 (100.0%)	4 (100.0%)	57 (100.0%)	26 (100.0%)

## Paybacks

All but one program requires a “payback” from students in the form of a commitment to work for a child welfare agency for a given period after graduation. Almost all programs scale the duration of the payback relative to how long the student received a stipend, with most opting for roughly a 1:1 ratio across all degree types. The highest ratio used by any program is two years of employment for one year of stipend receipt, and no program offered a ratio below 1:1. In Ohio, a 1:1 structure is used, with students required to commit to one year of employment for each year’s worth of stipend they receive. If an Ohio UPP employee does not complete their 1- or 2-year employment commitment, they are required to pay back the stipend in a prorated format.

## Existing Employees

A substantial number of programs offer special consideration for individuals who are already employed by child welfare agencies, particularly for part-time MSW programs. This includes separate eligibility requirements, preferential (or exclusive) enrollment, increased stipend values, reduced payback duration, continued salary/wages, and/or time away from work.

## Recommendations

---

These recommendations are based on the evaluation of action plan outcomes stemming from last year’s UPP Evaluation report as well as current feedback from students, former students, campus coordinators, and supervisors. Key learnings from the current evaluation support opportunities for action as follows:

- 1. Track National Initiatives on Child Welfare Workforce Issues**

As child welfare workforce shortages and instability have been documented nationwide, research has emerged on current best practices to ameliorate the impact of these issues. UPP and ODCY should monitor national clearinghouses and policy centers for strategies that may be applied locally. A few such reports are cited in the [References](#) section. Areas of focus should include:

- a. Enhancing supervision of new caseworkers

- b. Appropriate caseload management for new caseworkers
- c. Ensuring commensurate pay and benefits for caseworkers

In addition, the program should leverage CAPS LMS to collect data to track the retention of UPP students.

**2. Consider a Mentorship Program for Students in the Final Year of their Tenure**

UPP should consider pairing students in their final year of the program with a UPP Graduate mentor who works in the field of child welfare. This extra support was requested by some current and former students and could increase recruitment into the field and improve retention once employed (Trawver & Brocious, 2023; Voss et al., 2022; Romero & Lassmann, 2017).

**3. Provide Additional Data-Entry and Role Support for Campus Coordinators**

Some existing and new campus coordinators have indicated and demonstrated that they could benefit from additional database knowledge and data-entry support. Half of the new campus coordinators have expressed a desire for additional support to feel fully prepared to fulfill the duties of their role.

**4. Assess the Program Structure and Benefits Offered by Similar Title IV-E Programs**

UPP compares positively with the 77 other Title IV-E programs across the nation in terms of the number of participating universities (ranking in the Top 3) and offers junior, bachelor, and master's level participation with a centralized administration. Other programs offer tuition payment, mileage reimbursement, and other benefits that UPP may consider.

**5. Focus on Improvements to Caseworker Core Fidelity**

Based on the assessment of program fidelity, UPP leadership should consider the following to improve adherence and close gaps:

- a. Update CW1 and CW2 syllabi on an ongoing basis to make sure Caseworker Core revisions are reflected.
- b. Develop a syllabus scoring rubric that aligns with each of the four dimensions for compliance with Core.

- c. Recommend that all universities conduct learning labs on case planning and investigations.

## References

---

- Graham, J. R., Bradshaw, C., Surood, S. and Kline, T. J. B. (2014) Predicting social workers' subjective well-being. *Human Service Organizations Management, Leadership & Governance*, 38(4), 405-417. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2014.938584>
- National Child Welfare Workforce Institute. (2019). *The workforce development framework*. [https://ncwwi.org/files/Workforce\\_Development\\_Framework\\_Brief.pdf](https://ncwwi.org/files/Workforce_Development_Framework_Brief.pdf)
- Phillips, R., Bunker, A., & Bunker, S. (2022). (rep.). *Building a 21st Century Children Services Workforce*. Public Children Services Association of Ohio. Retrieved June 28, 2023, from <https://www.pcsao.org/pdf/workforce/ResearchReportWorkforceFeb2022.pdf>
- The Quality Improvement Center for Workforce Development. (2020, June 30). Coping in the Time of COVID: Interpreting the research to help the child welfare workforce build an understanding of pandemics, learn how to cope with stress and develop strategies to manage your personal life. <https://www.qic-wd.org/blog/coping-time-covid-interpreting-research-help-child-welfare-workforce-build-understanding>
- The Quality Improvement Center for Workforce Development. (2021). Secondary traumatic stress (STS) – its impact on the child welfare workforce and strategies for agencies to address it. <https://www.qic-wd.org/blog/secondary-traumatic-stress-impact-child-welfare-workforce-and-strategies-agencies>
- The Quality Improvement Center for Workforce Development. (2022a). Assessing your workforce needs. <https://www.qic-wd.org/blog/assessing-your-workforce-needs>
- The Quality Improvement Center for Workforce Development. (2022b). The child welfare workforce crisis – what we're hearing from the field. <https://www.qic->

[wd.org/blog/child-welfare-workforce-crisis-%E2%80%93-what-we%E2%80%99re-hearing-field](https://www.wd.org/blog/child-welfare-workforce-crisis-%E2%80%93-what-we%E2%80%99re-hearing-field)

- Romero, A., & Lassmann, H. (2017). Benefits of mentoring programs for child welfare workers: A systematic review. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 42(3), 301-316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2016.1267055>
- Trawver, K. R., & Brocius, H. (2023). A statewide integrated child welfare coaching and mentoring program: Mentored workers' perception of quality, impact, and satisfaction. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2023.2182397>
- Voss, J. G., Alfes, C. M., Clark, A., Lilly, K. D., & Moore, S. (2022). Why mentoring matters for new graduates transitioning to practice: Implications for nurse leaders. *Nurse Leader*, 20(4), 399–403. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mnl.2022.01.003>

## Appendix A

### UPP Main and Regional Campuses


Table 20. UPP Main and Regional Campuses

University	Campus Location (Main or Regional & County)	UPP Students- Yes- Recruited or No- Not Recruited
<b>The Ohio State University</b>	Columbus- Main- Franklin	Yes
	Newark- Licking	Yes
	Lima-Allen	Yes
	Mansfield-Richland	Yes
	Marion-Marion	Yes
<b>Wright State University</b>	Dayton-Main- Montgomery	Yes
	Lake- Lake	No Social Work Program
<b>Ohio University</b>	Athens-Main-Athens	Yes
	Eastern at St. Clairsville-Belmont	Yes
	Zanesville-Muskingum	Yes
	Chillicothe-Ross	Yes
	Lancaster-Fairfield	Yes
	Southern at Ironton-Lawrence	Yes
<b>University of Akron</b>	Akron-Main-Summit	Yes
	Lakewood-Cuyahoga	Yes
	Wayne-Wayne	Yes
<b>University of Cincinnati</b>	Cincinnati-Main-Hamilton	Yes
	Clermont-Clermont	No Social Work Program
	Blue Ash- Hamilton	No Social Work Program
<b>Cleveland State University</b>	Cleveland-Main-Cuyahoga	Yes
<b>University of Toledo</b>	Toledo-Main-Lucas	Yes

<b>Youngstown State University</b>	Youngstown-Main-Mahoning	Yes
	Lorain-Lorain- Regional campus	No Social Work Program
	Lakewood-Cuyahoga- Regional Campus	No Social Work Program
<b>Miami</b>	Oxford-Main-Butler	Yes
	Middletown-Butler	Yes
	Hamilton-Butler	Yes
<b>Bowling Green State University</b>	Bowling Green-Main-Wood	Yes
<b>Central State University</b>	Wilberforce-Main-Greene	Yes
<b>University of Rio Grande</b>	Rio Grande –Main- Gallia	Yes

# Appendix B

## UPP Placements and Employments by Ohio County since 2004 \*



\* Based on data reported in the UPP Database as of June 13, 2023



## Appendix C

---

### UPP Supervisor Survey

1. In what county is your agency?
  - a. [Respondents were offered a dropdown list of all 88 Ohio counties.]
2. Upon hire, how competent was the most recent UPP Graduate in the selected areas of job responsibility?
  - a. Maintaining Confidentiality
  - b. Engaging Clients
  - c. Conducting/Completing a Safety Assessment
  - d. Conducting/Completing a Safety Plan
  - e. Conducting/Completing a Family Assessment
  - f. Conducting/Completing a Family Case Plan
  - g. Entering Data into SACWIS
  - h. Thinking Critically
  - i. Ability to Handle Stress
    - i. Poor, no evidence of skill, Not Competent
    - ii. Fair, lacks clear evidence of skill, Limited Competence
    - iii. Good, some evidence of skill, Emerging Competence
    - iv. Very Good, clear evidence of skill, Competent
    - v. Excellent, ample evidence of skill, Very Competent
3. Upon hire, how competent was the most recent Non-UPP Graduate in the selected areas of job responsibility?
  - a. Maintaining Confidentiality
  - b. Engaging Clients
  - c. Conducting/Completing a Safety Assessment
  - d. Conducting/Completing a Safety Plan
  - e. Conducting/Completing a Family Assessment
  - f. Conducting/Completing a Family Case Plan

- g. Entering Data into SACWIS
  - h. Thinking Critically
  - i. Ability to Handle Stress
    - i. Poor, no evidence of skill, Not Competent
    - ii. Fair, lacks clear evidence of skill, Limited Competence
    - iii. Good, some evidence of skill, Emerging Competence
    - iv. Very Good, clear evidence of skill, Competent
    - v. Excellent, ample evidence of skill, Very Competent
4. What type of unit do you supervise?
- a. Intake
  - b. Ongoing
  - c. Intake & Ongoing
  - d. Foster Care/Adoption/Kinship
  - e. Other (please describe)
5. What is your race?
- a. American Indian/Alaska Native
  - b. Asian
  - c. Black/African American
  - d. Multiracial
  - e. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
  - f. White/Caucasian
  - g. Other (please describe)
6. What is your ethnicity?
- a. Hispanic/Latino
  - b. Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino
7. What is your highest level of education?
- a. BSW
  - b. BA
  - c. MSW

- d. MSSA
  - e. MBA
  - f. Med
  - g. MEd
  - h. Other master's degree (please explain)
8. What else should we know about your role or the program?
  9. What email address would you like us to send your gift card to?

## Appendix D

---

### Former UPP Student Survey

1. Please select your highest-level social work degree.
  - a. Bachelor's degree
  - b. Master's degree
2. Please identify your UPP status.
  - a. Employed and have completed my commitment [branches to Q3-Q6]
  - b. Employed and am still in my commitment period [branches to Q7-Q12]
  - c. Graduated but could not find employment in Child Welfare [branches to Q13-Q15]
  - d. Graduated but chose not to seek employment in Child Welfare [branches to Q16-Q17]
3. Please rate your agreement with the following statement: "The university partnership program prepared me for my child welfare job."
  - a. Strongly Agree
  - b. Agree
  - c. Neither Agree nor Disagree
  - d. Disagree
  - e. Strongly Disagree
4. Do you plan to leave your job in child welfare over the next year?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
5. If yes, please tell us why. (select all that apply)
  - a. Poor supervision
  - b. Caseload too high
  - c. Organizational climate
  - d. Inadequate Pay
  - e. Other (please describe)

6. Is there anything else you would like us to know about UPP or about your work experience in child welfare?

-----

7. Please rate your agreement with the following statement: "The university partnership program prepared me for my child welfare job."

- a. Strongly Agree
- b. Agree
- c. Neither Agree nor Disagree
- d. Disagree
- e. Strongly Disagree

8. Do you plan to leave your job in child welfare over the next year?

- a. Yes
- b. No

9. If yes, do you plan to leave either before fulfilling your commitment or immediately upon completion of your commitment?

- a. Before fulfilling my commitment
- b. Immediately upon completing my commitment
- c. Neither

10. If yes, please tell us why. (select all that apply)

- a. Poor supervision
- b. Caseload too high
- c. Organizational climate
- d. Inadequate Pay
- e. Other (please describe)

11. Is there anything else you would like us to know about UPP or about your work experience in child welfare?

12. Please tell us more about how the university partnership program did not prepare you for your child welfare job.

-----

13. Please rate your satisfaction with your UPP experience.

- a. Very Satisfied
- b. Satisfied
- c. Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- d. Dissatisfied
- e. Very Dissatisfied

14. Is there anything else you would like us to know about UPP or about your work experience in child welfare?

15. Please tell us more about why you are not satisfied with your UPP experience.

-----

16. Please tell us why you decided not to seek employment in Child Welfare.

17. Is there anything else you would like us to know about UPP or about your work experience in child welfare?

## Appendix E

---

### UPP Current Student Survey

1. What is your student status?
  - a. Junior
  - b. Senior
  - c. Master's
2. With what university are you affiliated?
  - a. Bowling Green State University
  - b. Central State University
  - c. Cleveland State University
  - d. Miami University
  - e. Ohio University
  - f. The Ohio State University
  - g. Rio Grande University
  - h. University of Akron
  - i. University of Cincinnati
  - j. University of Toledo
  - k. Wright State University
  - l. Youngstown University
3. Please select the option that corresponds with the following statement: "I receive adequate support from my campus coordinator."
  - a. Strongly Agree
  - b. Agree
  - c. Neither Agree nor Disagree
  - d. Disagree
  - e. Strongly Disagree
4. Please tell us more about how your campus coordinator can better support you.
5. Please rate your overall satisfaction with your experience in the following categories:

- a. Recruitment
  - b. Field Experience
  - c. Coursework
  - d. Required Readings
  - e. Seminar
  - f. Campus Coordinator
  - g. Student Incentive
  - h. Employment Assistance
    - i. Very Satisfied
    - ii. Satisfied
    - iii. Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
    - iv. Dissatisfied
    - v. Very Dissatisfied
6. Did your UPP field placement/ internship meet the requirements of your learning plan?
- a. Yes
  - b. No
7. Please tell us more about how your UPP field placement/ internship could better meet the requirements of your learning plan.
8. What is your impression of the culture of your placement agency?
- a. Very Negative
  - b. Negative
  - c. Neither Negative nor Positive
  - d. Positive
  - e. Very Positive
9. Please tell us more about how the culture of your placement agency could be better.
10. Did the UPP field placement/internship experience positively impact your decision to pursue child welfare as a profession?
- a. Yes
  - b. No



11. Please tell us more about how the UPP field placement/internship experience impacted your decision to pursue child welfare as a profession.
12. How prepared do you feel to enter the child welfare workforce based on your field experience?
  - a. Not at All Prepared
  - b. Somewhat Unprepared
  - c. Neither Unprepared nor Prepared
  - d. Prepared
  - e. Very Prepared
13. Please tell us more about why you do not feel prepared to enter the child welfare workforce based on your field experience.
14. Please rate your satisfaction with the quality of supervision received during your field placement.
  - a. Very Satisfied
  - b. Satisfied
  - c. Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
  - d. Dissatisfied
  - e. Very Dissatisfied
15. Please tell us more about how the quality of supervision received during your field placement could be better.
16. What experiences did you find most helpful in your UPP field placement/internship?
17. What additional experiences would have made the UPP field placement/internship experience better?

## Appendix F

---

### UPP Campus Coordinator Survey

1. Please select your university affiliation.
  - a. Bowling Green State University [branches to Q2-Q6]
  - b. Central State University [branches to Q2-Q6]
  - c. Cleveland State University [branches to Q7-Q19]
  - d. Miami University [branches to Q2-Q6]
  - e. Ohio University [branches to Q7-Q19]
  - f. The Ohio State University [branches to Q7-Q19]
  - g. Rio Grande University [branches to Q2-Q6]
  - h. University of Akron [branches to Q7-Q19]
  - i. University of Cincinnati [branches to Q7-Q19]
  - j. University of Toledo [branches to Q7-Q19]
  - k. Wright State University [branches to Q7-Q19]
  - l. Youngstown University [branches to Q7-Q19]
2. Please rate your agreement with the following statement: “I feel prepared to perform my duties as a campus coordinator.”
  - a. Strongly Agree
  - b. Agree
  - c. Neither Agree nor Disagree
  - d. Disagree
  - e. Strongly Disagree
3. What suggestions do you have for improving the onboarding process? Is there anything the program can do to enhance the experience of new universities and coordinators joining the program?
4. Please describe the training, policies, and curriculum review standards of your university’s social work program related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). You can

also provide a link to a university website specific to your social work program's DEI efforts.

-----

5. Please rate your agreement with the following statement “I feel satisfied in my role as a campus coordinator.”
  - a. Strongly Agree
  - b. Agree
  - c. Neither Agree nor Disagree
  - d. Disagree
  - e. Strongly Disagree
6. What suggestions do you have for improving your satisfaction in your role? What improvements can be made to the program in general?  
-----
7. How many times is CW1 being taught in person at your university each academic year?
8. What is the average enrollment?
9. How many times is CW1 being taught remotely at your university each academic year?
10. What is the average enrollment?
11. How many times is CW2 being taught in person at your university each academic year?
12. What is the average enrollment?
13. How many times is CW2 being taught remotely at your university each academic year?
14. What is the average enrollment?
15. Please describe the training, policies, and curriculum review standards of your university’s social work program related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). You can also provide a link to a university website specific to your social work program's DEI efforts. (open response)

## **Appendix G**

---

### **National Survey of IV-E Stipends & Paybacks**

See the following page.