

D. Step Two Report Form

(Except for signatures, please print)

Information about the Candidate

Name: _____
Address: _____

Phone: _____

INFORMATION ABOUT THE REVIEW TEAM

Chair: _____
Certification: _____
Member: _____
Certification: _____
Member: _____
Certification: _____

Signatures

REVIEW TEAM REPORT

Date Materials Received by Review Team Members: _____ Date Report Completed: _____

Did the Review Team meet face to face or by teleconference? _____

YES/NO Did the candidate provide a statement certifying that he/she is not currently under investigation or in appeals process for any alleged violation of the Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct?

Is this *(select one)*:

_____ the first scoring of all documents.
_____ re-scoring of *(list documents Note that documents may be re-scored once only)* _____

Demonstration of Competencies *(select one)*:

_____ All competencies were demonstrated; the candidate may proceed to Step Three.
Date and Location of Step Three meeting _____
Questions to begin the Step Three meeting *(use additional sheet if necessary)*: _____

_____ One or two competencies are not yet demonstrated; the candidate may re-submit the following paper(s): _____

_____ Three or more competencies were not demonstrated; the candidate's process is halted.

Date This Report Form Emailed or Faxed to the Candidate: _____

Date This Report Form Emailed or Faxed to the Chair of Certification: _____

Candidate: _____

*Consult Subsection 5.C. for full descriptions of the competencies noted in short-form here across the top of the grid.
 Consult Subsection 5.A. for full descriptions of the documents noted in short form under “reference” on the left side of the grid.*

Refer- ence	STEP TWO DOCUMENTS	5.C.1 Ministry Competence	5.C.2 Professional Identity	5.C.3 Ecumenical Multi-Faith/ Cultural	5.C.4 Pastoral Leadership & Education	5.C.5 Multi- Disciplinary Relationships	5.C.6 Integrated Theology of Ministry	5.C.7 Admin Structures Knowledge	5.C.8 Self- Aware, Growth	5.C.9 Ethics & Professional Conduct
5.A.1	Theology of Ministry						KEY			
5.A.2	Community, Church, Social Issues					KEY				
5.A.3	Multi-Faith/Cultural Issues			KEY						
5.A.4	Concerns, Strategies in Context				KEY					
5.A.5	Administrative Function							KEY		
5.A.6	Ethical Issues									KEY
5.A.7	Case Study	KEY								
5.A.8	Autobiography								KEY	
5.A.9	Threads & Transitions		KEY							
5.A.10	Resume									
5.A.11	3 Letters of Reference									
5.A.13	Pre-Certification Mentor’s Checklist & Report									
5.A.14	RAC Report Form for Adv Education									
5.A.12	Adv. #1 Self									
5.A.12	Adv. #1 Supervisor									
5.A.12	Adv. #2 Self									
5.A.12	Adv. #2 Supervisor									
5.A.12	Adv. #3 Self									
5.A.12	Adv. #3 Supervisor									
	TOTALS									
	COMPETENCY SCORES									

Scoring Grid

Each reflection paper or other required document is assessed for the extent to which it demonstrates the required competencies of a Specialist in Pastoral Care. Each competency is unlikely to be demonstrated in every document, and candidates are encouraged not to try to do so. The aim is to determine whether all competencies have been adequately demonstrated (NOT that they have been addressed in each document). It IS expected that each required competency will be demonstrated in its key paper, as identified with the word “key”.

Use by Candidates: Candidates are invited to mark with a high-lighter, one paper or document, in addition to the key document, in which they believe they have well-documented each required competency. For example, if the candidate believes that their competence in multi-disciplinary relationships is well-demonstrated not only in the paper on community, church and social issues (the key paper) but also in their self-evaluation for the second unit, they would high-light the section that corresponds to “Self #2” below “Multi-Disciplinary Relationships”.

Use by Review Team Members: As Review Team members read a document, they assess to what extent the required competencies are being demonstrated and assign a score: blank, zero, one, two, three or four. As not all competencies will be demonstrated in each paper, it is important to differentiate between a BLANK and a score of ZERO. A BLANK is left when one would not expect, given the topic of the paper or the approach to the paper taken by the candidate, that the competency would be discussed. A ZERO is given when one would expect, given the topic of the paper or the approach to the paper taken by the candidate, that the competency would be discussed and it has not been.

Calculating the final score:

For each competency, the scores are averaged, with blank boxes ignored. For example, if ethics, knowledge of CAPPE/ ACPEP’s Code of Ethics or limits of competence are addressed (or should have been addressed) in “Community, Church and Social Issues”, “Ethical Issues”, “Case Study”, “Pre-Certification Mentor’s Checklist and Report” and in both the self- and supervisory evaluation for Unit #2, the reviewer would total the scores and divide by 6. If the average for Ethics & Professional Conduct is 3.0 or higher, the competency is deemed to have been demonstrated. If the average for Ethics & Professional Conduct is 2.9 or less, the competency is deemed not to have been demonstrated, and the candidate may be invited to re-submit the key paper, in this case “Ethical Issues”. However, if more than two competencies are not demonstrated, the candidate’s process is halted, and no papers are invited for re-submission.

When a Candidate Expects that an Evaluation Will Skew Their Score Downward: A candidate may be aware that a certain evaluation (their own or a supervisor’s) identifies a serious problem in the achievement of a required competency. However, unit evaluations are snap-shots of the candidate’s development at a moment in time and therefore cannot be re-written for re-submission. In this case, it is incumbent upon the candidate to speak to the difficulty in their reflection papers so that the reviewers will have specific evidence that the problem identified in the evaluation has been addressed. When a difficulty is adequately addressed in this way, the Review Team may, if all members of the team agree, disregard the lower score in the evaluation.

SCORING GUIDELINES:

Blank: given the topic of the paper or the focus the candidate takes in writing, there was no need to address the competency in this paper.

Example: In the autobiography, the candidate makes no mention of ethics.

0 Not addressed: given what the paper was discussing, the competency should have been addressed and was not.

Example: In the ethics paper, there is no mention of boundaries.

1 Named (minimal): the candidate named the concept or issue. Did not provide a basic definition of the concept or issue. Did not explain or demonstrate the concept or issue within the overall framework.

Example: in the ethics paper, the issue of boundaries is referred to, but not defined, and maintenance of appropriate boundaries is not given any place in the candidate's ethical framework.

2 Named, Defined: The candidate named, and provided a basic definition of the concept or issue. Did not provide an explanation of the concept or issue. Did not demonstrate the concept or issue within his/her overall framework.

Example: in the Ethics paper, boundaries were named as important, and a definition of appropriate boundaries in helping relationships was given.

3 Named, Defined, Explained: The candidate named, defined and explained the concept or issue. Did not demonstrate the concept or issue within his/her overall framework.

Example: the candidate gave a definition of appropriate boundaries and explained the impact of boundary betrayals on those receiving pastoral care. However, the issue of boundaries was not given any place in the candidate's ethical framework.

4 Demonstrated: In addition to naming, defining and explaining the concept or issue, the candidate demonstrated the concept or issue within his/her overall framework.

Example: Boundaries in helping relationships defined and explained. Specific examples given from the candidate's own work which demonstrate how the candidate observes good professional boundaries. Ethical considerations are presented as an integral and intentional part of the candidate's framework of Pastoral Care.