# YES! Consultation Rubric

| CRITERIA: Area of Evaluation | Possible Points | Points Earned | Comments | Trainer Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A: Introduction** | | | | |
| Interview: asked important and relevant questions; reasonable time spent | 1.00 | | student if there was anything he had done in the past that he absolutely loved ? Overall, consultant demonstrated a genuine interest in the student and his parents were only too happy to offer their observations. | |
| Cover page: Confirmed ID; discussion of "self-discovery" | 0.75 | | Consultant checked with student and parent that details were correct. | |
| Table of Contents (ToC): When to use this report (to encourage future use) | 0.75 | | Consultant seemed to zoom through the table of contents etc. and suggested to the student that he could 'read them himself' before getting straight into the Personality section. | |
| **B: Personality** | | | | |
| Explanation of Scales and Scores as appropriate within the context of discussing personality, including explanation of mid-range | 0.75 | | Consultant explained the YES! Personality traits as being demonstrated on a 'Spectrum' and further articulated to the student that the traits were 'listed as opposites' or you might end up in the middle. Consultant used the phrase, 'Where would you land ?' when asking the student whether he thought he was Unstructured or Conscientious. Consultant also explained to the student that mid-range scores (of which there were a few), often do not demonstrate and Struggles. | |
| Personality: Main trait, description, sought student confirmation | 1.00 | | Consultant gave simplified, real-world references for Main Traits and always sought student (and often Parent) confirmation. All Main Traits were clearly explained in a way that was easy for the student to understand and student was given adequate opportunity to reflect, clarify and make a decision. At one point the consultant took active steps to make the student more comfortable with the process by reminding him that 'You're not being graded on this'. | |
| Personality: Sub-traits used to explain nuances of main trait; sought student confirmation | 1.50 | | Consultant explained Sub-Traits and the supporting connection to the Main Traits so that the student understood and took time to clarify the meaning of Sub-Traits in a real-world way that the student would easily understand. | |
| Personality: Personality Implications (Student ID of the most important ones; any not apply) | 0.75 | | Consultant walked through Personality Implications with student, checked with student about each Personality Implication and put ticks/check marks on the ones that were particularly relevant or confirmed as valuable by the student. | |
| Strengths/Potential Struggles: clear explanation, markings, summary, "homework" | 0.75 | | Consultant affirmed the identity of the student as she walked throught the Strengths with the student and linked these strengths back to the Main Traits and Sub-Traits when necessary. The context (and importance) of acknowledging the student's Struggles was explained but the consultant encouraged the student to 'Not focus on struggles but focus on strengths because strengths are your super power', which was helpful clarification. | |
| Synthesis of Personality: Connected personality traits and subtraits, noting themes and balancers and giving the student a sense of their overall personality design | 6.00 | | Consultant did a great job of drawing together and explaining the synthesis of Traits and Sub-Traits. She also encouraged and affirmed the student's strengths and gave real-world examples when necessary. | |
| **C: Interests** | | | | |
| Explanation of YES! Interest Pathways | 0.75 | | Consultant capably explained an overview of the YES! Interest Pathways and set the student 'Homework' between meeting #1 and meeting #2, to go through the Interest Pathways document and highlight any occupations which he was interested in. The consultant mentioned that they would look at this Interest Pathways document in the next session. | |
| Holland graph: discussion of student perception of their focus area(s) (things, ideas, people, data) | 0.75 | | Consultant did not dive in too deeply with the details of the Holland graph/diagram but explained the basics of it's structure and the implications of it in the second session in a way that was clear and easy for the student (and parent) to understand. The Holland Code was primarily explained in the context of the student's choices on the Interest Pathways document. | |
| Pie graph: good explanations of how the student's interests are distributed; good questions | 1.25 | | Consultant clearly linked the pie chart to the student's Career Interests as expressed on the Interest Pathways document. The pie chart accurately reflected the majority of the student's career interests were in the Doing - Realistic category and the consultant explained this and pointed it out. | |
| Work through Interests appropriately and tied it back to personality. | 1.00 | | Consultant moved briskly through the Interests section with the student but did not seem to explain the difference between 'Activity', 'Occupation' and 'Subject' groups and the implications of these for future choices at the beginning of the process. The student (and parents) sought clarification regarding whether some interests related to potential hobbies or potential jobs. It may have been clearer for the student and his family to explain this before diving into the Interests section. | |
| **D: Skills** | | | | |
| Skills: confirm highest scoring skills, tie skills to personality and interests, and note any red flags with the lowest skills | 0.50 | | Consultant again moved briskly through the Skills/Abilities section, making note of the fact that a number of the top 8 (Mechanical, Athletic etc.), were also from the practical, hands-on 'Doing-Realistic' Interest Group. | |
| **E: Priorities** | | | | |
| Surroundings, Results, and Life Purpose: Asked for further explanation of how the student defines them when needed/helpful | 0.50 | | Consultant explained to student (and family), that Priorities can change over time based on life-experiences and also articulated that 'Priorities fit with Personality' and pointed back to the student's Personality while discussing Priorities. Consultant briefly ignored student while talking to the parent/s, talking about him like he wasn't there, which felt awkward given that the whole consultation was about encouraging and valuing him. Consultant asked a lot of great, open ended, clarifying questions about Jonathan's Priority choices. | |
| 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? Accurately/appropriately tied priorities back to personality, interests, and skills. | 0.50 | | Consultant asked student for clarification about his top 5 Priority Choices and offered him the opportunity to explain his thinking and rearrange them if desired. Consultant very skillfully and tactfully asked the student about why he ranked Honourability at #5 and Faith at #9 on his list of Life Purpose Priorities when this did not seem to line up with the rest of the report. When he said he didn't know, the consultant validated his choices in a non-judgmental way but urged him to consider whether the Priority of 'Faith' (in particular) was in the right place. | |
| **F: Interactive Action Plan: Your Exploring Self Target** | | | | |
| Synthesis Process: Explain the YES! Target and demonstrate using a client-aligned Occupation choice | 0.50 | | Consultant did not seem to explain/use the YES! Target in this consultation but did tell a story about a carefully designed bolt that was meant for use on the space shuttle that ended up being used a paperweight. The student understood the moral of the story (God has carefully designed you to fulfil your calling for His glory). | |
| **G: ICF Core Competency Standards** | | | | |
| Cultivates trust & safety for the student | 0.20 | | Consultant demonstrated a genuine interest in the student and consistently navigated the consultation in a friendly, encouraging, upbeat and non-judgemental manner. | |
| Maintains presence | 0.20 | | Consultant remained tuned in to student throughout the consultation except for the one, brief moment when the consultant and the parent were talking about the student like he wasn't even there. | |
| Listens actively to student | 0.20 | | Consultant regularly linked back to things that the student had mentioned earlier in the consultation for context. | |
| Evokes awareness - ask questions | 0.20 | | Consultant did a great job of asking lots of clarifying questions and took the time to explain things in more detail when Jonathan (or Parents ) where unclear or unsure. | |
| Facilitates student's growth | 0.20 | | Consultant took time to suggest that Jonathan 'Focus on the things that you are interested in' and don't worry abou the things you are not interested in. She encouraged Jonathan to seek out opportunities to get a part-time job, work experience, etc. in areas of vocational interest to work out whether that job/occupation really gets him excited ... or not. | |
| **Total** | **20.00** | | | |

**H: Overall Consultant Feedback:** Consultant was fully engaged with both Jonathan and the family and approached the whole process with professionalism, warmth and a calm, friendly approach that put everyone at ease and made them feel like they were in safe hands. She prayed at the beginning and end of each session in a way that would have really blessed/encouraged Jonathan and his family.

| Area | Points possible | Points Assigned |
|---|---|---|
| **Personality** | **3** | |
| **Interest** | **2** | |
| **Skills/Abilities** | **1.5** | |
| **Priorities** | **1.5** | |
| **Recommendation** | **2** | |

Comments