

# CASE STUDY RUBRIC

The National School Psychology Certification Board (NSPCB) of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) developed the following rubric to help guide applicants in structuring an effective case study. Additionally, the NSPCB utilizes the rubric as part of the evaluation process for NCSP candidates from graduate programs without NASP approval/accreditation.

We encourage all school psychology graduate preparation programs to disseminate the rubric among students and utilize this resource in relevant courses.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Eric Rossen, NCSP, NASP Director of Professional Development and Standards, at [erossen@naspweb.org](mailto:erossen@naspweb.org).

**The determination of an effective/needs development case study is guided by whether it is both data driven and makes logical sense, rather than how many isolated elements are found to be effective.**

**Section 1: Elements of an Effective Case Study**

	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Needs Development</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Demographics of the case are adequately described (e.g., age, type of class/school, grade, SES, disability, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/> Demographic information does not include sufficient information.
<b>1.2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment, intervention, and/or consultation practices identify and address unique individual characteristics.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment, intervention, and/or consultation practices <b>DO NOT</b> identify and address unique individual characteristics.
<b>1.3</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Collaboration with relevant stakeholders (e.g., parents, teachers, and other professionals) is evident throughout the process.	<input type="checkbox"/> Collaboration with relevant stakeholders (e.g., parents, teachers, and other professionals) is <b>NOT</b> evident throughout the process.
<b>1.4</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Steps of the problem-solving process are implemented coherently (i.e., sequential, goal directed, and flow logically based on evidence).	<input type="checkbox"/> The steps of the problem-solving process are not followed.
<b>1.5</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional practices of writing style, formatting, and graphing are present in the case study (i.e., clear succinct and well written text with clearly labeled graphs).	<input type="checkbox"/> Errors in writing convention, style, and graphing interfere with readability and interpretation of data.
<b>1.6</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Personal identifying information of the case study subject is redacted from the report.	<input type="checkbox"/> Personal identifying information is not sufficiently redacted from the report.
<b>RATING</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>EFFECTIVE</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>NEEDS DEVELOPMENT</b>

**Comments:**

## Section 2: Problem Identification

	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Needs Development</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Information is gathered from multiple sources [e.g., Record review, Interview, Observation, and Testing (RIOT)].	<input type="checkbox"/> Data are not gathered from multiple sources. The following are missing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Record Review</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Interview</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Observation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Testing</li> </ul>
<b>2.2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> The problem is operationally defined in observable, measurable terms (i.e., the referral concern is restated as an observable, measurable dependent variable).	<input type="checkbox"/> The problem is not operationally defined. (e.g., it is reported as a categorical/descriptive cause such as Autism, Depression, ADHD; or terms such as aggression, anxiety or hyperactivity).
<b>2.3</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Expectations for the identified behavior are stated based upon an appropriate source for comparison (e.g., grade level standards, peer performance, normative data, etc.).  <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The difference between actual and expected levels of performance is explicitly stated.	<input type="checkbox"/> Expected performance is not based on an appropriate source for comparison or is not included  <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The difference between actual and expected levels of performance is not explicitly stated.
<b>2.4</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Baseline data are graphed  <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly establish a discrepancy (e.g., level, trend) between actual and expected levels of performance  <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Use an appropriate comparison standard.	<input type="checkbox"/> Baseline data are not graphed  <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Do not clearly establish a discrepancy (e.g., level, trend) between actual and expected levels of performance  <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Do not use an appropriate comparison standard.
<b>RATING</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>EFFECTIVE</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>NEEDS DEVELOPMENT</b>

**Comments:**

### Section 3: Problem Analysis

	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Needs Development</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> The problem behavior is stated as a skill or performance deficit	<input type="checkbox"/> The problem behavior is not stated as a skill or performance deficit.
<b>3.2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple hypotheses are formulated to address the problem across one or more of the following areas: curriculum, instruction, and environment. <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> All hypotheses are testable.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple hypotheses are not developed <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Hypotheses are untestable.
<b>3.3</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Hypotheses are stated in observable/measurable terms.	<input type="checkbox"/> Hypotheses are NOT stated in observable/measurable terms.
<b>3.4</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposed hypotheses are empirically tested <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate sources of data are used to confirm or reject each hypothesis.	<input type="checkbox"/> Hypotheses are not tested <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate sources of data are not used to confirm or reject each hypothesis.
<b>3.5</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> A conclusive statement that formally describes the cause of the problem is included <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Leads to a logical intervention.	<input type="checkbox"/> A conclusive statement formally describing the cause of the problem is not included <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Does not lead to a logical intervention.
<b>RATING</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>EFFECTIVE</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>NEEDS DEVELOPMENT</b>

**Comments:**

### Section 4: Intervention

	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Needs Development</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> A single evidence-based intervention is implemented <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Is linked to preceding sections.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple interventions are implemented simultaneously. <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The intervention is not evidence-based. <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The intervention is not linked to preceding sections of the report.
<b>4.2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptability of the intervention by one or more stakeholders (e.g., caregivers, teachers, etc.) is verified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptability of the intervention by one or more stakeholders is not verified.
<b>4.3</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> The intervention is replicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Intervention components [i.e., independent and dependent variable(s)] are clearly described</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Logistics are reported (e.g., who will implement, setting, duration and frequency of sessions, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> The intervention is not replicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Intervention components [i.e., independent and dependent variable(s)] are not clearly described</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Logistics are missing (e.g., who will implement, setting, duration and frequency of sessions, etc.)
<b>4.4</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> A skill or performance goal is stated. <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Described using the same metric as the dependent variables <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Is linked to baseline data <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Achievable based on research or other data.	<input type="checkbox"/> A skill or performance goal is NOT stated. <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Is not described using the same metric as the dependent variables <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Is not linked to baseline data <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Is not achievable based on research or other data.

**Section 4: Intervention (Continued)**

	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Needs Development</b>
<b>4.5</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Progress monitoring data are presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> Progress monitoring data are not presented.
<b>4.6</b>	Treatment integrity/fidelity data are: <input type="checkbox"/> Reported <p align="center">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Used in the interpretation of intervention efficacy.	Treatment integrity/fidelity data are not: <input type="checkbox"/> Reported <p align="center">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Are not used in the interpretation of intervention efficacy.
<b>RATING</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>EFFECTIVE</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>NEEDS DEVELOPMENT</b>

**Comments:**

### Section 5: Evaluation (Summative)

	<b>Effective</b>	<b>Needs Development</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> A single graph is depicted for the target behavior and includes the following elements: <input type="checkbox"/> Baseline data <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Goal/Target indicator or aimline <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Treatment/progress monitoring data with a trend line.	<input type="checkbox"/> A single target behavior is presented on multiple graphs <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant graphs are not included. <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> The following components are not included in the graph: <input type="checkbox"/> Baseline data <input type="checkbox"/> Goal/Target indicator or aim line <input type="checkbox"/> Treatment/progress monitoring data with a trend line.
<b>5.2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Adequate intervention data are collected to meaningfully interpret the results of the intervention.: <input type="checkbox"/> At least 7 data points collected over <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> A minimum of 6 weeks)	<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient intervention data are collected to meaningfully interpret the results of the intervention. <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 7 data points <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 6 weeks
<b>5.3</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual analysis of the level, trend and variability and/or statistical analyses (e.g., effect size) were used <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The intervention was effective.	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual or statistical analyses were not used <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The intervention was ineffective.
<b>5.4</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategies for generalizing outcomes to other settings are included.	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategies for generalizing outcomes to other settings are not included.
<b>5.5</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategies for follow-up are included.	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategies for follow-up are not included.
<b>RATING</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>EFFECTIVE</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>NEEDS DEVELOPMENT</b>

**Comments:**

## Recommended Resources

- Brown-Chidsey, R., Andren, K. J. (2015). *Assessment for intervention: A problem-solving approach*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Briesch, A. M., Volpe, R. J., & Floyd R. G. (2018). *School-based observation: A practical guide to assessing student behavior*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Burns, M. K., Riley-Tillman, C. T., & Rathvon, N. (2017). *Effective school interventions: Evidence-based strategies for improving student outcomes*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Crone, D. A., J. Hawken, L. S., & Horner, R. H. (2015). *Building positive behavior support systems in school: Functional behavioral assessment*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Dougherty Stahl, K. Flanigan, K. & McKenna, M. C. (2019). *Assessment for reading instruction*. (4th ed.) New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Hagermoser Sanetti L. M., & Collier-Meek, M. A. (2019). *Supporting successful interventions in schools: Tools to plan, evaluate, and sustain effective implementation*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hulac, D. M & Briesch, A. M. (2017). *Evidence-based strategies for effective classroom management*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hunley, S., & McNamara, K. (2010). *Tier 3 of the RTI model problem solving through a case study approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin and Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Kovaleski, J., VanDerHeyden, A., & Shapiro, E. (2013). *The RTI approach to evaluating learning disabilities*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Mascolo, J. T., Alfonso, V. C., & Flanagan, D. P. (2014). *Essentials of planning, selecting, and tailoring interventions for unique learners*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Newman, D. S., Rosenfield, S. A. (2018). *Building competence in school consultation: A developmental approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Riley-Tillman, T. C., Burns, M. K., & Kilgus, S. P. (2020). *Evaluating Educational Interventions: Second Edition: Single-Case Design for Measuring Response to Intervention*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Steege, M. W., Pratt, J. L., Wickerd, G., Guare, R., & Watson, T. S. (2019). *Conducting School-Based Functional Behavioral assessments: Third edition: A practitioner's guide*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Wanzek, J. Al Otaiba, S., & McMaster, K. L. (2020). *Intensive Reading Interventions for the Elementary Grades*. New York: The Guilford Press.