

Case Study Guidelines

During your school psychology internship, you are to complete a case study. In this case study, you will be expected to describe an actual case that has been completed using systemic and structured problem-solving procedures. The attached rubric will be used to evaluate the submitted case study and will also serve as a guideline as you are developing your case study. Your case study should be no more than 10-15 pages long including charts and graphs.

Section 1: Provide a brief description of the student(s), the context, and the presenting issue (can be either academic or behavioral). In this description, define the problem clearly and present data on how the observed performance differs from the norm as well as from the expected level of performance (if different than the norm). Include a baseline graph of your observations. You will also want to include a description of who you are working with on this issue and your process for working together.

Section 2: In this section, you will want to describe your hypothesis for why the student is performing in the manner described and incorporate all points of data that lead you and your team to this conclusion. In your hypothesis, be sure to include a consideration of diversity issues (e.g., ability, cultural, SES) that might be playing a role in the identified concern.

Section 3: This section provides a description of the selected interventions, including a thorough description of why they were selected. That is, how did the data lead you toward the selection of these interventions and how do these interventions relate to your expected outcomes? You will also want to address whether these interventions are evidence-based. That is, is there research available to suggest that these approaches are effective in remediating the presenting issue? Other aspects to consider in your presentation of the selected intervention is the process you used to decide on these interventions and how you were sensitive to individual differences, resources, etc. in your selection and implementation of these interventions. Finally, you'll want to be sure to address the logistics of implementing your plan as well as your process for measuring whether the plan was implemented as intended.

Section 4: This section reflects your evaluation of your plan. It is expected that you will present graphs that compare the performance of the student before implementing your plan as well as after implementation. In your evaluation, you will want to address whether your plan was effective, what leads you to this conclusion, and what you and your collaborative team will do based on the data. In your presentation, discuss how the plan will be generalize to other settings and how you shared the outcomes of your intervention.

Section 5: Although this is not a specific section that you will write up, you will be evaluated on the degree to which your plan reflects legal, ethical, and best practices. Additionally, you will receive a rating on the degree to which your plan reflects a professional product (e.g., spelling, grammar, and organization).

The following rubric will be used to score your case study. It can also serve as an additional guide as you are developing your case study. Your case study should be no more than 10 pages including charts and graphs. There are 18 elements to the case study and you should score at least 36 pts or better (Mean of 2.0 indicating proficient) in order to pass this assignment and demonstrate that you have a positive effect on student learning or behavior. Total possible pts is 54.

Case Study Rubric

		Scoring Criteria	
Standard	Developing (1)	Proficient (2)	Advanced (3)
Problem Identification, 1.1	The student's behavior is identified but not operationally defined.	The student's behavior is operationally defined, but not in terms of current and desired levels of performance.	The student's behavior is operationally defined in terms of current and desired levels of performance.
Problem Identification, 1.2	A baseline for the student behavior is not established or has insufficient data.	A baseline for the student behavior is established using sufficient data.	Baseline includes the student behavior and peer/grade norms and expectations with computed trend lines.
Problem Identification, 1.3	Parents/guardians and teachers are not involved in the problem-identification process.	Either parents/guardians or teachers, but not both, are involved in the problem-identification process.	Parents/guardians and teachers are involved in the problem-identification process.
Problem Analysis, 2.1	Hypotheses are not developed, hypotheses are developed in only one area and/or hypotheses are not measurable.	One or more hypotheses are developed to identify the functions of the behavior and/or the conditions under which the behavior occurs in two or more of areas: child factors, peers, curriculum, teacher, classroom, home.	Hypotheses are generated through collaboration with others and address two or more areas and are measurable.
Problem Analysis, 2.2	Appropriate data were not collected to confirm or reject the hypotheses.	There is evidence that appropriate data were collected to confirm or reject the proposed hypotheses. Appropriate data include one or more of the following: record review, interview, observation,	There are multiple sources of data that converge on each proposed hypothesis.

		tests results, self-report.	
Problem Analysis, 2.3	Hypotheses do not reflect an awareness of issues related to diversity (e.g., physical, social, linguistic, cultural)	Hypotheses reflect some awareness of issues related to diversity, but are not fully explained or show limited understanding.	Hypotheses reflect an awareness of issues of diversity (e.g., physical, social, linguistic, cultural)
Intervention, 3.1	The link between the problem analysis, selected interventions, and observable, measurable goal statements is not present or unclear.	The link between the problem analysis, selected interventions and observable, measurable goal statements is present, but might be vague or difficult to measure.	The link between the problem analysis, selected interventions, and observable, measurable goal statements is clear and complete.
Intervention, 3.2	The selected interventions are not evidence-based (e.g., research literature, functional analysis, single case design) for identified concerns.	The selected interventions are generally evidence-based (e.g., research literature, functional analysis, single case design), but the connection to the identified concerns may not be clearly articulated.	The selected interventions are clearly evidence-based (e.g., research literature, functional analysis, single case design) for the identified concerns.
Intervention, 3.3	The selected interventions do not reflect sensitivity to individual differences, resources, classroom practices, and other systems issues. Acceptability of interventions is not verified.	The selected interventions generally reflect sensitivity to individual differences, resources, classroom practices, and other system issues. Acceptability of intervention is verified.	The selected interventions clearly reflect sensitivity to multiple variables including individual differences, resources, classroom practices, resources, and other relevant system issues. Acceptability of the intervention is verified.
Intervention, 3.4	It does not appear that a collaborative process was used to design the intervention and there is no reporting of the logistics of setting, time, resources, and	It appears that a collaborative process was used to design the intervention and there is reference to the logistics of setting, time, resources, and personnel included in the plan. Some	It is clear that a collaborative process was used in designing the intervention and the plan reflects the logistics of setting, time, resources, and personnel included in the plan.

	personnel included in the plan.	of the aspects of these logistics may be vague or have not been fully considered.	
Intervention, 3.5	No report on the integrity of the intervention is provided.	It is clear that treatment integrity was monitored, but may have been done so intermittently or in an informal manner.	The intervention is monitored and data are provided to ensure that it is implemented as designed.
Evaluation, 4.1	Progress monitoring data are not demonstrated on a chart.	Progress monitoring data are demonstrated on a chart.	Charting includes student performance trend lines, and/or goal lines.
Evaluation, 4.2	The selected interventions are not demonstrated to be effective through data comparison.	The selected interventions appear to be somewhat effective as compared to the baseline data.	The selected interventions are demonstrated to be effective when compared to both baseline data as well as from other sources/settings.
Evaluation, 4.3	Data are not used to inform further problem solving and decision making.	Data are used to inform further problem solving and decision making (i.e., continuation of intervention, modification of intervention, maintenance of intervention).	Data are used to inform further decision-making through additional analysis including for example, single case design with changing criterion, parametric, component analysis, multiple baseline, and/or alternating treatment.
Evaluation, 4.4	Follow up strategies for transfer/generalization are not addressed.	Follow up strategies for transfer/generalization is addressed.	Follow up strategies for transfer/generalizations are documented as effective.
Evaluation, 4.5	Effectiveness of the interventions are not communicated or shared.	Effectiveness of the interventions is shared through collaboration with parents, teachers, and other personnel. The presentation of this data does not	Effectiveness of the interventions is shared with other stakeholders through the use of technology and from this data, modifications for

		reflect the use of technology or is perhaps presented through informal strategies.	future interventions are considered.
Professionalism, 5.1	It is not clear that all legal and ethical guidelines were followed in carrying out this case study (e.g., violating student's confidentiality, no attempts to involve parents).	All legal and ethical guidelines appear to have been followed in completing this case study.	All legal and ethical guidelines, as well as best practices, have been followed in completing this case study.
Professionalism, 5.2	The final report does not reflect a professional product as there are spelling or grammatical errors and/or the presentation is difficult to follow.	The final report reflects an adequate level of professionalism but might have some errors present.	The final report reflects and exemplary level of professionalism as it is clearly written and free of errors.

Comments:

Total points _____/54

(Students must achieve a minimum of 36 (or an average of 2.0) indicating overall proficiency)