

CPSY 423- Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy

Spring 2011

Loyola University Chicago

Instructor: David Shriberg, Ph.D.

TA: Ruth Schumacher

Office: 1147 Lewis Towers

Office Hours: Th 1-3 and by appointment

Email: dshribe@luc.edu

Work Phone: (312) 915-7087

Cell Phone: (224) 456-9450

Class Time and Location: Tuesdays, 1-3:30, Corboy Law Center- Room 426

Course Description: Basic psychological concepts of counseling children, adolescents and adults living in a culturally complex society. Introduction to counseling theory and process, role-playing, and analysis of individual and small group interviews.

Overview of Course: This course will have three primary themes. The first theme is exposure to and critical analysis of a wide variety of theoretical approaches to counseling, with an emphasis on understanding the core assumptions and limitations of each approach as well as a critical exploration of your own approach to counseling. There will be particular emphasis on models (e.g., time-limited approaches) more likely to be employed in school settings. There will also be an emphasis on feminist/multicultural/social justice perspectives and on wellness perspectives, as well as on more traditional theoretical approaches (e.g., psychodynamic, cognitive-behavioral, humanistic).

The second theme involves the development of clinical microskills that can be applied across primary, secondary, and tertiary intervention efforts and across a wide range of theoretical orientations. For a variety of reasons, school-based mental health professionals often lead student educational/guidance, counseling, and/or therapy groups. As such, the third primary theme of this course will focus on the specific skills connected with group leadership.

Instructor's Philosophy: Our primary goal in this course is to help to put all of you in the best possible position to produce positive outcomes for the students, families, educators, and communities that you will be working with. In order to achieve this goal, you will need a wide range of skills, some of which can be taught directly and some of which are best learned through experience. Research has been quite clear that there is no overarching model of mental health service delivery that can claim superiority over all others and that the most effective mental health service providers know themselves, know the research, and know how to translate their knowledge and experience into positive action. As such, while I (Dave) have my biases like anyone else, my goal is not to enforce a particular ideological or research agenda, but rather to work with you to enhance your clinical skills, your knowledge of pertinent research and ideas, and your knowledge of your own strengths and limitations. Each of you comes to this class with your own strengths and weaknesses—my hope is that you will all emerge with a clearer

sense of who you are as a mental health service provider and how you can utilize your talents to best serve children, families, other educators, and the communities in which you work.

Course objectives: Below is a listing of the four primary goals/objectives for this course:

- 1) *Students will obtain exposure to and demonstrate proficiency in knowledge of leading counseling theories and theorists*

Primary assessments connected to this objective: case study paper and conference, personal theoretical orientation paper

- 2) *Students will work towards a greater understanding of their personal strengths and weaknesses as relates to mental health work in schools and obtain insight as to which theoretical orientations they most connect with and why*

Primary assessment connected to this objective: personal theoretical orientation paper

- 3) *Understanding of and proficiency in microskills that cut across theoretical paradigms and are essential to effective interviewing and problem-solving*

Primary assessments/activities connected to this objective: case study paper, in-class individual and group simulations

- 4) *Enhanced understanding of the complexity of and proficiency in the core skills needed to lead group counseling*

Primary assessment connected to this objective: group plan paper, in-class group simulations

Primary NASP Competencies Covered:

Standard 2.1 Data-Based Decision Making

Standard 2.2 Interpersonal Communication, Collaboration, and Consultation

Standard 2.4 Socialization and Development of Life Competencies

Standard 2.5 Student Diversity in Development and Learning

Standard 2.6 School Structure, Organization, and Climate

Standard 2.8 Home/School/Community Collaboration

Standard 2.10 Legal, Ethical Practice and Professional Development

Required Texts:

Ivey, A.E., D'Andrea, M., Ivey, M.B., & Simek-Morgan, L. (2007). *Theories of counseling and psychotherapy: A multicultural perspective* (6th Ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Corey, M. S., & Corey, G. (2008). *Groups: Process and practice* (8th ed.). New York: Brooks Cole.

Suggested optional reading:

Meier, S. T., & Davis, S. R. (2010). *The elements of counseling* (7th ed.). New York: Brooks Cole.

All additional readings will be made available via Blackboard.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The School of Education, as part of a Catholic, Jesuit University, espouses social justice as a unifying conceptual framework that is designed to prepare teachers and other school personnel to practice “professionalism in the service of social justice” (see below). In concert with the rest of Loyola University Chicago and with the precepts of the Society of Jesus, an effort is made to prepare professionals who understand and seek to advance distributive justice. We prepare individuals to strive toward equity and fairness in their future professional roles. CPSY 423 maintains this focus on social justice with regard to providing services to all individuals. The four components of the conceptual framework of the School of Education are addressed within the context of four areas of study:

1. **Knowledge:** candidates pursue justice by being knowledgeable in their specialized disciplines and well educated in general so that they can offer the highest quality of service
2. **Skills:** candidates pursue justice by being competent professionals and offering their well developed skills in the service of others-particularly the sick, the poor, and the young.
3. **Ethics:** candidates know and practice the ethical standards of their professions.
4. **Service:** from whatever faith tradition they may come, candidates strive to be "persons for others."

PROFESSIONALS IN SERVICE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Jesuit education is founded on a 400-year tradition of academic excellence emphasizing the unique bond between teachers and learners. The School of Education prepares educators, administrators and school psychologists to be competent in the exercise of professional skills, to display a respect for diversity, to embrace distributive justice as social justice, and to recognize that education is a life-long process. Loyola University’s School of Education seeks to develop professionals who use their scholarship to evaluate actions and decisions in light of their ramifications and impact on students, school organizations, and the broader community. We see the professionals of the future as thoughtful persons able to analyze situations, set goals, plan and monitor actions, evaluate results, and reflect on their own professional thinking.

Professionals are responsive to the long-term social and ethical implications of their decisions and actions. The School of Education develops persons of conscience devoted to the service of others. The faculty of the School of Education seek to develop professionals able to develop and offer educational opportunities for children, adolescents and adults that enable them to contribute to and benefit from the social, political, and

economic opportunities in their lives and to promote social justice. Professional educators in service of social justice will know the subjects they teach and how to convey content of those subjects to learners; engage in disciplined inquiry based on informed reason, reflect on experiences of self and others, consider alternative perspectives, and pursue a problem-solving orientation; evidence respect for and ability to respond to differences in learners' personal, social, economic and cultural experiences; evaluate the effects of their decisions on others (learners, families, and other professionals in the learning community); provide learning opportunities to support all learners' intellectual, social, and personal development; possess the knowledge and skills to teach all learners well and with rigor; create a learning environment that promotes positive social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation; and maintain standards of professional conduct.

The content of this course is consistent with this framework in that understanding the context in which mental health services are typically provided in schools, knowing the leading counseling theories and their strengths and weaknesses, knowing one's personal strengths and weaknesses as a mental health provider, and knowing and practicing key microskills and group leadership skills all help professional school psychologists bring a more competent and therefore just approach to the services they render to diverse populations.

Academic Honesty: Academic honesty is an expression of interpersonal justice, responsibility and care, applicable to Loyola University faculty, students, and staff, which demands that the pursuit of knowledge in the university community be carried out with sincerity and integrity. The School of Education's Policy on Academic Integrity can be found at: http://www.luc.edu/education/academics_policies_integrity.shtml. For additional academic policies and procedures refer to: http://www.luc.edu/education/academics_policies_main.shtml

Accessibility: Students who have disabilities which they believe entitle them to accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act should register with the Services for Students with Disabilities (SSWD) office. To request accommodations, students must schedule an appointment with an SSWD coordinator. Students should contact SSWD at least four weeks before their first semester or term at Loyola. Returning students should schedule an appointment within the first two weeks of the semester or term. The University policy on accommodations and participation in courses is available at: <http://www.luc.edu/sswd/>

Harassment (Bias Reporting): It is unacceptable and a violation of university policy to harass, discriminate against or abuse any person because of his or her race, color, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, disability, religion, age or any other characteristic protected by applicable law. Such behavior threatens to destroy the environment of tolerance and mutual respect that must prevail for this university to fulfill its educational and health care mission. For this reason, every incident of harassment, discrimination or abuse undermines the aspirations and attacks the ideals of our community. The university qualifies these incidents as incidents of bias.

In order to uphold our mission of being Chicago's Jesuit Catholic University-- a diverse community seeking God in all things and working to expand knowledge in the service of humanity through learning, justice and faith, any incident(s) of bias must be reported and appropriately addressed. Therefore, the Bias Response (BR) Team was created to assist members of the Loyola University Chicago community in bringing incidents of bias to the attention of the university. If you believe you are subject to such bias, you should notify the Bias Response Team at this link: <http://webapps.luc.edu/biasreporting/>

Technology: This course acknowledges and addresses the belief that technology for school psychologists is multidimensional and helps the psychologist make informed decisions by applying this technology within the school community. We will be utilizing technology in multiple ways throughout the course.

Diversity Statement: I view a commitment to culturally responsive service delivery as part and parcel to a commitment to social justice. The way that I currently view this relationship is that social justice is the aspiration (the “why” of what school psychologists do), advocacy and the use of up-to-date practice are the typical strategies that support social justice (the “how”), and then issues of cultural diversity provide the context from which much of this work takes place. Thus, for the purposes of this course, my goal is not to discuss counseling theories and beginning interview and counseling skills in a vacuum, but rather in terms of how school psychology practice takes place within the real world, with all that entails, including consideration of diversity and justice. My goal is not for you to view the world as I do—indeed there are greater opportunities for learning when we respectfully disagree, including student disagreement with the instructors—but rather that students emerge from this course with an enhanced understanding of how issues of cultural diversity impact and provide opportunities for enhanced school psychology practice as relates to the content areas of this course.

Course Assignments:

1. Class Participation (25%)

Attendance and participation in class are crucial for your skill development. Class time will be spent learning about context, theory, and practice through a combination of lecture, video, discussion of readings, presentations, and practice of skills. If you are unable to attend class, please let me know through a phone call or email by 8AM on the day of class. In addition, I expect everyone to come to class on time. Repeatedly coming late or leaving early will result in a significant reduction of your class participation grade and possible failure in this course if the problem persists.

As part of this course, during class meetings you will be placed in the position of leading a simulated group counseling session and of practicing several simulated individual counseling skill building exercises. While you will not be graded on your performance during these tasks, at times you may receive written feedback from myself, from the course TA, and/or from your classmates (please see appended feedback forms) and, as such, it is expected that your performance in these simulations reflect that you have read the assigned materials and have been actively participating in class discussions.

In addition, while one of the primary goals of this course is for you to further develop your direct interviewing and counseling skills, *it is equally important that you develop your skills in observing others and provide constructive feedback to those you are observing.* In order to facilitate this, when you are in the role of observer you are expected to record some brief notes using the format appended later in this syllabus and then turn in these notes to me or the course TA upon request (with your name on it and not the name of the person you were observing).

As a counselor, ethical conduct demands that you do not disclose any information to others that was provided to you by someone you are counseling except under very specific situations (e.g., danger to self, others, court order to report). The same principle applies to a course on counseling. In this course, it is likely that there will be many times when, either as part of a practice exercises or as part of a larger group discussion, individual students may describe something personal about their life. This will be said by me in class but so that there is no confusion, let me state here the following—**ALL STATEMENTS MADE IN CLASS ARE TO BE KEPT ENTIRELY CONFIDENTIAL. DO NOT REPEAT ANY PERSONAL DISCLOSURES MADE IN CLASS OUTSIDE OF THE CLASSROOM!** Not only would such disclosures be in violation of another’s rights, many of our classroom exercises and discussions will be significantly enriched if students feel able to talk about their actual experiences. If confidentiality is broken, the quality of classroom exercises and of discourse will suffer significantly. Any student found to have violated confidentiality in this manner is subject to failing this course and may well be removed from their graduate program of study.

Periodically, you may be asked to complete a daily log or another brief reflective activity indicating what you have learned from the day’s events in class, your evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the class, and personal areas you wish to develop further. The specific format for this log is appended to this syllabus but, again, do not feel confined to this structure if you have other thoughts, reactions, etc. that would be useful to record.

2. Case Conceptualization Paper (25%)

A twelve year old Appalachian Caucasian boy of very low SES status (let’s call him “James”) is referred to you by the school guidance counselor for counseling. Upon meeting James and his mother, you discover the following:

- *James states that he was sexually assaulted over the summer (it is now October) by a man who he used to work for. He has filed charges against this man (who he didn’t know previously) and the case is pending. Nobody outside of James’ immediate family knows about this,*
- *James is currently facing charges of sexual assault himself. Specifically, approximately two weeks after James was assaulted, he states that he engaged in consensual oral sex with another twelve year old boy. He states that he did not force this other boy to engage in oral sex, but when the other boy’s mother walked in during this sex act, the other boy claimed that he was forced to do this by James. The initial court hearing is scheduled for December and James is currently on probation*

- *James' mother and father separated this summer. While James' father was not present at your initial meeting, James' mother reports that this is their third separation, repeatedly curses James' father, and states that James' father is an alcoholic who has been physically abusive with her (but not her kids)*
- *James has a younger brother (age 10), who James describes as "psycho." This brother is currently in a residential school based on a history of violent behavior (e.g., fights, brought knives to school)*
- *James and his mother argue throughout the interview, with James stating that his mother gives all her attention to his brother and that she drove his father away by badgering him*
- *James comes across as extremely bright and a particularly skillful speaker and debater. He has a solid academic and behavioral history in school, but several of his current teachers report that he frequently cuts class and "mouths off" to them when he is in class. He recently was suspended from school for cursing his teacher and tells you that there are several classmates that he is itching to fight.*
- *James' hobbies include football and chess. He also tells you that he is very interested in girls but that they always blow him off because he is small (he does in fact appear slightly smaller than your typical twelve year old, but not dramatically smaller). He has many negative things to say about some of the girls in his school who have turned down his advances.*

There are few things more practical than a good theory. You are to analyze this case from the perspective of one of the theoretical orientations (e.g., psychodynamic, cognitive/behavioral, existential/humanistic, feminist, multicultural, developmental, family systems, etc.) emphasized in this course. In your analysis, describe how this case would be conceptualized and the action steps a person working from this model might take, including possible contingencies that would affect your analysis and intervention. Following this discussion of this case from one particular orientation, in a section labeled "Rebuttal From (Person Whose Perspective You Are Representing)" you are to write a rebuttal to your conceptualization based on the perspective of a famous psychology theorist (e.g., Sigmund Freud (Psychodynamic), Victor Frankl (Logotherapy), Miriam Greenspan (Feminist)). While you are free to choose any well-known theorist (anyone mentioned prominently in the main course textbook is fine, as are many others upon approval by the course instructor or TA), *it is paramount that the person you select comes from a different theoretical tradition from the approach you have taken in the first half of your paper.* Thus, if, for example, you have chosen to start by analyzing this case from a behavioral perspective, you cannot provide a rebuttal from a behaviorist such as B.F. Skinner, but rather would need to select someone from a different tradition (e.g., Carl Rogers (Humanist)).

This assignment is due on March 29 and the evaluation rubric for this assignment is appended. On March 29, we will hold an in-class "case conference," where the instructor and/or course TA will present the details of this case and you will provide your input based on your own personal perspective on the case, not necessarily the perspectives you are presenting in your paper. Your participation in the case conference

will not be formally graded, but rather will be considered as part of your class participation grade.

3. Personal Theoretical Orientation Paper (25%)

While different theoretical approaches have different levels of demonstrated efficacy within specific syndromes/problem areas, no one theoretical orientation can claim overall superiority over others since numerous theoretical approaches (including all those covered in this course), when implemented skillfully, have been shown to lead to positive outcomes. A central maxim in counseling is “counselor, know thyself.” One of the ways a counselor can know oneself is through identification of one’s personal theoretical orientation or tendencies. On April 12, you are to produce a paper in which you outline your personal theoretical orientation. You may find that you align particularly strongly with one theoretical approach or you may find that you are more eclectic. Your paper will be evaluated based on the following four questions: 1) Does your paper reflect your *own* perspective and position? (e.g., are you clearly writing about your theory and not simply describing someone else’s), 2) Do you identify and assess the key assumptions that underlie your perspective and position? (e.g., do you talk about how you arrived at your theory or do you simply state your conclusions?), 3) Do you identify and consider potential limitations/blind spots of your personal theory? and 4) Do you identify ways in which your personal theory may manifest in the school setting, including potential opportunities and challenges to implementation?

The grading rubric for this assignment is attached.

4. Group Counseling Plan (25%)

Leading school-based psychoeducational and therapeutic groups is a common and vital practice among school psychologists. Much of the success of such groups is associated with the degree of planning done ahead of time by the group’s leader. For this assignment, you are to think of a topic for a school-based therapeutic group that either you are already planning on leading during your practicum year (in the case where you have already spoken with your practicum supervisor about this) or that you would have an interest in leading (e.g., a group that you would enjoy leading at your service-learning site). You then are to devise a group proposal following the structure and content of Chapters 3-8 in Corey & Corey’s *Groups: Process and Practice* (8th ed.). Specifically, your paper should have the following outline:

- I. *Context*: Here provide some background on the type of group you will be creating, including the setting, age group, etc.
- II. *Ethical & Legal Issues* (see chapter 3 of C&C book)
- III. *Group Formation* (see chapter 4): Here provide information on the considerations and logistics prior to the first group meeting.
- IV. *Stages of a Group* (see chapters 5-8 of C&C book): Here describe your overall group plan as well as considerations for potential process elements that would support or impede the implementation of this plan.

It is anticipated that your paper, due on at the start of class on April 26 will be approximately 10-12 double-spaced pages in length. Your paper will be graded (see appended rubric) based on the comprehensiveness, clarity, and quality of your writing.

Grades:

All assignments will be graded on an A+-F scale, with a grade of A+ equaling 4.3, a grade of A equaling 4.0, a grade of A- equaling 3.7 and so forth. Final grades will be based on a weighted average of assignment scores (see course assignments for specific weights) with the final grade based on the following scale:

A= average of 3.85 or greater

A-=3.5-3.84

B+=3.15-3.49

B= 2.85-3.14

B-=2.5-2.84

Etc.

Schedule of Readings and Topics (readings, topics, and assignments subject to change at the instructor's discretion):

January 18- Introduction, Course Highlights

Counseling Theories and Microskills

January 25

Theories: Overview, Multicultural-Feminist-Social Justice Movement

Skills: Begin interviewing skills

Readings: 1) Ivey et al.- Chs. 1 & 2
2) Ivey & Ivey- Ch. 5

February 1

Theories: Approaches to Counseling: Learning from the Masters

Readings: 1) Vernon- Ch 2. The Individual Counseling Process
2) Ivey et al.- Ch. 4

February 8

Theories: Positive Psychology and Wellness Counseling; Principles of Brief Counseling

Skills: Open and Closed Questions

Readings: 1) Ivey et al.- Ch. 3
2) BP 90: Best Practices in Conducting Brief Counseling with Students
3) Ivey & Ivey- Ch. 4

February 15

Theories: Psychodynamic, Adlerian, and Jungian

Skills: Encouraging/Paraphrasing, Summarizing, First Panel Presentations

Readings: 1) Ivey et al.- Chs. 5, 6
2) Ivey & Ivey- Ch. 6, 7

Feb 22- No Class- NASP

March 1

Theories: Cognitive/Behavioral, Rational-Emotive

Skills: Reflection of Feelings, Second Panel Presentations

Readings: 1) Ivey et al.- Chs, 7, 8
2) Ivey & Ivey- Ch. 8

March 8- No Class-Spring Break

March 15

Theories: Existential/Humanistic, Logotherapy, Gestalt

Skills: Five Stage Interview, Third Panel Presentations

Readings: Ivey et al.- Chs. 8, 9

March 22

Theories: Feminist and Multicultural Models

Skills: Continue Five Stage Interview

Readings: Ivey et al.- Chs. 11, 12

March 29

Theories: Developmental Counseling, Family Counseling

Skills: Interviewing from a Developmental Framework, Case Conference

Readings: Ivey et al.- Chs. 13-15

Case conceptualization papers due

Group Counseling/Working in Groups

April 5- Introduction to Group Work

Readings: 1) Crespi, T. (2009). Group counseling in the schools: Legal, ethical and treatment issues in school practice. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46(3), 273-280.

2) BP 94: Best Practices in Group Counseling

3) Corey & Corey- Chs. 1, 9 and 10

April 12- Personal Development/Awareness as a Group Leader

Guest Speaker: Carolyn Mildner, Clinical Assistant Professor, Counseling Psychology, Loyola University Chicago

Readings: Yalom, Chapters 6-7

Personal Theoretical Orientation papers due

April 19- Student-Led Groups

April 26- Student-Led Groups

Group Plan Paper Due

May 3- Class Wrap-Up

Rubric for Case Conceptualization Paper

CPSY 423- Spring 2011

- A= Clear distinction made between the two perspectives presented
- Perspectives taken and intervention steps described fully consistent with theoretical model you are describing
- Case conceptualization and intervention steps described at a level of detail that makes it clear that you have thought through case from start to end, including possible contingencies that might impede progress and/or cause you to change course
- Writing is clear, concise
- A-= Distinctions between perspectives blurry at times
- Perspectives taken and intervention steps described at times not fully consistent with model you are describing
- Case conceptualization, contingency analysis, and intervention steps described mildly incomplete (e.g., you describe first steps in great depth, but then offer little on how you would evaluate progress)
- Writing unclear at times, ideas not fully thought through
- B+= Distinctions between perspectives blurry at several points
- Perspectives taken and intervention steps described often not fully consistent with model you are describing
- Case conceptualization, contingency analysis and intervention steps described moderately incomplete (e.g., cover all but with little detail)
- One or more sections have very unclear writing, ideas vague or not expressed well
- B or lower: Distinctions between perspectives consistently blurry
- Frequently describe perspectives/interventions inconsistent with the model you are describing
- Case conceptualization, contingency analysis, and intervention steps missing or lacking sufficient detail in significant portions
- Writing and ideas consistently unclear

While it is the quality of your thoughts that I am evaluating (as opposed to the appropriate use of grammar, syntax, etc.), I reserve the right to reduce your grade due to things such as a preponderance of typos and/or particularly unclear writing. It is my recommendation that for a conceptualization paper such as this you spend a fair amount of time thinking through and outlining what you want to say *before* you start writing. If you are clear in your thoughts, the writing will follow, but if you are not clear in how the two perspectives you selected differ from each other and how you would conceptualize and implement interventions from start to finish using the models you selected, this will very likely be reflected in unclear writing.

CPSY 423- Spring 2011
Instructor: David Shriberg

Student:

Grading Rubric for “Your Own Counseling Theory” Assignment

The ratings below are based on a 10 point scale with a score of 1 indicating “scant evidence” and a score of 10 indicating “substantially developed.”

Rating	Dimension
	Does your paper reflect your <i>own</i> perspective and position? (e.g., are you clearly writing about your theory and not simply describing someone else’s)
	Do you identify and assess the key assumptions that underlie your perspective and position? (e.g., do you do you talk about how you arrived at your theory or do you simply state your conclusions?)
	Do you identify and consider potential limitations/blind spots of your personal theory?
	Do you identify ways in which your personal theory may manifest in the school setting, including potential opportunities and challenges to implementation?

Total Grade:

Comments:

Grading Rubric and Feedback for Group Counseling Plan
 CPSY 423- Spring 2011
 Instructor- David Shriberg

Student Name:

<i>Context</i>				
Comprehensiveness	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Clarity	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Quality	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Context Overall	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
<i>Ethical & Legal Issues</i>				
Comprehensiveness	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Clarity	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Quality	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
E&L Issues Overall	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
<i>Group Formation</i>				
Comprehensiveness	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Clarity	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Quality	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Group Form Overall				
<i>Group Plan</i>				
Comprehensiveness	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Clarity	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Quality	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Group Plan Overall	Outstanding	Very Good	Adequate	Inadequate

Total Grade:

Comments:

CPSY 423-In-Class Groups Spring 2011

For Group Members:

Name:

Date:

Group Topic:

Group Leader #1:

1. Something the group leader did particularly well was.....

2. An area for improvement is...

Group Leader #2:

1. Something the group leader did particularly well was.....

2. An area for improvement is...

CPSY 423-In-Class Groups Spring 2011

For Observers:

Name:

Date:

Group Topic:

Group Leader #1:

Counseling Skills (e.g., empathy, genuineness, reflective listening, appropriate clarifying/challenging):

Confidence:

Organization/Coherence:

Strength:

Weakness:

Group Leader #2:

Counseling Skills (e.g., empathy, genuineness, reflective listening, appropriate clarifying/challenging):

Confidence:

Organization/Coherence:

Strength:

Weakness:

**Interviewer/Interviewee Feedback Form: Microskill Practice Sessions
CPSY 423- Spring 2011**

Name of Interviewer:

Date of Observation:

1) Interviewer's strength:

2) Most effective moment in interview:

3) A moment where interviewer could have been stronger was (describe reason)...

Daily Log-CPSY 423 Spring 2011

Name:

Date:

1. Some things that worked well in class today were.....
2. Some things that did not work as well in class today were...
3. Some suggestions I have for the next class are...
4. Some activities, ideas, etc. that made an impact on me today were...
5. Some things that surprised me about myself today were...
6. After today, I feel that I am on solid footing with...
7. Some things that I need further work on are...
8. At this point, I would describe my theoretical orientation as...
9. Other comments/thoughts...