



## **School Psychology Credential Program**

*Signature Assignment for EDP 536*

*Consultation Case Study*

### **Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed:**

SLO #2: Knowledge of varied methods of consultation, collaboration, and communication applicable to individuals, families, groups, and systems and used to promote effective implementation of services.

### **Description of the Signature Assignment**

Candidates will engage in a consultation relationship with a teacher at their practica or internship site. The focus of the consultation will be a student who is experiencing academic difficulties. Candidates will submit a report of the outcomes of their consultation.

### **Directions for Students**

#### **Consultation Paper**

Candidates will engage in consultation with an individual teacher concerning an individual student. Through role play, analysis of theory, and group practice, each student will master the art and craft of consultation. Each student will choose a teacher within his/her practica or internship setting and spend 4 to 6 sessions with that teacher completing a consultation case. One of the two cases will involve a child with learning problems. The outcomes of the case study will be typed, double-spaced and not exceed five pages in length and should follow the rubric posted on BeachBoard. The setting in which the consultation occurred should be clearly defined, as should the nature of the presenting problem as seen by the consultee. Discuss the process by which you narrowed the problem down and made it more specific; the strategies that you used to overcome any resistance; and your analysis of what the consultee(s) may have been experiencing.

## Scoring Rubric:

CONTENT OF CONSULTATION	
<b>RUBRIC</b>	<p>4 - Sensitively written; relevant and adequate background information of consultee and client (e.g., grade, ethnicity, language proficiency, grades, IEP, 504 Plan, etc.) provided; <u>all</u> information listed in a-c below is included.</p> <p>3</p> <p>2 - Adequate background information included; may not include <u>all</u> information listed below; some information may be irrelevant.</p> <p>1</p> <p>0 – Incomplete/inadequate and irrelevant information provided.</p>
<b>INDICATORS</b>	<p>a. Described problem in observable, measurable terms.</p> <p>b. Baseline data were established as appropriate, to define present levels of performance and were used to interpret and draw conclusions regarding the existence of the problem.</p> <p>c. Intervention goal developed and based on expected level of performance as indicated by consultee and/or grade, district, or state standards (e.g., language such as “miracle questions” or scaling from “1-10” via solution-focused theory)</p> <p>d. Evidence that intervention strategies to circumvent identified problem were brainstormed with consultee</p> <p>e. Intervention strategies selected are scientifically-based</p> <p>f. Details of implemented intervention described: what was the chosen intervention, who implemented it, where, when, how long?</p> <p>g Observation of consultee implementing intervention strategies: describe what was observed and analyze consultees level of implementation</p> <p>h. Inferences regarding effectiveness of consultation based on client and/or consultee data.</p>
COMMUNICATION	
<b>RUBRIC</b>	<p>4 – Language is clear and expressive; reader can create a mental picture of the situation being described; activities reflected upon are relevant and meaningful to student and course learning goals; moves beyond simple description of the experience to an analysis of how the experience contributed to student understanding of self, others, and/or course concepts; demonstrates ability to question own biases, stereotypes, preconceptions, and/or assumptions and define new modes of thinking.</p> <p>3</p> <p>2 – Language and descriptions are vague; some attempt to demonstrate relevance, but relevance is unclear; some attempt at applying experience to understanding of self, others, and/or course concepts but fails to demonstrate depth of analysis; some attempt at self-criticism, but fails to demonstrate a new awareness of personal biases.</p> <p>1</p> <p>0 – Language is unclear and confusing throughout; concepts are either not discussed or presented inaccurately; reflection does not move beyond description of the experience; no attempt at self-criticism.</p>
<b>Indicators</b>	<p>a. Honest reflection of the consultation process.</p> <p>b. Evaluation of lessons learned.</p> <p>c. Description of possible consultee resistance and strategies used to overcome.</p> <p>d. Projection of what you might do differently next time</p>

**Average of Content & Communication:        /4**

## Legend

<b>Total Points</b>	<b>College of Education Assessment Scale Equivalent</b>
<b>4</b>	Exceeds Expectations
<b>3</b>	Meets Expectations
<b>2</b>	Meets Some Expectations
<b>1</b>	Does Not Meet Expectations
<b>0</b>	Can't Score