



School Psychology Program
Signature Assignment for EDP 642A
Ethics Problem Solving Case Study

Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed:

SLO #10: Knowledge of the history and foundations of school psychology; multiple service models and methods; ethical, legal, and professional standards; and other factors related to professional identity and effective practice as school psychologists.

Description of the Signature Assignment

Candidates will apply Koocher and Keith-Spiegel's 8-step problem-solving ethics model to a typical dilemma encountered in a school setting. In describing the dilemma, candidates are required to identify which of the ethical principals (respect for dignity of person, responsible caring, integrity in professional relationships, and responsibility to community and society) is at issue. The focus of the dilemma (i.e., the person who may be "harmed") may be students, staff or parents, but not the candidate. 2 – 3 pages

Directions for Students

1. Describe the Ethical Dilemma
2. Define the ethical principles at work:
3. Summarize ethical and legal guidelines (NASP, APA, etc) and district policies that apply to the resolution of each issue. Consider the broad as well as specific guidelines.
4. Evaluate the rights, responsibilities and welfare of all affected parties, including any cultural characteristics that may be salient to understanding the dilemma.
5. Generate a list of alternative decisions possible for each issue.
6. Describe the likely consequence of each decision, evaluating the short-term, ongoing and long-term consequences of each possibility. Consider psychological as well as financial implications.
7. Present evidence of the likelihood of the consequences occurring (i.e., risk-benefits analysis)
8. Describe your decision and course of action.

Scoring Rubric:

EDP 642A Ethics Problem Solving Case Study

Criteria	4 = Exceeds expectations	3 = Meets expectations	2 = Meets some expectations	1 = Does not meet expectations	0 = Unable to score; incomplete or missing work	Weight	Final Score
Thoroughness	Identifies all relevant principals, guidelines, policies	Identifies most principals, guidelines, policies	Misses 4 or more principals/ guidelines	Misses or more	Unintelligible or inappropriate case	x2 =	
Analysis	Concisely synthesizes information in a logical manner for steps 4 -8	Synthesizes information in a somewhat logical manner for steps 4 -8	Summarizes information in for steps 4 -8 or analysis misses some steps	Incomplete or illogical	Unintelligible or inappropriate case	x2 =	
Quality of writing	Excellent – appropriate level of detail, active voice, organized, no typos/ grammatical errors, etc.	Good- a little too much/little detail, some grammatical errors, adequately organized	Fair- a little difficult to follow, grammatical errors, too detailed or not detailed enough	Poor- the writing is so poor it distracts the reader from the information.	Unintelligible or inappropriate case Or anonymity of case subject not protected	x1=	
Total							20

Legend

Total Points	College of Education Assessment Scale
20-18	4 (Exceeds Expectations)
17-16	3 (Meets Expectations)
15-14	2 (Meets Some Expectations)
13-12	1 (Does Not Meet Expectations)
<12	0 (Can't Score)