

Assessment 6 Rubric for Evaluation of Clinical Experience

Part A. Home-Based Practicum (Birth – 3 years)

Candidates are required to complete an internship that includes services to children ages 0-3 with special needs as well as typically developing children. This may involve (in addition to 0-3 home based services; Early Head Start, Parents as Teachers, child care center, child care home, or other community based services unique to the candidate’s location). It is a requirement of the practicum to provide experience with infants and toddlers with and without special needs and their families or care givers.

Factor #1: The candidate successfully completed 150 hours in a 0-3 home based program to include typically developing children and children with special needs. Candidates have documented the hours in a daily log that included date, child’s first name, description and evaluation of activities, and time involved each day.

Rubric: The degree to which the candidate provides specific information regarding the above factor.

Content	1	2	3	Score
	Standard not met	Standard partially met	Standard met	
150 hours documented in daily log	100-125 hours documented	125-149 hours documented	150 hours or more documented	
Date, child’s first name and time involved included for each visit	Information lacking on most dates	Most, but not all, of the information is provided	Candidate provides all information for all visits	
Description of activities	Candidate provides minimal description of a few activities	Candidate provides brief description of most activities	Candidate provides thorough description of all activities	
Evaluation of activities	Candidate provides very few evaluations and these are cursory	Candidate provides brief evaluation of most activities	Candidate provides evaluation of all activities/visits	
Information on observations of various therapists	Candidate does not describe the activities of therapists	Candidate gives brief descriptions of therapists’ activities	Candidate give thorough descriptions of therapists’ activities and includes interpretation	

Total for Factor #1: _____

Factor #2: The candidate provided a short summary for each child that included age, referral source, medical history, family history, service history (including previous assessment information), and goals from the current IFSP (If appropriate) or family goals for the typically developing child(ren)

Rubric: The degree to which the candidate provided the above information

Content	1	2	3	Score
	Standard not met	Standard partially met	Standard met	
Child’s age, referral source, medical	Candidate provides very little background	Candidate provides some background on some of	Candidate provides complete description of	

history, family history, service history	information on most of the children		background information
Current IFSP goals or family goals	Candidate does not provide IFSP or family goals for most of the children	Candidate provides some IFSP or family goals for some of the children	Candidate provides all current IFSP or family goals for all of the children

Total for Factor #2 _____

Factor #3: Assessment and IFSP

The candidate examined at least four assessment instruments that are used with infants and toddlers and wrote a summary of each that included the strengths and limitations of each. The candidate administered one formal and one informal measure to the same child, indicated the results for each measure, and discussed how the information will be utilized in planning programs for the infant or toddler. The candidate obtained a developmental history from the primary caregiver of the infant or toddler. The candidate participated in the writing of an IFSP **OR wrote goals and objectives for an infant or toddler based on assessment and developmental observation of any of the children visited by the candidate.**

Rubric: The degree to which the candidate provided information on the above factor. (total 15 possible points)

Content	1	2	3	Score
Examination of assessment instruments	Standard not met Candidate merely listed the instruments	Standard partially met Candidate gave brief descriptions, with cursory attention to strengths and limitations	Standard met Candidate describe assessments with detail, and provided reasonable strengths and limitations of each	
Administration of formal and informal measure	Candidate failed to describe one or both of these assessment tools	Candidate gave description of both assessment tools, but the narrative is merely cursory	Candidate gave detailed narrative of both formal and informal assessments, including age of the child, gender, setting, etc.	
Interpretation of results: how the information will be used	Candidate failed to describe interpretations	Candidate interpreted results, but these are unclear, based on the cursory nature of the assessment report	Candidate's interpretations are logical and are aligned with the assessment results	
Developmental history of infant or toddler	Candidate failed to obtain developmental history	Candidate obtained a very brief developmental history	Candidate described developmental history in detail, based on a knowledgeable interview of the primary caregiver	
Participation in writing of IFSP OR write goals and objectives based on assessments and developmental observation	Candidate did not participate in IFSP meeting OR Candidate did not provide goals and objectives based on assessments and developmental	Candidate wrote a brief description of the IFSP meeting, but did not include his/her own participation in the narrative OR Candidate provided goals and objectives that were	Candidate wrote a full descriptive narrative of the IFSP meeting and included information on his/her participation OR	

observation	not aligned with the assessments and developmental observation	Candidate provided realistic goals and objectives that were closely aligned with the assessments and developmental observation
-------------	--	--

Total score for Factor #3 _____

Factor #4: Developmental Observations:

The candidate wrote a developmental observation on two different children, or on one child in two different settings. Observations include cognitive, communication, social/emotional, adaptive, and motor development. Candidate provided interpretations of observations, and provided information regarding how these observations fit into the IFSP **or goals articulated by the family.**

Rubric: The degree to which the candidate provided information on all of the above.

Content	1	2	3	Score
	Standard not met	Standard partially met	Standard met	
Developmental observations	Candidate's descriptions lack one or more areas of development. Evidence that candidate carefully observed infant(s) or toddler(s) is not apparent	Candidate's descriptions include all areas of development, but the descriptions are vague and cursory	Candidate describes all areas of development in a comprehensive manner. Evidence is clear that candidate observed carefully	
Interpretations of observations	Candidate's interpretations are lacking	Candidate's interpretations are rudimentary and lack evidence of critical thinking	Candidate's interpretations are reasonable and clear and are based on what was observed in all areas of development	
Observations and the IFSP	Candidate does not indicate how the results of the observations would fit into an IFSP or goals of the family as appropriate	Candidate merely lists a few ways that the results of the observations would fit into an IFSP or goals of the family as appropriate. Critical thinking is not apparent	Candidate discusses in detail how the observation results would fit into an IFSP or goals of the family. Critical thinking is apparent	

Total score for Factor #4 _____

Factor #5: Planning visits and lesson plan format

Candidate was responsible for the planning for four children: one typically developing child and three with special needs for the last half of the practicum. Candidate collaborated with parents and/or caregivers to write developmentally appropriate lesson plans for each visit in the natural setting, following the prescribed format. Candidate used evidence from observations and assessments to plan activities/lessons.

Rubric: The degree to which the candidate includes specific information on the above factor.

Content	1	2	3	Score
	Standard not met	Standard partially met	Standard met	
Lesson plans provided for all visits for which the candidate was responsible	Candidate provides only a few lesson plans, which are vague	Candidate provides some lesson plans. A few are well written, a few are vague	Candidate provides detailed lesson plans for all visits	
Lesson plans follow the prescribed format	Candidate does not follow the prescribed format	Candidate follows prescribed format on some of the plans	Candidate follows the prescribed format on all lesson plans	

Total score for Factor #5: _____

Factor #6: Project proposal and implementation

Candidate developed a project proposal, and implemented the project that fit the unique needs of an infant or toddler and family, small group, or program in the appropriate natural environment.

Rubric: The degree to which the candidate planned and carried out the project.

Content	1	2	3	Score
	Standard not met	Standard partially met	Standard met	
Project proposal	Candidate's proposal lacks critical thinking and is simplistic	Candidate's proposal is somewhat vague and not aligned with need	Candidate's proposal appears well thought out and fits the need for which it is intended	
Project implementation	Project is not implemented	Candidate does not complete implementation	Candidate implements project to the satisfaction of the family or program	

Total score for Factor #6: _____

Factor #7: Final reflective paper including self evaluation

The candidate analyzed performance in the practicum, and reflected on what was gained from the practicum; a comparison between typically developing children and those with special needs and how their families were managing the challenges of parenting; strengths regarding working with infants, toddlers, and families, ways of dealing with challenges, and the impact that the candidate has had on the children and families.

Rubric: The degree to which the candidate reflects on the above factor.

Content	1	2	3	Score
	Standard not met	Standard partially met	Standard met	
Gains to candidate from practicum experience including a comparison of	No indication of having gained from the	Vague discussion of gains, but superficial. Little depth of reflection noted	Clear discussion of gains from the experience. Candidate	

typical development with atypical development	experience		gives specific information and exhibits critical thinking
Strengths related to working with infants, toddlers, and families	Very brief mention of strengths	A few strengths are discussed, but in vague terms. Little depth of reflection	Candidate discusses strengths in detail and shows evidence of critical thinking and depth of reflection
Methods of dealing with challenges/obstacles	No challenges mentioned, therefore no methods to deal with them	Dealing with obstacles/challenges is discussed in general terms, but no specific instances are given	Clear discussion of ways that the candidate dealt with specific challenges
Issues that remain challenges	No indication of challenging issues	Discussion of challenging issues is general. Not much detail in the discussion that would indicate depth of reflection	Candidate clearly discusses the issues that remain challenging. Clear evidence of critical thinking and depth of reflection
Impact on the children and families	No indication of impact	General discussion but not enough depth or detail	Clear and detailed discussion of candidate's impact, with evidence of critical thinking

Total score for Factor #7: _____

Total for all factors _____ /72

Acceptable performance is 65; Target performance is 68.

Part B. Experiences with Infants and Toddlers With and Without Special Needs in Natural Environments

Content	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Target	Score
B-walking observation	Sketchy notes w/out detail. No mention of caregiver interactions Brief indication age/stage of development 0-5	Complete notes on infant behavior. Brief notes on caregiver interactions, no reflection on development 6-10	Complete notes on setting and infant behavior. Detailed notes on infant/caregiver interactions. In depth reflection on what was observed with relation to dev. theory 11-15	
Walking to 3 yrs observation	Sketchy notes w/out details. No or brief description of interactions	Complete notes on toddler behavior. Brief notes on	Complete notes on setting and toddler behavior. Detailed notes on	

	with caregivers, brief indication of age/stage of development 0-5	caregiver interactions and language No reflection on development 6-10	interactions w caregiver. In depth reflection on what was observed with relation to dev. theory(s) 11-15	
Implemented infant activity	Activity does not follow template, is not dev. appropriate. Formal feedback indicates poor prep or implementation 0-10	Follows template is marginally dev. appropriate. Formal feedback indicates adequate implementation 11-17	Follows template well. Is dev. appropriate and implementation is evaluated as good to excellent. 18-25	
Implemented toddler activity	Activity does not follow template, is not dev. appropriate. Formal feedback indicates poor prep or implementation 0-10	Follows template is marginally dev appropriate. Formal feedback indicates adequate implementation 11-17	Follows template well. Is dev. appropriate and implementation is evaluates as good to excellent. 18-25	

80 points possible

Total points _____

75-80 points A
 72-74 points A-
 67-71 points B+
 64-66 points B
 61-63 points B-
 58-60 points C+
 56-57 points C

Target Level 72-80 points
 Adequate level 61-71 points