

**4. Step Two Report Form**

*(Except for signatures, please print)*

**INFORMATION ABOUT THE CANDIDATE**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

PCE or CPE? \_\_\_\_\_  
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 \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ 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: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>REFERENCE</u>	<u>STEP TWO DOCUMENTS</u>	<u>D.2.a) CONCEPTUAL COMPETENCE</u>	<u>D.2.b) PROGRAM MGMT</u>	<u>D.2.c) GROUP SUPERVISION</u>	<u>D.2.d) INDIVIDUAL SUPERVISION</u>	<u>D.2.e) PERS &amp; SUP INTEGRATION</u>
	Description of SPE offered		KEY			
D.3.a) ii	Site Description__					
D.3.a) iii)	Educational Activity Description					
D.3.a) iv)	Other Ed Activities, PCE course only					
D.3.b)	Approach to SPE	KEY				
D.3.d)	Group Facilitation			KEY		
D.3.e)	Brief Reflections on Each Student					
D.3.f)	Thorough Report on One Student				KEY	
D.3.g)	Autobiography					KEY
D.3.i)	Response to Prov. Recommendations					
D.3.j)	Resume					
D.3.c)	<u>6 Most Recent Supervisees</u>					
	Student #1 Self-Evaluation					
	Student #1 Supervisor					
	Student #2 Self-Evaluation					
	Student #2 Supervisor					
	Student #3 Self-Evaluation					
	Student #3 Supervisor					
	Student #4 Self-Evaluation					
	Student #4 Supervisor					
	Student #5 Self-Evaluation					
	Student #5 Supervisor					
	Student #6 Self-Evaluation					
	Student #6 Supervisor					
D.3.h)	<u>Evaluations of Provisional</u>					
	Self #1					
	Supervisor #1					
	Self #2					
	Supervisor #2					
	Self #3					
	Supervisor #3					
	<b>TOTALS</b>					
	<b>COMPETENCY SCORES:</b>					

**Scoring Grid**

Each reflection paper or other required document is assessed for the extent to which it demonstrates the required competencies of an Associate supervisor. Each competency is unlikely to be demonstrated in every document, and candidates are encourage not to try to do so. The aim is to determine whether all objectives have been adequately addressed (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 SPE program management is demonstrated not only in the description of the SPE offered (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 “Program Management”.

**Use by Review Team Members:** As Review Team members read the required materials, they assess to what extent the required competencies are being demonstrated and assign a numerical 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. So, if SPE Program Management is addressed (or should have been addressed) 3 times in the papers, plus every time in 4 evaluations (by both supervisor and candidate), the reviewer would total the scores and divide by 7. If the average for SPE Program Management is 3.0 or higher, the competency is deemed to have been demonstrated. If the average for SPE Program Management 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 “Brief Description of the SPE offered”.

**When a Candidate Expects that an Evaluation Will Skew Their Score Downward:** Evaluations, by the candidate, their supervisees or their own supervisors, cannot be re-written. However, a candidate may be aware that a certain evaluation may present a particularly negative view of their achievement of one of the required competencies. 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 difficulty or negative view presented in the evaluation has been addressed. When a difficulty is addressed in this way, the Review Team may, if all members of the team agree, disregard the problematic score in the evaluation.

**SCORING GUIDELINES:**

**Blank:** given the topic of the paper and 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 group supervision.*

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

*Example: In the reflective paper on group supervision, there is no mention of group dynamics.*

**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 reflective paper on group supervision, the issue of dynamics among students as a learning group is referred to, but not defined, and the impact of group dynamics on students' learning is not given any place in the candidate's understanding of group supervision.*

**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 reflective paper on group supervision, group dynamics were named as important for students' learning, and a definition of group dynamics was given. However, examples of the use of group dynamics for students' benefit were lacking, and student interpersonal dynamics seem to have only an incidental or accidental place in the candidate's framework of group supervision.*

**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 dynamics within a student group, with an explanation of how group dynamics can contribute to learning. However, the final link, how student interpersonal dynamics are intentionally used by the candidate for student growth and development, is not made.*

**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: Student interpersonal dynamics in group supervision were named, defined and explained. Specific examples were given from the candidate's own supervision of SPE groups, demonstrating how the candidate makes intentional use of the opportunity for student growth in personal integration and practice. The use of group dynamics is presented as an integral and intentional part of the candidate's framework of SPE.*