**Descriptions of Required Case Studies to be completed during Internship
with Scoring Rubrics**

I.   Comprehensive Case Study

Psychoeducational Assessment with Standardized Measures

What you need to provide: Report of comprehensive psychoeducational evaluation
Multidisciplinary Conference (MDC) eligibility decision paperwork

For this case study, you will need to provide a final report for a "traditional" psychoeducational assessment that you completed. In other words, this report should be based on standardized assessment methods. You must assess and integrate data from the following domains: academic, cognitive, social/emotional; other domains are optional and should be dictated by the student with whom you work. Data collected must include information from the cumulative folder, student, teachers, and parents.

The report you provide should be the one on which your internship supervisor has signed off. The report will be treated as confidential, but also be sure to redact any identifying information. You will have an opportunity to comment on the report in the narrative that must accompany the report. The narrative will allow you to comment on the process that led to your product, that is, the report. *You should have a narrative for each of the 9 sections listed below. A narrative IS NOT copying and pasting parts of your report into the case study document!* The narrative is where you think about what you did and comment on it. At the most basic level, you should comment on what you liked about what you did or whether you would do it differently as a practitioner, BUT this should not be the only comment you make. The narrative allows for reflection about the process as a whole.

Your narrative should address the following:
1. Organization of the Report:
Most reports have the following sections:
   a. Organizational letterhead
   b. Descriptive/demographic information
   c. Reason for referral
   d. Background information
   e. Tests selected
   f. Test observations
   g. Test results and interpretation
   h. Summary, implications, and recommendations

School districts and cooperatives may differ in their expectations concerning the organization of reports. If your report strays from the typical format, comment on how the content listed above is addressed. For example, if the tests selected are incorporated in the body of the test results and interpretation section, say so. If an appendix is used to list previous and current test results, state this. You also may comment on the strengths and weaknesses that you find in the particular format used at your site.

2. Referral Question(s)/Problem(s):
The referral question(s) or problem(s) form the basis for conceptualizing the case and guide the assessment. Again, some sites like these to be stated as questions, others use this section to explain why the evaluation is being conducted. In either case, the reason for referral becomes your initial working hypothesis (or hypotheses). If your working hypothesis(es) are not clear from your report, explain them here.

3. Background Information:
This section should include all relevant data: cultural background, family, birth and developmental issues when relevant, education, academic performance, onset of difficulty, and prior intervention. Also, any health issues, physical disabilities, medications, family health history, should be included when relevant.

4. Choice of Assessment Measures: These should be tailored to the referral question and to the student, to the extent that is possible. Where there are constraints on the choice of instruments, explain. Use the latest versions of the instrument. Use measures such as interviews, tests, rating scales, direct observation, review of records, etc. When possible, interview the child, the parents, teachers, or other informants.

5. Linking Data to Inferences:
The inferences need to be valid representations of the assessment data. Only make those inferences for which the assessment or test is valid. The link between the data collected, inferences, conclusions, and recommendations should be clear. The content of the assessment report should answer the referral question, provide a clear understanding of the strengths, deficits, interests, and general functioning of the student, and distinguish between aspects of the individual that appear to be certain from those that are questionable. The report should also provide alternative explanations for the findings, where relevant. Rather than provide all the data in detail, summarize what the data indicate with respect to the referral problem/initial hypothesis. The conceptualization should include an ecological perspective. In particular, the report should explicitly consider contextual factors that affect the individual, including cultural and linguistic factors. Explain the connection between the referral problem and contextual factors.

6. Language:
Avoid colloquial expressions (e.g., mom), jargon, and pejorative or judgmental language. Write clearly and in language that all can understand (teachers, parents, etc.). Write in specifics rather than in overly broad generalizations. If a diagnostic category is used (e.g., attention deficit hyperactivity disorder), describe specifically what behaviors are relevant for this case.

7. Summary and Recommendations:
Summarize the important findings and provide recommendations. Recommendations should be linked to assessment data, background information, and contextual factors, such as cultural and linguistic factors. Recommendations should take into consideration empirically-supported strategies. Recommendations should be both practical and specific. In addition, recommendations should build upon the student's strengths and/or interests, as well as his/her difficulties and also the opportunities and constraints in the student's environment.

8. Ethical and Legal Issues:
Indicate how you abided by relevant NASP ethical standards in conducting the assessment and reporting the results. Cite the specific standards. Using the MDC Eligibility Conference paperwork, indicate how you abided by relevant state and national laws or regulations. Cite the specific laws or regulations.

9. Comment on Information Technology:
Summarize what information technologies you used during the assessment (e.g., computer scoring program), analyzing the data (e.g., graphing of data), or writing the report (e.g., digital databases to find research articles or intervention strategies).

Evaluation of Case Study
Each of the nine (9) "sections" outlined above will be considered when evaluating the comprehensive psychoeducational case study. The following ratings will be used to indicate the quality of the comprehensive psychoeducational report and accompanying narrative:

3 = Pass: Student demonstrates mastery, requiring little or no additional supervision.

2 = Minimal Pass: Meets expectations for level of training; it is understood that continued practice and supervision are required.

1 = Needs Improvement: Does not meet expectations for level of training; the student needs much more practice and supervision. Remediation will be discussed with the student and his/her internship supervisor.

If the student obtains a score of 18 across all areas, s/he earns an overall passing score for the case study.

NASP Domains Addressed:
1 Data-Based Decision-Making and Accountability
3 Interventions and Instructional Support
8 Diversity in Development and Learning
10 Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice

II. Consultation Case Study

Consultation Case

What you will need to provide: Behavioral consultation report
                                  Supporting documents

For this case study, you will need to provide documentation of a behavioral consultation case study. This case could be an informal consultation or a more formal consultation case that has been referred for a functional behavior analysis. Your report will be evaluated on the four-step problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention, and Problem Evaluation.

The report must address each of these areas and meet the criteria specified on the attached rubric. Note that this rubric titled "National Association of School Psychologists Report on Case Study Evaluation" is one requirement for individuals seeking the Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) credential, who have not graduated from an approved program.

Again, this is a report that should be ready for your current internship site supervisor's signature. The report will be treated as confidential, but be sure to redact any identifying information.

1. District/cooperative Orientation to Behavioral Consultation Cases
School districts and cooperatives may have different philosophies and approaches regarding the implementation of behavioral supports for students. In your narrative, briefly state your district or cooperative's orientation to the implementation of positive behavioral supports. This would also be the place to outline the district or cooperative's Tier I/universal screening/benchmarking procedures, if they exist. Also, state the district or cooperative's pre-referral intervention process and how behavioral consultation fits within this framework. Depending on your school district, this may include Positive Behavioral Intervention Support (PBIS) or other systematic behavior supports for students.

2. Referral Question(s)/Problem(s)
The referral question(s) or problem(s) form the basis for the reason you are working with a student. The reason for referral also guides the problem solving process. The basic questions are: Why are you working with this student? What is your goal in working with this student?

3. Background information
This section should include all **relevant** data: cultural background, family, birth and developmental issues when relevant, education, academic performance, onset of difficulty, and prior intervention. Also, any health issues, physical disabilities, medications, family health history, should be included when relevant. Data could include information from the cumulative folder, student, teachers, and parents. Note we discussed this in class as distal antecedents during the interview process. For this report, you would want to verify the distal antecedents if you thought there were any that are directly impacting the identified concern.

4. Problem Identification
You need to address how the problem is operationalized. Provide support for your operational definition from both the consultation with the teacher and behavioral observations. The operational definition should be objective, clear, and complete. The problem identification discussion needs to consider the components from the NCSP problem-solving rubric provided in PSY 591 (Behavioral Consultation).

5. Problem Analysis
You need to address your analysis of the behavior. Provide support for your analysis from both the consultation with the teacher and behavioral observations. What is the function of this behavior? The problem analysis discussion needs to consider the components from the NCSP problem-solving rubric provided in PSY 591 (Behavioral Consultation).

6. Intervention
You need to clearly state how your intervention is tied to the identified problem and the analysis of this problem. How does your intervention address the function of the behavior? Make sure you clearly articulate how this intervention is evidence based. Discuss information about this intervention that supports it is evidence based. The intervention discussion needs to consider the components from the NCSP problem-solving rubric provided in PSY 591 (Behavioral Consultation).

7. Problem Evaluation
You need to clearly explain whether the data collected shows that the problem behavior was addressed. You need to address generalization of change or transfer of training. The problem evaluation discussion needs to consider the components from the NCSP problem-solving rubric provided in PSY 591 (Behavioral Consultation).

8. Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS)
You need to develop a goal attainment scale that clearly shows the behavior was addressed and the level of success achieved. Think about whether this goal was appropriate for the student given the current concerns and environment. The GAS could be part of the report to turn into the school or it could be a separate document for this analysis. You need to report how this scale was developed and what rating the student would receive. The rating should be clearly marked on the final GAS turned in with the report.

9. Ethical and Legal Issues:
Indicate how you abided by relevant NASP ethical standards in conducting the assessment and reporting the results. Cite the specific standards. Indicate how you abided by relevant state and national laws or regulations. Cite the specific laws or regulations.

10. Comment on Information Technology:
Summarize what information technologies you used during the assessment (e.g., computer scoring program), analyzing the data (e.g., graphing of data), or writing the report (e.g., digital databases to find research articles or intervention strategies).

Evaluation of Case Study
Each of the ten "sections" outlined above will be considered when evaluating the behavioral consultation case study. The following ratings will be used to indicate the quality of the behavioral consultation case study and accompanying narrative:

3 = Pass: Student demonstrates mastery, requiring little or no additional supervision.

2 = Minimal Pass: Meets expectations for level of training; it is understood that continued practice and supervision are required.

1 = Needs Improvement: Does not meet expectations for level of training; the student needs much more practice and supervision. Remediation will be discussed with the student and his/her internship supervisor.

If the student obtains a score of 20 across all areas, s/he earns an overall passing score for the case study.

NASP Domains Addressed
1 Data-Based Decision-Making and Accountability
2 Consultation and Collaboration
4 Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills
7 Family-School Collaboration Services
8 Diversity in Development and Learning
9 Research and Program Evaluation
10 Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

NATIONALLY CERTIFIED SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST (NCSP)

REPORT ON CASE STUDY EVALUATION

Section 1: <u>Problem Identification</u>

	Very Effective	**Effective**	**Needs Development/ Lacks Documentation**
1.1	☐ The student's behavior is defined in the context of appropriate grade and/or peer expectations (e.g., local norms).	☐ The student's behavior is operationally defined.	☐ The student's behavior is identified but not operationally defined.
1.2		☐ The problem is collaboratively defined.	☐ The problem is not collaboratively defined.
1.3	☐ The discrepancy between current and desired level of performance is explained.	☐ The behavior is operationally defined or quantified in terms of both current and desired levels of performance.	☐ The behavior is not operationally defined in terms of both current and desired levels of performance.
1.4	☐ Baseline includes the student's behavior and peer/grade norms and expectations with computed trend lines.	☐ A baseline for the student behavior is established using sufficient data.	☐ A baseline for the student's behavior is not established or has insufficient data.
1.5		☐ The student's behavior is identified as a skill and/or performance deficit.	☐ The student's behavior is not identified as a skill and/or performance deficit.
1.6		☐ Parents/guardians and teachers are involved in the problem-identification process.	☐ Parents/guardians and teachers are not involved in the problem-identification process.
RATING	☐ **Very Effective**	☐ **Effective**	☐ **Needs Development/ Lacks Documentation**

Comments:

Section 2: <u>Problem Analysis</u>

	Very Effective	**Effective**	**Needs Development/ Lacks Documentation**
2.1	☐ Hypotheses are generated through collaboration with teacher and/or parent.	☐ One or more hypotheses are developed to identify the functions that the behavior serves and/or the conditions under which the behavior is occurring or has developed in two or more of the following areas: child factors, curriculum, peers, teacher, classroom, and/or home.	☐ Hypotheses are not developed, hypotheses are developed in only one area and/or hypotheses are not measurable.
2.2	☐ There are multiple sources of data that converge on each proposed hypothesis.	☐ There is evidence that appropriate data are collected to confirm or reject the proposed hypotheses. Appropriate data include one or more of the following: record review, interview, observation, testing, and self-report.	☐ Appropriate data are not collected to confirm or reject the hypotheses.
2.3		☐ Hypotheses reflect an awareness of issues of diversity (e.g., physical, social, linguistic, cultural).	☐ Hypotheses do not reflect an awareness of issues related to diversity (e.g., physical, social, linguistic, cultural).
RATING	☐ **Very Effective**	☐ **Effective**	☐ **Needs Development/ Lacks Documentation**

Comments:

Section 3: <u>Intervention</u>

	Effective	**Needs Development/ Lacks Documentation**
3.1	☐ Intervention is linked to observable, measurable goal statement(s).	☐ Intervention is not linked to observable, measurable goal statement(s).
3.2	☐ Intervention(s) selection is based on data from problem analysis and hypothesis testing.	☐ Intervention(s) selection is not based on data from problem analysis and hypothesis testing.
3.3	☐ Intervention(s) is evidence-based (e.g., research literature, functional analysis, single case design analysis).	☐ Intervention(s) is not evidence-based (e.g., research literature, functional analysis, single case design analysis).
3.4	☐ Intervention(s) is developed collaboratively.	☐ Intervention(s) is not developed collaboratively.
3.5	☐ Intervention(s) reflects sensitivity to individual differences, resources, classroom practices, and other system issues. Acceptability of intervention is verified.	☐ Intervention(s) does not reflect sensitivity to individual differences, resources, classroom practices, and other system issues. Acceptability of intervention is not verified.
3.6	☐ Logistics of setting, time, resources and personnel are included in the intervention plan.	☐ Logistics of setting, time, resources and personnel are not included in the intervention plan.
3.7	☐ Intervention selection considers unintended outcomes or limitations.	☐ Intervention selection does not consider unintended outcomes or limitations.
3.8	☐ Intervention is monitored and data are provided to ensure that it is implemented as designed.	☐ Treatment integrity is not monitored.
RATING	☐ **Effective**	☐ **Needs Development/ Lacks Documentation**

Comments:

Section 4: <u>Evaluation</u>

	Very Effective	**Effective**	**Needs Development/ Lacks Documentation**
4.1	☐ Charting includes student performance trend lines, and/or goal lines.	☐ Progress monitoring data are demonstrated on a chart.	☐ Progress monitoring data are not demonstrated on a chart.
4.2	☐ Progress monitoring data are demonstrated to be effective when compared to data generated from multiple sources/settings.	☐ Progress monitoring data are demonstrated to be effective when compared to baseline data.	☐ Intervention is not demonstrated to be effective through data comparison.
4.3	☐ Response to intervention data are used to inform problem solving and decision making. Single case design was specified (e.g., changing criterion, parametric, component analysis, multiple baseline, alternating treatment).	☐ Data are used to inform further problem solving and decision making (i.e., continuation of intervention, modification of intervention, and maintenance of intervention).	☐ Data are not used to inform further problem solving and decision making.
4.4	☐ Strategies for transfer/generalizing outcomes to other settings are documented as effective.	☐ Strategies for transfer/generalizing outcomes to other settings are addressed.	☐ Strategies for transfer/generalizing outcomes to other settings are not addressed.
4.5	☐ Modifications for future interventions are considered based upon collaborative examination of effectiveness data.	☐ Effectiveness of intervention is shared through collaboration with parents, teachers, and other personnel.	☐ Effectiveness of intervention is not shared or communicated.
4.6	☐ Strategies for follow-up are developed and implemented.	☐ Suggestions for follow-up are developed (e.g., continued progress monitoring, transition planning).	☐ Suggestions for follow-up are not developed.
RATING	☐ **Very Effective**	☐ **Effective**	☐ **Needs Development/ Lacks Documentation**

Comments:

III.   Counseling Case Study

What you need to provide: Signed permission form
Copies of Weekly Progress Notes
Formal Case Summary
Narrative with appropriate appendices

Although the documents you provide will be treated as confidential, please sure to redact any identifying information.

Case Management
This section is primarily providing documentation for permission to provide counseling services, weekly progress, and the final summary report. The case summary report will include information required for the Treatment Planning section of the rubric, and the Weekly Case Notes should include the required information from the Direct Services section of the rubric.

Treatment Planning
Referral Question / Description of Problem: Use the referral question or problem as a basis for conceptualizing the case. Provide a clear description of who the referring party is and the nature of the problem in specific, behavioral, measurable terms.

Background and Context
Describe relevant ecological context, including (a) relevant behavior setting (e.g., number of people, stressors, types of activities, demands, etc.), (b) antecedents to problem(s), (c) consequential events, (d) the conditions under which the problem does the problem not occur, (e) interpersonal or group process variables, (e) cultural or linguistic factors, (f) system factors (e.g., family or school) that might affect the case, and (g) developmental factors. Be sure to address any previous attempts to resolve the problem or factors that might be maintaining it.

Goals: As a formal part of the planning process specific goals should be developed in collaboration with the student. Goals should also be derived based on pre-test data and therefore measurable.

Students should prepare a Goal Attainment Scale for this counseling case based on the pre-test data or in light of reason for referral and should record this information in the outcome section of the case summary or narrative with consideration for what the data mean (see Outcomes section below).

Direct Services
A description and justification for your theoretical approach to this case (e.g., cognitive-behavioral), and a clear description, documentation, and justification of the counseling strategies should be described. The justification should be based on three factors: (a) a review of the research on relevant counseling strategies, (b) a broad-based understanding of the problem and hypothesized function, and (c) relevant ecological factors, such as the student's strengths and

interests, relevant sociocultural aspects of the case, and the systems (e.g., school and / or family) context.

> Appendix A--Reference List of Articles Reviewed for Counseling Strategies
> At the end of the case report, provide a list of references (APA format) that provide empirical support for one or more of the counseling strategies.

Outcomes
The evaluation part of the report shall include a detailed description of the extent to which the counseling strategies were implemented as planned. Provide a summary of counseling outcomes with respect to (a) goals, (b) the student's reactions to counseling (i.e., this may also include student satisfaction survey data), and (c) related effects. Based on the available data, determine to what extent any changes might be attributable to the counseling. Describe how and why the counseling plan will be modified as a result of the evaluation. In the Appendix of the report, there should be a clearly labeled graph (see APA publication guidelines) that appropriately compares pre-counseling and post-counseling data with respect to counseling goals. Please be sure to include your Goal Attainment Scale with descriptors and with the outcome rating clearly noted.

Ethical and Legal Issues
In Appendix B indicate how you abided by relevant NASP ethical standards in providing counseling services. Cite the specific standards.

Self-Evaluation of Counseling Process Issues
In a separate document provide a description and critique of the process issues in this case, including to what extent you:
- established a mutually rewarding and collaborative process (i.e., built rapport);
- attended to nonverbal/paralinguistic cues
- used active listening and expressed empathy;
- maintained appropriate boundaries with client;
- summarized the important points;
- conducted the meetings at an appropriate tempo;
- avoided speaking too much or too little;
- handled termination

Provide brief examples of the strengths and weaknesses of your counseling behavior.

Intern Individual Counseling Rubric

	Needs Improvement 1	Satisfactory 2	Exceptional 3
Case Management			
Obtained written permission for counseling—documentation to be provided			

Completed weekly case notes (must be at least 10 sessions)—to be included			
Completed formal case summary—to be included			
Treatment Planning			
Reason for referral stated in observable and measurable terms			
Background and context of problem coherently described			
Considered cultural diversity in conceptualization of problem			
Goals/focus clearly stated and consistent with theoretical framework			
Direct Services			
Description, justification for counseling strategies			
Considered cultural diversity in selection and implementation of counseling interventions			
Documentation of empirical support for intervention/strategies—in Appendix			
Outcomes			
Measured effectiveness of counseling intervention--GAS			
Measured effectiveness of counseling intervention with pre- and posttest measures data to be included			
Measured student satisfaction with counseling sessions-data to be included			
Ethical and Legal Issues			
Statement on how you abided by NASP ethical standards in relation to case—in Appendix			
Self-Evaluation of Counseling Process			

NOTE:

Needs Improvement: Element is either not present, not fully described, or does not represent good professional practice.
Satisfactory: Element is adequately described and represents good professional practice.
Exceptional: Element is very well described and represents outstanding professional practice.

If the student obtains a score of 12 across the six broad areas, s/he earns an overall passing score for the case study. Students earning a rating of 1 "Needs Improvement" for any specific item, may need to remediate this item in order to pass the case study.

IV. Response-to-Intervention Academic Case Study:

Data-based Decision-Making Option

You will identify a person at your internship site that is responsible for a part of the RtI process (e.g., collecting RtI data, implementing interventions, making data-based decisions at team meetings). This person may be a **Title 1 teacher**, an **Interventionist**, or even the **school psychologist**. You will meet with this person to observe the *entire* RtI process. It may be helpful to think of the process as occurring at 3 levels: Systems level, Group level, and Individual level. Your case study involves four major components.

1. **Report on the RtI process used at your internship site. Here are some possible questions that you might ask. Do not limit yourself to these – it is expected that there will be significant variability in case studies, based on site differences.**
   - How are students referred?
   - What happens to referrals once they are made?
   - Are there set criteria that teachers are aware of for PST referrals?
   - What is the problem-solving process?
     - Who determines what the problem is?
     - How is the intervention selected?
     - Who implements it?
   - How does the interventionist coordinate services with teachers?
   - How and when are the data shared, and with whom are they shared?
   - What interventions are used regularly?
   - Are there established groups according to academic targets (e.g., reading fluency)
   - What criteria are used for determining change in intervention services?
   - What kinds of changes are typical?
   - Are there certain exit criteria? If so, what are they?
   - What percentage of students responds to intervention and do not get referred for SPED?
2. **Observe at least 3 intervention sessions. Describe your observations.**
   - Student (no identifying information)
   - Pull-out process
   - Characteristics of session (time of day, # times per week, group or individual, etc.)
   - Targeted skill
   - Intervention (what is it?)
3. **Data: There are 3 options for the kind of data that can be included in this project: systems level, group level, or individual level.**
   - Include your choice of data in this project (e.g., graph)
   - Discuss the data in terms of data-based decision-making
   - What is the student's/group/system's goal?
   - How was goal determined?
   - How long has student/group/system received intervention?
   - Has the student/group/system made progress?
   - Have there been any changes in intervention?
   - Has the interventionist (or team) made any decisions in terms of exiting intervention or SPED referral?

4. **Goal attainment scaling (GAS)**
   - Based on what you have learned about your school's RtI system, develop a goal attainment scaling (GAS) table that captures what the goals are at the level you have chosen to describe in this project: system, group, or individual
   - Be certain to list the name of the assessment tool that is used in your district (e.g., AIMSweb)
   - For systems level, the GAS should be similar to this table:

Much less than expected	-2	70% of students achieving at or above the 25th percentile
Somewhat less than expected	-1	75% of students achieving at or above the 25th percentile
Expected level of outcome	0	80% of students achieving at or above the 25th percentile
Somewhat more than expected	+1	85% of students achieving at or above the 25th percentile
Much more than expected	+2	90% of students achieving at or above the 25th percentile

   - For group and individual level data, the goals should be specific to the individual or group.
   - This part of the case study is essential because you must be able to document change in an individual, group, or the system. Consult carefully with your RtI personnel to develop the most appropriate GAS for your district.
5. Put on your consultation hat and make recommendations for change. Your recommendations will vary in terms of scope (systems, group, and individual) because they are site-specific. They do not need to be linked together (e.g., some may be for the system as a whole, some may be for a group you observed).
   - Develop at least **5 recommendations** that are evidence-based
     - Provide details about why you're making each recommendation
     - Provide evidence for each recommendation
   - Each recommendation should approximate a half-page, double spaced

This case study will take a significant amount of time. Plan carefully. There are no length requirements. It is estimated that, once written, the case study will be 8-12 pages, double-spaced. The format of your write up is up to you. It should be well organized, however, and the use of "white space," headers, and boldface is recommended.

Evaluation of Case Study
Each of the five (5) "sections" outlined above will be considered when evaluating the RtI case study. The following ratings will be used to indicate the quality of the RtI case study and accompanying narrative:
3 = Pass: Student demonstrates mastery, requiring little or no additional supervision.
2 = Minimal Pass: Meets expectations for level of training; it is understood that continued practice and supervision are required.

1 = Needs Improvement: Does not meet expectations for level of training; the student needs much more practice and supervision. Remediation will be discussed with the student and his/her internship supervisor.
If the student obtains a score of 8 across all areas, s/he earns an overall passing score for the case study.

NASP Domains Addressed for RtI Academic Case Study
1 Data-Based Decision-Making and Accountability
3. Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills
5 School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning
8 Diversity in Development and Learning
10 Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice