## Counseling Program

Signature Assignment for COUN 555
Cross Cultural Case Study

## Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed:

SLO \#2: Know cultural dimensions (race, ethnicity, SES, sexual orientation) of self and others in ways that are integrative, contextual, and reflective of systems of oppression.

## Description of the Signature Assignment

Using a short story provided by the instructor, candidates will be responsible for conducting a brief multicultural case study. Using information about the client's worldview and concepts learned in class, candidates will develop a case conceptualization and treatment plan for the client.

## Directions for Students

- Provide a very brief summary (1 to 2 paragraphs) of the short story-this will serve as a case overview.
- You will be expected to discuss the worldview and cultural beliefs of the client. Using support from the text address the client's:
- Dimensions of worldview (which include, but is not limited to locus of control, locus of responsibility, time orientation, individualism/collectivism, notion of human activity, and nature of human relations)
- Level of acculturation
- Level of cultural identity
- You will use information from the client's worldview to formulate your case conceptualization. You will need to:
- Identify the client's presenting concern
- Explain if an emic or etic counseling approach is most appropriate
- Explain if an alloplastic or autoplastic intervention is most appropriate
- Explain if a holistic of monistic intervention is most appropriate
- Identify which of the eight helping roles is most appropriate for this client
- Using all of the above information devise a treatment plan for the client that is culturally specific
- The case study should be between 5 and 8 pages in length and must conform to APA style.


## Scoring Rubric:

| Criteria | Exceeds expectations | Meets expectations | Meets some expectations | Does not meet expectations | Unable to score; incomplete or missing work | Final Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In addition to requirements of " 3 ", highlights information that will serve as rationale for case conceptualization and treatment plan. <br> (5 points) | Briefly summarizes story with focus on client. Discusses main points of the client's story. Provides sufficient detail to understand the clients presenting concern and worldview. (4 points) | Summarizes story, but does not sufficiently: focus on the client; highlight the client's presenting concern or worldview; or highlight the main points of client's story. (3-2 points) | Summarizes story, but omits or glosses over: focus on the client; details that highlight the clients presenting concern or worldview; or main points of client's story. (1 point) | Either does not provide summary or does not do any of the following in their summary of story: focus on the client; provide sufficient detail to highlight the clients presenting concern or worldview; or highlight main points of client's story. <br> (0 points) |  |
|  | In addition to requirements for " 3 ", the writing style weaves the dimensions of worldview together is a way that provides insight into the cultural values and beliefs of client. (10 points) | Identifies client's: locus of control, locus of responsibility, time orientation, individualism/collectivi sm, notion of human activity, and nature of human relations. Uses examples from case study to support argument. (9-7 points) | Does not sufficiently address: locus of control, locus of responsibility, time orientation, individualism/collectivi sm, notion of human activity, and nature of human relations. <br> Provides examples from case study for each identified element. (6-5 points) | Omits or glosses over: locus of control, locus of responsibility, time orientation, individualism/collectivi sm, notion of human activity, and nature of human relations. Provides examples from case study for each identified elements. <br> (4-1 points) | Does not adequately address elements of worldview or fails to provide any examples from case study to support argument. <br> (0 points) |  |
|  | In addition to requirements for " 3 ", discusses how client's values align with Euro American values. (10 points) | Identifies client's level of acculturation and provides example from case study to support decision and uses dimension of worldview to support decision. <br> (9-7 points) | Identifies client's level of acculturation, but does not adequately: provide example from case study to support decision or use dimension of worldview to support decision. (6-5 points) | Identifies client's level of acculturation, but omits or glosses over: example from case study to support decision and dimensions of worldview to support decision. <br> (4-1 points) | Does not discuss client's level of acculturation. (0 points) |  |
|  | In addition to requirements for " 3 ", discusses how client's values align with traditional cultural values. (10 points) | Identifies client's level of cultural identity and provides example from case study to support decision and uses dimensions of worldview to support decision. <br> (9-7 points) | Identifies client's level of cultural identity, but does not adequately: provide example from case study to support decision and use dimensions of worldview to support decision. (6-5 points) | Identifies client's level of cultural identity, but omits or glosses over: example from case study to support decision and use dimensions of worldview to support decision. <br> (4-1 points) | Does not discuss client's level of cultural identity. (0 points) |  |
|  | In addition to the requirements for " 3 ", discusses how social context and cultural beliefs influence presenting concern. (10 points) | Identifies client's presenting concern(s), provides rationale for diagnosis uses examples from case study to demonstrate how issue affects client. 9-7 points) | Identifies client's presenting concern, but does not adequately provide rationale for diagnosis and example of how issue affects client. (6-5 points) | Identifies client's presenting concern, but omits or glosses over rationale for diagnosis and example of how issue affects client. <br> (4-1 points) | Does not discuss clients presenting concern. (0 points) |  |


| Criteria | Exceeds expectations | Meets expectations | Meets some expectations | Does not meet expectations | Unable to score; incomplete or missing work | Final Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In addition to requirements for " 3 ", provides an example of a therapeutic intervention. (10 points) | Identifies if an emic and/or etic perspective is most appropriate, and use acculturation, cultural identity, and presenting concern as rational for decision. (9-7 points) | Identifies if an emic and/or etic perspective is most appropriate, but does not adequately use acculturation, cultural identity, and presenting concern as rational for decision. (6-5 points) | Identifies if an emic and/or etic perspective is most appropriate for client, but omits or glosses over use of acculturation, cultural identity and presenting concern as rational for decision. (4-1 points) | Does not discuss if emic or etic perspective is appropriate. (0 points) |  |
|  | In addition to requirements for " 3 ", uses outside literature to establish the appropriateness of approach. (10 points) | Identifies if holistic or monistic approach is most appropriate, uses presenting problem as rationale, and provides example of approach. (9-7 points) | Identifies if holistic or monistic approach is most appropriate, but does not adequately: use presenting problem as rationale or provide example of approach. (6-5 points) | Identifies if holistic or monistic approach is most appropriate for client, but omits or glosses over presenting problem as rationale for decision or example of approach. (4-1 points) | Does not discuss if holistic or monistic approach is appropriate. (0 points) |  |
|  | In addition to requirements for " 3 ", uses client's social context as rationale. (10 points) | Identifies if autoplastic and/or alloplastic intervention is appropriate, uses presenting problem as rationale, and provides example of approach. <br> (9-7 points) | Identifies if autoplastic and/or alloplastic intervention is appropriate, but does not adequately use presenting problem as rationale or provides example of approach. (6-5 points) | Identifies if autoplastic and/or alloplastic intervention is appropriate, but omits or glosses over presenting problem as rationale or provides example of approach. (4-1 points) | Does not discuss if autoplastic or alloplastic intervention is appropriate. (0 points) |  |
|  | In addition to requirements for " 3 ", uses client's social context as rational. <br> (10 points) | Identifies one or more of the 8 helper roles that is most appropriate for the client, uses presenting problem as rationale, and provides example of intervention consistent with helper role. <br> (9-7 points) | Identifies one or more of the 8 helper roles that is most appropriate for the client, but does not adequately use presenting problem as rationale or provide example of intervention consistent with helper role. <br> (6-5 points) | Identifies one or more of the 8 helper roles that is most appropriate for the client, but omits or glosses over use of presenting problem as rationale or example of intervention that is consistent with helper role. <br> (4-1 points) | Does not identify if any of the 8 helper roles is appropriate. (0 points) |  |
|  | In addition to requirements for " 3 ", plan highlights best practices (as cited in the counseling literature) for client's cultural community. (10 points) | In addition to requirements for " 2 ", plan is consistent with decision of role of helper, autoplastic/alloplastic, holistic/monistic, and emic/etic. <br> (9-7 points) | Intervention plan highlights additional information needed and addresses presenting concern. (6-5 points) | Intervention plan lacks sufficient detail to be implemented and does not address presenting concern. (4-1 points) | Does not identify an intervention plan. (0 points) |  |


| Criteria | Exceeds expectations | Meets expectations | Meets some expectations | Does not meet expectations | Unable to score; incomplete or missing work | Final Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Paper has introduction and conclusion, correctly uses heading and subheadings, correctly uses intext citation, has properly formatted reference page and is free of stylistic or grammar errors. (5 points) | Paper is largely free of stylistic and grammar errors and has the following: introduction and conclusion, correct usage of heading and subheadings, correct usage of in-text citation, and properly formatted reference page. (4 points) | Either paper has many stylistic and grammar errors or omits or glosses over: introduction and conclusion, correct usage of heading and subheadings, correct usage of in-text citation, and properly formatted reference page. <br> (3-2 points) | Paper has many stylistic and grammar errors and omits or glosses over the following items: introduction and conclusion, correct usage of heading and subheadings, correct usage of in-text citation, and properly formatted reference page. <br> (1 point) | Paper is difficult to read because of excessive stylistic and grammar errors. (0 points) |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Legend

| Total Points | College of Education Assessment Scale Equivalent |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{9 0 - 1 0 0}$ | 4 (Exceeds Expectations) |
| $\mathbf{7 0 - 8 9}$ | 3 (Meets Expectations) |
| $\mathbf{4 4 - 6 9}$ | 2 (Meets Some Expectations) |
| $\mathbf{1 1 - 4 3}$ | 1 (Does Not Meet Expectations) |
| $\mathbf{0 - 1 0}$ | 0 (Can't Score) |

