

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY THERAPY

Clinical Portfolio Evaluation of Written Component

Student name _____

Faculty reviewer _____ Date _____

Overall Outcome: Pass or In Progress (circle one)

The Clinical Portfolio is considered a capstone experience assessing the student learning outcome associated with advanced systemic/relational theory and ethical/professional clinical practice. Similar to a doctoral qualifying exam, the Clinical Portfolio is an important benchmark in progressing towards candidacy. In order to successfully pass the entire Clinical Portfolio, students must pass BOTH the written and the presentation components. If either component is scored as In Progress, students must sign-up for Clinical Portfolio the following term.

In the Written Component, students are assessed on their ability to communicate their ideas in writing as is customary in professional/academic arenas. The Clinical Portfolio Written Component is assessed on a total of 10 criteria, each of which is given a score of "P" (Pass) or "IP" (In Progress). **To receive an Overall Outcome of Pass from a faculty reviewer, students must earn a P on seven out of 10 criteria. It is especially important to address #9 (ethics, professionalism, statutes, policies and regulations in the MFT field).**

Criteria 2, 3, and 4 are divided into five subcategories, each of which addresses a specific component of the criterion as a whole. Each subcategory is given a P when there are fewer than three errors of this type noted throughout the paper. When three or more errors on a particular subcategory are present in a paper, that subcategory is given an IP. The assessment of criteria 2, 3, and 4 is determined by the number of P's and IP's given to the subcategories within them: **a P is given when there are fewer than three IPs in the subcategories; an IP is given when there are three or more IP's in the subcategories.**

In order to pass the Written Component, students must receive an Overall Outcome of Pass from two out of three faculty reviewers. If a student does not pass the Written Component, they must sign-up for Clinical Portfolio again the following term. The student will have the same faculty reviewers the following term, and they should discuss their evaluation feedback with the faculty before resubmitting the paper. If a student passes the Written Component, they must make the recommended edits and submit a revised, final copy to their faculty reviewers, Program Coordinator, and Director of Doctoral Programs prior to the start of the next term. **If a student does not turn in their final copy prior before the following term, a hold will be placed on their registration until this is completed.**

_____ 1. **Adherence to minimum and maximum page limits** (18-25 pages not including title page, abstract, and reference list).

_____ 2. **Writing skills:**

_____ Introduction explaining the purpose of the paper and conclusion at the end of the paper.

- _____ Grammatically correct and well-formed sentences (e.g., parallel construction, appropriate placement of modifiers).
- _____ Correct use of punctuation.
- _____ Accurate spelling and word choice.
- _____ Well-formed paragraphs and sections (coherent idea development across sentences within paragraphs and across paragraphs).

_____ **3. Adherence to APA 7th edition conventions:**

- _____ Title page, level headings, page numbers.
- _____ Appropriate formatting (e.g., font style and size, 1 inch margins on all sides, one space after end of sentence, double line spacing, paragraph indented .5 inch).
- _____ Appropriate within text citations (in the main body of the paper) and minimal use of direct quotations (no more than one direct quote per page).
- _____ Reference list construction and citations in main body of paper correspond to sources in reference list.
- _____ Non-sexist and non-ethically biased language.

_____ **4. Model(s) and/or theory(ies):**

- _____ Personal Philosophy of Treatment reflects either a well-grounded theoretical orientation or a unique/original synthesis of more than one.
- _____ Theoretical orientation is grounded in a systemic paradigm (e.g., cybernetic, social constructionism, natural systems).
- _____ Model(s) and/or theory(ies) is clearly articulated and accurately described in the Philosophy of Treatment.
- _____ Philosophy of Treatment is influenced by systemic/relational concepts.
- _____ Student's clinical work is a reflection of the Philosophy of Treatment and is supported in the Case Study.

_____ **5.** Student accurately references appropriate sources to support claims/assertions in both the Philosophy of Treatment and Case Study. A minimum of six sources are required with a significant number being from primary sources from the model/theory developer(s).

_____ **6.** Student demonstrates a clear and well-articulated understanding of self/person-of-the-therapist influences on their clinical presence and work with clients in the Philosophy of Treatment and Case Study.

_____ **7.** Issues related to diversity, culture and inclusion are addressed in the Philosophy of Treatment as it relates to the student's personal background, and how this plays a role in therapy as demonstrated in the Case Study.

_____ **8.** Student clearly and accurately describes a well-grounded understanding of the presenting problem within a systemic context as it applies to the Case Study (i.e., explanation of the etiology of the presenting issue(s) to be addressed in therapy).

_____ **9.** Student clearly and accurately demonstrates rationales for interventions related to treatment goals as it applies to the Case Study (i.e., explanation of therapeutic choices on the actions, activities, and interventions you made that focused on improving/resolving the problems).

_____ **10.** Student demonstrates a clear and well-articulated grasp of all aspects of therapy that involve ethics, professionalism, statutes, policies and regulations in the MFT field in the Philosophy of Treatment. This is evidenced by providing a clinical example of an ethical decision made, and how the student applied these ideas in a systemic/relational way in the Case Study.

COMMENTS: _____

Faculty reviewer signature _____ **Date** _____

Program director signature _____ **Date** _____

(Note: The program director's signature denotes receipt of the evaluation, only.)

Updated 01/2021