

**UW-RF School Psychology Training Program
Intervention Case Study Appraisal Rubric**

Candidate: _____

Rater: _____

Year in Program: 3rd (Practicum) or 4th (Intern)

Date: _____

RATING INSTRUCTIONS:

While passing levels will vary by year in the program (see table below), all ratings should be assigned with the expectations of a graduating intern in mind. Feedback to the candidate should be provided about her or his intervention skills/awareness relative to graduating intern expectations. A non-passing level TOTAL score may necessitate the development of a “Professional Growth Plan” (see Appendix Y of the Program Handbook) or other new goals for the candidate.

The Intervention Case Study rubric has 57 total points. Passing levels vary by year in program, as follows:

Year in Program	TOTAL rubric passing level
<i>Practicum, Year 3</i>	70% (40+)
<i>Intern, Year 4</i>	80% (47+)

Please rate the candidate on each item using the scale below. Comments on any particular strength or challenging characteristic may be written in the box at the end of the rubric.

RATING SCALE:

1: This intervention component is not clearly included or minimally described
2 or 3: This intervention component is adequately described or comprehensively described (assignment of 2 or 3 will depend on maximum item score – varies by item).

Section 1: Problem Identification	3	2	1	LEVEL
1.1	Student's behavior is defined in the context of appropriate grade and/or peer expectations	The student's behavior is operationally defined.	The student's behavior is identified by not operationally defined.	
1.2		The problem is collaboratively defined.	The problem is not collaboratively defined.	
1.3	The discrepancy between current and desired level of performance is explained.	The behavior is operationally defined or quantified in terms of both current and desired level of performance	The behavior is not operationally defined in terms of both current and desired levels of performance.	
1.4	Baseline includes the student behavior and peer/grade norms and expectations with computed trend lines.	A baseline for the student is established using sufficient data.	A baseline for the student behavior is not established or has insufficient data.	
1.5		The student behavior is identified as a skill deficit or a performance deficit.	The student behavior is not identified as a skill or performance deficit.	
1.6		Parents/guardians and teachers are involved in the problem-identification process.	Parents/guardians and teachers are not involved in the problem-identification process.	
TOTAL				

Section 2: Problem Analysis	3	2	1	LEVEL
2.1	Hypotheses are generated through collaboration with teacher and/or parents.	One or more hypotheses are developed to identify the functions that the behavior serves and/or the conditions under which the behavior is occurring (two or more of the following factors: child factors, curriculum, peers, teacher, classroom, home.)	Hypotheses are not developed or are developed in only one area and/or hypotheses are not measurable.	
2.2	There are multiple sources of data that converge on each proposed hypothesis.	There is evidence that appropriate data are collected to confirm or reject the proposed hypotheses. Appropriate data include one or more of the following: record review, interview, observation, testing, self-report.	Appropriate data are not collected to confirm or reject the hypotheses.	
2.3		Hypotheses reflect an awareness of issues of diversity (e.g., physical, social, linguistic, cultural).	Hypotheses do not reflect an awareness of issues related to diversity.	
TOTAL				

Section 3: Intervention	3	2	1	LEVEL
3.1		Intervention is linked to observable, measurable goal statement(s).	Intervention is not linked to observable, measurable goal statement(s).	
3.2		Intervention selection is based on data from problem analysis and hypothesis testing.	Intervention selection is not based on data from problem analysis and hypothesis testing.	
3.3		Intervention is evidence-based (e.g., research literature, functional analysis, single case design analysis).	Intervention is not evidence-based.	
3.4		Intervention is developed collaboratively.	Intervention is not developed collaboratively.	
3.5		Intervention reflects sensitivity to individual differences, resources, classroom practices, and other system issues. Acceptability of intervention is verified.	Intervention does not reflect sensitivity to individual differences, resources, classroom practices, and other system issues. Acceptability of intervention is not verified.	
3.6		Logistics of setting, time, resources, and personnel are included in the intervention plan.	Logistics of setting, time, resources and personnel are not included in the intervention plan.	
3.7		Intervention selection considers unintended outcomes or limitations.	Intervention selection does not consider unintended outcomes or limitations.	
3.8		Intervention is monitored and data are provided to ensure that it is implemented as designed (Intervention Integrity)	Intervention Integrity is not monitored.	
TOTAL				

Section 4: Evaluation	3	2	1	LEVEL
4.1	Charting includes student performance trend lines and/or goal lines.	Progress monitoring data are demonstrated on a chart.	Progress monitoring data are not demonstrated on a chart.	
4.2	Progress monitoring data are demonstrated to be effective when compared to data generated from multiple sources/settings.	Progress monitoring data are demonstrated to be effective when compared to baseline data.	Intervention is not demonstrated to be effective through data comparison.	
4.3	Responses to Intervention data are used to inform problem-solving and decision making. Single-case design was specified.	Data are used to inform further problem solving and decision making (i.e., continuation of intervention, modification of intervention, maintenance of intervention).	Data are not used to inform further problem-solving and decision making.	
4.4	Strategies for transfer/generalizing outcomes to other settings are documented as effective.	Strategies for transfer/generalizing outcomes to other settings are addressed.	Strategies for transfer/generalizing outcomes to other settings are not addressed.	
4.5	Modifications for future interventions are considered based upon collaborative examination of effective data.	Effectiveness of intervention is shared through collaboration with parents, teachers, and other personnel.	Effectiveness of intervention is not shared or communicated.	
4.6	Strategies for follow-up are developed and implemented.	Suggestions for follow-up are developed (e.g., continued progress monitoring, transition planning).	Suggestions for follow-up are not developed.	
TOTAL				

Summary Data for the Intervention

CASE STUDY OVERALL RATING	
Section 1 TOTAL	___/15
Section 2 TOTAL	___/8
Section 3 TOTAL	___/16
Section 4 TOTAL	___/18
RUBRIC TOTAL	___/57 P or F
Intervention Integrity Rating (separate form) (80 to 100% is considered acceptable)	___%
Effect Size or Percent of Non-Overlapping Data	___

Comments/Recommendations:

Supervisor/Date