



McGill

School of
Social Work

Field Education

**MSW FIELD EVALUATION
(Research Based Placements)
2023-2024**

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| STUDENT'S NAME: | |
| TERM: | |
| DATE: | |
| PLACEMENT: | |
| FIELD INSTRUCTOR: | |
| FIELD LIAISON: | |

| Rating Scale & Explanations | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
| | 1= Unacceptable | 2= Poor | 3= Average/Acceptable | 4= Very Good | 5= Exceptional | Rating Given (1-5 or N/A) |
| Background knowledge of the research topic | Major error(s) in exposition of the topic and/or omission of key source(s) | Minor errors, omissions, and/or lack of synthesis | Adequate and accurate exposition of topic and key sources | Good coverage and synthesis of key sources plus additional relevant material pertaining to the topic | Thorough review and excellent synthesis of sources, including some obscure but relevant ones | |
| Appropriate experimental methodology | Major errors in methodology selection or use | Minor methodological errors and/or omissions | Methodology applied correctly and adequately; appropriate documentation | Methodology applied correctly, explained clearly, and documented well | Mastery of finer points of methodology plus elegant application and/or supplementary approaches | |
| Application of knowledge and methodology to research topic | Research topic and methodology not referenced or applied well | Some links to topic knowledge and methodology but not clearly integrated with research | Adequate connection between knowledge of topic and use of methodology and research | Clear exposition of relationship of research topic knowledge and methodology to project | Insightful references to sources and application of methodology to excellent research topic | |
| Critical thinking | Muddled presentation with errors in reasoning and/or without much analysis and synthesis | Reasoning sometimes confused, simplistic, and/or not clearly explained | Adequate reasoning, explanation of assumptions, and supporting evidence | Clear reasoning with organized presentation of evidence, assumptions, and conclusions | Clear and organized argument that represents sound, original, and complex thought | |
| Effective graphic/written communication | Graphs and/or writing generally unclear, with consistent errors and/or poor organization | Graphs and/or writing sometimes unclear with weak organization and/or | Graphs and/or writing clear, concise, and organized, with minor or no grammatical errors | Graphs and/or writing generally error-free with clear organization and depth | Elegant graphs and/or writing with fully developed arguments, clear organization, and correct grammar | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | grammatical errors | | | | |
| Effective oral communication | Presentation generally unclear, with poor organization and/or marred by distracting mannerisms or language | Presentation sometimes unclear, with weak organization, and/or some distracting mannerisms or language | Presentation organized to convey main points of research clearly and without distractions | Articulate presentation with clear organization and appropriate scientific terminology and language | Elegant, confident, and engaging presentation with clear organization and flow | |
| Overall quality (not necessarily an average of earlier ratings) | Unacceptable | Poor | Average/Acceptable | Very Good | Exceptional | |

*****Please note that the rating scale must be filled out for each project the student is a part of if more than one*****

SUMMARY OF PLACEMENT EXPERIENCES:

Please list in point form all responsibilities and assigned work in the placement setting.

Please note other pertinent observations or anything that distinguishes this student:

Student status:

Pass

Fail (prior consultation with field coordinator/liaison required for this designation)

Field Instructor's typed name below is in place of a signature:

Please submit the completed form to:

fielddeduction.socialwork@mcgill.ca