



Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) Problem-Solving Report Rubric

Reviewer: _____

Date of Review: _____

Initial Review

Second Review

Other: _____

Name of Applicant: _____

Decision on Problem-Solving Report (To be completed by board):

Approved – Meets Criteria

Not Approved – Needs Development

Recommendation to NCSP Board (To be completed by field reviewer):

Approved – Meets Criteria

Not Approved – Needs Development

Summary of Strengths (Based on the rubric):

Summary of Areas for Improvement (Based on the rubric):

The determination of a problem-solving report that meets criteria is guided by whether it is both data-driven and makes logical sense, rather than how many isolated elements are identified.

Section 1: Foundational Elements of an Effective Problem-Solving Report

	Key Elements:	Comments
1.1	<input type="checkbox"/> Demographics of the case are adequately described (e.g., age, type of class/school, grade, SES, disability, etc.).	
1.2	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment, intervention, and/or consultation practices identify and address unique individual characteristics.	
1.3	<input type="checkbox"/> Collaboration with relevant stakeholders (e.g., families, teachers, and other professionals) is evident throughout the process.	
1.4	<input type="checkbox"/> Steps of the problem-solving process are implemented coherently (i.e., sequential, goal directed, and flow logically based on evidence).	
1.5	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional practices of writing style, formatting, and graphing are present in the problem-solving report (i.e., clear succinct and well written text with clearly labeled graphs).	
1.6	<input type="checkbox"/> Personal identifying information of the problem-solving report subject is redacted from the report.	
<input type="checkbox"/> MEETS CRITERIA <input type="checkbox"/> NEEDS DEVELOPMENT		

Section 2: Problem Identification

	Key Elements:	Comments
2.1	<input type="checkbox"/> Information is gathered from multiple sources [i.e., Record review, Interview, Observation, and Testing (RIOT)]. “Testing” may include review of academic progress monitoring (e.g., CBM) and/or behavioral data (e.g., FBA, performance skill assessment, etc.).	
2.2	<input type="checkbox"/> The problem is operationally defined in terms of an observable, directly measurable dependent variable (e.g., reading fluency).	
2.3	<input type="checkbox"/> Expectations for the identified behavior are stated and based upon an appropriate source for comparison (e.g., grade level standards, peer performance, normative data, etc.).	
2.4	<input type="checkbox"/> The difference between actual and expected levels of performance is explicitly stated or described.	
<input type="checkbox"/> MEETS CRITERIA <input type="checkbox"/> NEEDS DEVELOPMENT		

Section 3: Problem Analysis

	Key Elements:	Comments
3.1	<input type="checkbox"/> When the problem is described, it is stated as a skill or performance deficit.	
3.2	<input type="checkbox"/> A process for developing multiple, testable hypotheses to identify the cause of the problem is thoroughly described. It is clear that the applicant examined existing data; how and what additional data was collected.	
3.3	<input type="checkbox"/> Hypotheses are stated in observable/measurable terms.	
3.4	<input type="checkbox"/> A process for using data to support or reject each hypothesis is thoroughly described (e.g., functional behavior assessment, skill/performance assessments, etc.).	
3.5	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate sources of data are used to support or reject each hypothesis.	
3.6	<input type="checkbox"/> A conclusive statement that formally describes the cause of the problem and leads to a logical intervention (e.g., evidence-based, linked to the data, etc.) is included.	
<input type="checkbox"/> MEETS CRITERIA <input type="checkbox"/> NEEDS DEVELOPMENT		

Section 4: Intervention

	Key Elements:	Comments
4.1	<input type="checkbox"/> A single intervention or intervention package that is clearly linked to the accepted hypothesis is implemented to address all relevant aspects of the identified problem.	
4.2	<input type="checkbox"/> At least one citation of peer-reviewed research demonstrating empirical support for the selected intervention or intervention package is included.	
4.3	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptability of the intervention by one or more stakeholders (e.g., caregivers, teachers, etc.) is verified.	
4.4	The intervention is replicable. All of the following are clear: <input type="checkbox"/> Intervention components (e.g., independent variable) are described. <input type="checkbox"/> Logistics are reported (e.g., who will implement, setting, duration, and frequency of sessions, etc.).	
4.5	A skill or performance goal is stated. It includes all of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Uses the same metric as the dependent variables. <input type="checkbox"/> Is linked to baseline data. <input type="checkbox"/> Is achievable based on research or other data.	
4.6	<input type="checkbox"/> Progress was monitored. Student performance data were collected and presented.	
4.7	Treatment integrity/fidelity data: <input type="checkbox"/> were collected. <input type="checkbox"/> results are reported. <input type="checkbox"/> the data were used in the interpretation of intervention efficacy.	
<input type="checkbox"/> MEETS CRITERIA <input type="checkbox"/> NEEDS DEVELOPMENT		

Section 5: Evaluation (Summative)

	Key Elements:	Comments
5.1	<p>Case data are presented on a single graph that include ALL of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Baseline data that clearly establish a discrepancy (e.g., level, trend) between actual and expected behavior. <input type="checkbox"/> A goal/target indicator or aim line. <input type="checkbox"/> A trendline (for academic cases). <input type="checkbox"/> An appropriate comparison standard. 	
5.2	<p>Adequate intervention data are collected to meaningfully interpret the results of the intervention. Each of the following conditions must be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A minimum of 8 intervention data points. <input type="checkbox"/> Data are collected over a minimum of 6 weeks. <input type="checkbox"/> Data are sufficient to demonstrate positive change in the case. <input type="checkbox"/> <i>(Only if the intervention was initially ineffective):</i> Appropriate changes or adaptations were described and implemented, and monitoring data were collected (at least 8 more data points). 	
5.3	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual analysis of the level, trend, and variability and/or statistical analyses (e.g., effect size) demonstrate that the intervention was effective.	
5.4	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategies for generalizing outcomes to other settings are included.	
5.5	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategies for follow-up are included.	
<input type="checkbox"/> MEETS CRITERIA <input type="checkbox"/> NEEDS DEVELOPMENT		

Recommended Reading

- Burns, M. K. (2010). Formative evaluation in school psychology: Fully informing the instructional process. *School Psychology Forum: Research in Practice*, 4, 22-33.
- Christ, T.J. (2014). Best practices in problem analysis. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 159-176). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Daly, III, E. J., Witt, J. C., Martens, B. K., & Dool, E. J. (1997). A model for conducting a functional analysis of academic performance problems. *School Psychology Review*, 26, 554-574.
- Eckert, T. L., Dunn, E. K., Rosenblatt, M. A., & Truckenmiller, A. J. (2008). Identifying effective school-based reading interventions: A review of the brief experimental analysis literature. *School Psychology Forum: Research in Practice*, 2, 16-28.
- Hawkins, R. O., Morrison, J. Q., Musti-Rao, S., & Hawkins, J. A. (2008). Treatment integrity for academic interventions in real world settings. *School Psychology Forum: Research in Practice*, 2, 1-15.
- Hixson, M., Christ, T. J., & Bradley-Johnson, B. (2014). Best practices in the analysis of progress-monitoring data and decision making. *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 2133-2146). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Horner, R. H., Carr, E. G., Halle, J., McGee, G., Odom, S., Wolery, M. (2005). The use of single-subject research to identify evidence-based practice in special education. *Exceptional Children*, 71, 165-179.
- Howell, K. W., Hosp, J. L., & Kurns, S. (2014). Best practices in curriculum-based evaluations. In A Thomas & J Grimes (Eds.). *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 349-362). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Hunley, S., and McNamara, K (2010) Tier 3 of the RTI Model Problem Solving Through a Problem-solving report Approach Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin and Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Jones, K. M., & Wickstrom, K. F. (2010). Using functional assessment to select behavioral interventions. In G. Peacock, R. A. Ervin, E. J. Daly III, & K. W. Merrell (Eds.), *Practical handbook of school psychology: Effective practices for the 21st century* (pp. 192 – 210). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kratochwill, T. R., Hitchcock, J., Horner, R. H., Levin, J. R., Odom, S. L., Rindskopf, D. M. & Shadish, W. R. (2010). Single-case designs technical documentation. Retrieved from What Works Clearinghouse website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/wwc_scd.pdf.
- 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.
- Methe, S. A., & Riley-Tillman, T. C. (2008). An informed approach to selecting and designing early mathematics interventions. *School Psychology Forum: Research in Practice*, 2, 29-41.

- Riley-Tillman, T. C., & Walcott, C. M. (2007). Using baseline logic to maximize the value of educational interventions. *School Psychology Forum: Research in Practice, 1*, 87-97.
- Upah, K. R. F. (2014). Best practices in designing, implementing, and evaluating quality interventions. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 209 - 224). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- VanDerHeyden, A. M., & Witt, J. C. (2014). Best practices in can't do/won't do assessment. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 131 - 140). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Zaslofsky, A. F., & Volpe, R. J. (2010). Graphing single-case data in Microsoft Excel 2007. *School Psychology Forum: Research in Practice, 4*, 15-24.