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)

B: Personality

Explanation of Scales and Scores as appropriate within the context of discussing personality, including explanation of mid-range

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

Work through Interests appropriately and tied it back to personality.

D: Skills

Skills: confirm highest scoring skills, tie skills to personality and interests, and note 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? Accurately/appropriately tied priorities back to personality, interests, and skills.

F: Interactive Action Plan: Your Exploring Self Target

Synthesis Process: Explain the YES! Target and demonstrate using a client-aligned Occupation choice

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

Total

The Consultant did a great job over all, guiding the student throug personality. She also synthesized verbally, the different, interests

Possible Points	Points Earned
1.00	0.75
0.75	0.75
0.75	0.60
0.75	0.75
1.00	1.00
1.50	1.50
0.75	0.75
0.75	0.75
6.00	6.00
0.75	0.65
0.75	0.75
1.25	1.00

1.00	1.00
0.50	0.50
0.50	0.45
0.50	0.50
0.50	0.50

0.20	0.20
0.20	0.20
0.20	0.20
0.20	0.15
0.20	0.20
20.00	**19.15**

gh the different categories of the YES! A
,skills and priorities traits to give the st

YES! Consultation Rubric

Comments

There were relevant and important questions asked. The consultant maybe could have taken less of the valuable time, speaking about herself instead of focusing on the student

Confimed ID. The discussion of self discovery came through on the second video

ToC was only skimmened through(student was told to read himself) In the second video the consultant explained when and how to use the report well, and encouraged future use of the report (Interactive (target)funnel.)

The consultant explained the scales/acores well, while also explaining the midrange.

The consultant, after doing the description of the main traits, well got confirmation from student and his parent

The consultant sought confirmation from the students after discussing nuances of the subtraits with the main traits.

The implications of the personality traits handled well (also using/discussig the subtraits accents/balances). The one inconsistency "laid back" was handled well by asking questions; also mentioning the more in-depth assessment that should be taken at a later age.

The consultant explained the strengths/potential struggles by discussion(homework in second video with Interest Pathways) "? Summary and markings

The consultant used the "Milshake-visual" showing the 3 main traits (no subtraits were mentioned), but maybe could have emphasized with confirmation from the student the overall personality design (in the 1st video) In the 2nd video,the connections with themes and balances made the student's design more clear

The consultant explained this maybe a bit superficially

There were questions asked regarding the Holland graph and the student could could identify his focus area

The consultant could maybe have explained the Pie graph better regarding the student's interest. She only discussed the first 2 sections pointing out the student's interests, and did not ask questions.

In the second video the consultant worked through the students mentioned interests and she tied it back to personality (YES! Interest Pathways)

The consultant tied the student's highest scores to his personality and interests, mentioning that his low score in the interest and computer skills may need attention if he wanted to be a lawyer,worship-leader or writer.(red flag)

Maybe the consultant could have asked more questions regarding the students understanding/definition of the different priorities

The consultant mentioned that priorities can change and asked student if he would like to rearrange his choices in the different categories. She tied the priorities back to personality,interests and skills

The consultant used the visual body skillet to explain as well as the interactive Pathway/Target funnel which was helpful for the student. Using the student's occupation choices was meaningful to the student.

Especially in the introduction

The consultant got distracted once or twice with technology issues, but for the majority of the time was present.

The consultant responded well to questions throughout the consultation.

The consultant mostly spoke about her own experiences. In the second videos there were more opportunities to evoke awareness by asking questions (The 1st video also had some opportunities to evoke awareness)

The consultant facilitated growth by encouraging job-shadowing, asking questions of career interests and taking the YES! Again, the Career Direct assessment after the age of 16.

Assessment, also using examples (video and skeleton) to illustrate udent his wholistic design, very well.

Trainer Comments

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

Comments