

CRITERIA: Area of Evaluation

A: Introduction

Interview: asked important and relevant questions; reasonable time spent

Cover page: Confirmed ID; discussion of "self-discovery"

Table of Contents (ToC): When to use this report (to encourage future use)

Explanation of Scales and Scores, including mid-range, Self Assessment of Personality

B: Personality

Personality: Main trait, description, sought student confirmation

Personality: Sub-traits used to explain nuances of main trait; sought student confirmation

Personality: Personality Implications (Student ID of the most important ones; any not apply)

Strengths/Potential Struggles: clear explanation, markings, summary, "homework"

Synthesis of Personality: Connected personality traits and subtraits, noting themes and balancers and giving the student a sense of their overall personality design

C: Interests

Explanation of YES! Interest Pathways

Holland graph: discussion of student perception of their focus area(s) (things, ideas, people, data)

Pie graph: good explanations of how the student's interests are distributed; good questions

Working through Interests appropriately

D: Skills

Skills: confirm highest scoring skills, any red flags with the lowest skills

E: Priorities

Surroundings, Results, and Life Purpose: Asked for further explanation of how the student defines them when needed/helpful

Surroundings, Results, and Life Purpose: Any others need to be added (top 5?) Anything low in Priorities that should be noted/pointed out/asked about?

F: Interactive Action Plan

Synthesis Process: Create a Funnel with student

G: ICF Core Competency Standards

Cultivates trust & safety for the student

Maintains presence

Listens actively to student

Evokes awareness - ask questions

Facilitates student's growth

Overall Feedback for Consultant

I must commend the Consultant for her efforts and a good job, but my observation was seeking for clarity of questions because no adequate explanation given by

YES! - Personal Consultation Rubric - Student 2

Greatly Exceeds Expectations (Excellent)	Exceeds Expectations (Good)	Meets Expectations (Satisfactory)	Below Expectations (Fair)	Does Not Meet Expectations (Poor)
5 Points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point
		3		
			2	
				1
				1
		3		
			2	
		3		
		3		
			2	
			2	

			2	
			2	
			2	
				1
			2	
			3	
		3		
			2	
		3		
			2	
	4			

is that the consultant was too much in a hurry to have the consultation done. No detailed explanation in m
the consultant. Going by the YES! and ICF standards of consultation, the consultant did a fair job, but could

Comments

Consultant spent too much time on the introduction. There was no introduction on the Yes! Assessment, and student was not made to understand his unique design and God's purpose for his life. The intro focused too much on his achievements and interests and too much time was taken on that.

Consultant did not take time to go through the cover page to confirm details of ID, and no discussion of "self discovery"

There was no reference to the table of contents, infact the Consultant mentioned she would skip the page and asked the student to read up later. She needed to help the student understand the summary of what the YES! Assessment was all about.

There was no explanation nor mention of the scales and scores

The personality traits on feedback activity was not carefully explained to student

The sub trait was not explained in details , nor was it connected to main traits.

This was done moderately , but personality implication was not well defined to student.

Explanation could be done with more details rather just rushed through. No opportunity for open ended questions. Home work was given but not with much support

Explanation was not very clear and no support given to student to help understand the synthesis. No use of Ready, Steady and Go approach.

Explanation not properly done

Explanation not clear. Consultant rushed through, not very detail.
Explanation was not clear. Good Questions were not used.
There was no aligning interests with personality
This was poorly done. It was rushed through by consultant. No red flags mentioned.
Not clearly done with enviroment, but was done well with surrounding and Life purpose.
It would have been nice if the student was asked open ended questions on priorities, to be sure of his understanding of each value, and his motivation.
A clear funnel was not created with student.
More could have been done.
Consultant too much in a rush to move to next conervation all the time
Student was not given adequate opportunity to speak much by the consultant, who did more of the talking..
Student was not given adequate oppportunity to speak much by the consultant, who did more of the talking..
This was well done

most cases and no open ended questions. There were instances where the student's | be better.