

Consultation-Collaboration Scenario Rubric

	Excellent (3 pts.)	Above Average (2 pts.)	Average (1 pts.)	Below Average (0 pts.)
The type of collaborative support needed to best meet student and teacher needs is fully explained(i.e., direct, indirect), along with a rationale for the choice made	The proposal is insightful, demonstrating the author's in-depth understanding of types of collaborative support discussed in the class; the rationale is well explained and very thorough	The proposal is somewhat insightful, demonstrating the author's correct understanding of types of collaborative support discussed in the class; the rationale is quite thorough and in depth	The proposal provides some insight and demonstrates the author's level of understanding of types of collaborative support discussed in the class; the rationale is of acceptable detail	The proposal provides little insight or demonstration of the author's level of understanding of collaborative support types discussed in the class; the rationale is unacceptable or missing
The model of collaborative consultation proposed for the scenario is fully explained	The model of collaborative consultation demonstrates the author's in-depth understanding of collaborative consultation models discussed in the class; the writing demonstrates the author's thorough analysis of the scenario	The model of collaborative consultation demonstrates the author's acceptable understanding of collaborative consultation models discussed in the class; the writing demonstrates the author's analysis of the scenario	The model of collaborative consultation demonstrates the author's somewhat limited understanding of collaborative consultation models discussed in the class; the writing somewhat demonstrates the author's analysis of the scenario	The model of collaborative consultation does not demonstrate a clear understanding of collaborative consultation models discussed in class or is missing
Description of the team "players" (i.e., who will be part of the team formed to best meet the student needs?)	The proposal clearly describes all potential team players needed to best meet the needs of the scenario's student, indicating a thoughtful, in-depth analysis of the problematic situation	The proposal describes all potential team players needed to best meet the needs of the scenario's student, indicating a thoughtful analysis of the problematic situation	The proposal describes some but not all potential team players needed meet the needs of the scenario's student, indicating a, acceptable analysis of the problematic situation	The description of the team players in the proposal lacks depth, specificity, or understanding of the situation described in the scenario

Description of projected difficulties that may arise resulting from the proposed solution to the situation in the scenario.	The proposal indicates the author's higher order thinking in the description of potential problems relating to the proposal; this segment is clearly and written and thoroughly explanatory	The proposal indicates the author's thinking in the description of potential problems relating to the proposal; this segment is quite clearly written and explanatory	The author's thought process regarding the potential difficulties in the proposal is apparent and acceptably written	The description of potential difficulties resulting from the proposal was not included, incomplete, and/or poorly written
Proposal is supported with timely and corrected formatted references, both in the paper and at the end; submission completed in APA (6th ed.) style with a minimum of three pages; it is professionally done with an absence of spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.	The proposal was well supported with topical citations; there was no more than one grammatical, spelling, or punctuation error in the submission; there was consistent and correct formatting completed in APA (6 th ed.) style.	The proposal was adequately supported with topical citations; there were minimal (2 or 3) grammatical, spelling, punctuation, and/or APA formatting errors in the submission.	The proposal had some citations but others were missing or incorrectly done; there were a few (4 or 5) grammatical, spelling, punctuation, and/or APA formatting errors in the submission.	Citations within the proposal were inadequate; there were numerous (6 or 7) grammatical, spelling, punctuation, and/or APA formatting errors in the submission.

Total Points:

14 – 15 pts. A
13 pts. B
12 pts. C
11 and below F