

Acknowledgement of Indigenous Peoples and Traditional Territories:

York University recognizes that many Indigenous nations have longstanding relationships with the territories upon which our campuses are located that precede the establishment of York University. We acknowledge our presence on the traditional territories of the Mississaugas of Credit First Nation, the Huron-Wendat, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and the Métis Nation of Ontario.

Faculty of Health School of Kinesiology and Health Science

Course: KINE 4226 3.0 M – Principles of Neurorehabilitation

Course webpage: eClass

Term: Winter 2024

Prerequisite/Co-requisite: HH/KINE 3020 3.0 – Skilled Performance and Motor Learning

Course Director

Dr. George Mochizuki

Email: gmochizu@yorku.ca

Office: 363 Bethune College, x22202

Office hours: Monday from 10-11:00am OR contact through email to schedule an office meeting or Zoom call at a different time. The information for online office hours meetings is:

<https://yorku.zoom.us/j/94693892676?pwd=dDY3ZkRMZmJNY1E4bW9sOVVZVWUT09>

Meeting ID: 946 9389 2676; Passcode: 958146

Teaching Assistant

Sonia Vovan

Email: svovan2@yorku.ca

Time and Location

Lectures: Tuesdays – 11:30 – 1:00pm – FC104 (Founders College)

Thursdays – 11:30 – 1:00pm – ACW204 (Accolade West)

Experiential Education Activity: asynchronous online/in person activity (TBD) – see schedule below

***remote/in-person delivery will follow the University's directives based on public health guidelines. If there is a need to return to online learning, a Zoom link will be created for this course and be made available on eClass**

Please Take Care of You and Each Other:

We all face stressors and anxiety in our lives. Please be kind to yourselves and others. There are a number of online free resources available to help support you. If you need help, the following list of websites (this is not an exhaustive list) may be a good place for you to start:

<https://good2talk.ca/>

<https://counselling.students.yorku.ca/>

<https://yorkinternational.yorku.ca/>

Technical requirements

The primary platform that will be used in this course is eClass. Students will be able to interact with the course materials, the Course Director, TA, and one another. Please review the syllabus to determine how the class meets (in whole or in part) and how office hours and other interactions will be conducted. The content of this course will be delivered in-person. In the event that the University returns to remote learning, we will continue to meet synchronously on Zoom.

If classes or meetings are held over Zoom, students shall note the following:

- Zoom is hosted on servers in the U.S. This includes recordings done through Zoom.
- If you have privacy concerns about your data, provide only your first name when you join a session.
- The system is configured in a way that all participants are automatically notified when a session is being recorded. In other words, a session cannot be recorded without you knowing about it.

Technology requirements and FAQs for eClass can be found here: <https://lthelp.yorku.ca/95440-student-faq>

Useful links describing computing information, resources and help for students:

Student Guide to eClass/Moodle	https://lthelp.yorku.ca/student-guide-to-moodle
Computing for Students Website	https://student.computing.yorku.ca/
Student Guide to eLearning at York University	http://elearning-guide.apps01.yorku.ca/
Learning Skills Services	https://lss.info.yorku.ca/online-learning/
Zoom@YorkU User Reference Guide	http://staff.computing.yorku.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2012/02/Zoom@YorkU-User-Reference-Guide.pdf
Zoom@YorkU Best Practices	https://staff.computing.yorku.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2020/03/Zoom@YorkU-Best-Practicesv2.pdf

Course Description

This course examines principles and clinical best practices for implementation of neurorehabilitation strategies following neurologic injury. Students will be introduced to processes of neuroplasticity and repair and the use of assistive technologies to facilitate neurorehabilitation interventions for upper and lower limb motor deficits. Students will be exposed to current models and views on the organization and scope of the field of neurorehabilitation. In addition, the course will provide students an opportunity to appreciate the consequences of neurologic injury on typical motor function and how motor learning principles and neuroplastic processes can be used to remediate function.

An important component of this course is engagement and interaction with clinicians (physicians or therapists) and/or researchers in the field of neurorehabilitation currently working in hospitals or private clinics, as well as interaction with individuals with neurologic injury. This engagement will enable students to directly interact with neurorehabilitation practitioners and patients in the community to understand the benefits, challenges, and impact of neurorehabilitation services. Interviews, discussion, and reflection with these individuals will contribute to a broader understanding of the principles of neurorehabilitation. In addition, students will have an opportunity to apply and synthesize the knowledge gained through in-class content and the Experiential Education activity by working through and reporting on relevant case studies.

Learning Objectives

The purpose of this course is to:

- introduce students to current theoretical models for classifying disability in the context of neurorehabilitation.
- provide students an opportunity to recognize the consequences of neurologic injury on typical motor function and how motor learning principles and neuroplastic processes are used to remediate function.
- enable direct student engagement and interaction with neurorehabilitation practitioners and patients in the community to develop awareness of the benefits, challenges, and impact of neurorehabilitation services.
- develop skill in applying and synthesizing knowledge gained from in-class and off-campus interactions to solve problems from a neurorehabilitation perspective in individual cases.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

- describe current theoretical models for classifying disability in the context of neurorehabilitation.
- apply knowledge of principles of motor learning and neuroplasticity to develop rehabilitation strategies in specific case studies.
- evaluate the utility, challenges, and impact of neurorehabilitation based on the perspectives of clinicians and their patients.

- describe historical and contemporary views on approaches for augmenting neurorehabilitation for upper and lower limb impairment.

Course Text/Readings

- Oxford Textbook of Neurorehabilitation, 2nd Ed. Volker Dietz and Nick Ward (editors). Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK. 2020. ISBN: 978-0-19-882495-4 (digital version available).
 - Pricing options: digital version (180 days of access) - \$138.00
 - Pricing options: print version - \$229.95
- **Supplemental reading:** Motor control: Translating Research into Clinical Practice, 4th Ed. Anne Shumway-Cook and Marjorie Woollacott. Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins, Baltimore, 2010. 3rd and 5th editions available On Reserve in the Steacie Science Library.

Content delivery and availability of lecture material

This course will take place in person, on campus according to the Registrar's Office posted schedule. Students are encouraged to attend lectures in person. Lecture notes will be made available for every class. These will be posted to eClass prior to the start of the scheduled lecture time. Portions of lectures will also be recorded and posted to eClass; **however, in-class group activity discussions which link to course content and which develop skill in preparation for writing the midterm and final exam will not be included in the recordings.**

A note on lecture recordings – lecture recordings are to be used for educational purposes only and as a means of enhancing accessibility. Students **do not** have permission to duplicate, copy, or distribute the recordings outside of class. These acts can violate copyright laws, the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, and intellectual property rights. Copying this material for distribution may lead to a charge of misconduct under York's Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities and the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty and/or legal consequences for violation of copyright law if copyright law has been violated.

Lecture Schedule – Winter 2024

LECTURE / DATE	TOPICS	READINGS Dietz and Ward, 2 nd ed OR assigned papers
Week 1 (January 8)	T: Introduction to the course Th: WHO International Classification of Disability and models of disability in the context of neurorehabilitation	Assigned readings Chapter 1
Week 2 (January 15)	T: Neurorehabilitation approaches: a historical perspective Th: Neurorehabilitation approaches: a contemporary perspective	Assigned readings Assigned readings + Chapters 14, 16
Week 3 (January 22)	T: Neurologic Injury – stroke Th: Neurologic Injury – traumatic brain injury	Assigned readings + Chapter 4 Assigned readings + Chapter 30
Week 4 (January 29)	T: Neurologic Injury – multiple sclerosis Th: Neurologic Injury – spinal cord injury	Assigned readings Assigned readings
Week 5 (February 5) Deadline for completing all reflections is February 9	T: Neuroplasticity Th: Neural repair	Chapters 12, 13, & 15 Chapters 12, 13, & 15
Week 6 (February 12)	T: Motor re-learning in neurorehabilitation Th: Midterm exam (Weeks 1-6) – in class	Chapter 7
Week 7 (February 19)	Reading week – no class	--
Week 8 (February 26)	T: Experiential education activity overview: expectations, professionalism, privacy/confidentiality/anonymity (in class) Th: Experiential learning activity (asynchronous)	Assigned readings and Interview Skills Module* --
Week 9 (March 4) Experiential learning reports/reflections due March 10	T: Experiential learning debrief/reflection time Th: Interdisciplinarity in neurorehabilitation	-- Chapter 2
Week 10 (March 11) March 11 – last date to drop without receiving a grade	T: Neurorehabilitation in the community T: Recovery vs compensation	Chapter 35 Assigned readings
Week 11 (March 18)	T: Music therapy in neurorehabilitation Th: Upper limb neurorehabilitation/technology	Chapter 31 Readings + Chapters 20, 33
Week 12 (March 25)	T: Lower limb neurorehabilitation/technology Th: Group presentations	Readings + Chapters 18, 34 --
Week 13 (April 1) Case reports due April 8	T: Group presentations Th: Group presentations	-- --

***Completion of the Interview Skills Module is a requirement – you will not be permitted to participate in the Clinical Interview without first completing this module**

EVALUATION

Final Grade

The final grade for the course will be based on the following items weighted as indicated:

- Weekly reflections 15%
- Experiential education activity group presentation 15%
- Experiential education activity reflection statement (individual) 15%
- Mid-term examination 25%
- Case Study 30%

1. Weekly reflections: Reflective engagement with course material is one way of reinforcing content and concepts covered in the course in a flexible way that allows students to identify with the material that is most meaningful to them. Students will be required to submit a written reflection on lecture material, reading, discussion point, or 'Clinician's Corner' content. Students may submit a reflection for content from **Weeks 1-5**. Students will submit 5 reflections each worth 3% of their final grade (15% total). To be clear, there are 5 weeks (9 lectures) worth of content to choose from. You only have to submit 5 reflections, but they have to be submitted by the end of the week during which the content was reviewed. The reflections can be up to 2 pages in length (double spaced, 2cm margins) with an extra page for your name, title of the reflection and student ID. **Refer to the rubric on Page 14 of this document for grading expectations.**

Reflections will be due on Sunday 11:59pm of the appropriate week (uploaded to eClass). Reflections submitted for the incorrect week or after the Sunday deadline will be considered late and subject to penalties described below.

2. Experiential Learning Presentation and Reflection Statement: Students will work in groups (4-5 students per group, depending on class size) to engage with a community partner in a single off-campus meeting for an Experiential Education activity. For this activity, students will conduct a semi-structured interview with a clinician in the area of neurorehabilitation and one of their clients. If the client is unavailable, the Experiential Education activity will involve interacting with the clinical facilitator. If the in-person interview with the clinical facilitator is not feasible, a video call will be set up between students and the off-campus clinical facilitator. Current Public Health guidelines will be followed for these interactions.

This activity is meant to have the students understand personal perspectives on the impact and challenges of neurorehabilitation from a 'deliverer' and 'receiver' point of view. However, in situations where only the clinician is available (without the client), it will still be possible for students to explore personal views on impact and challenges from the perspective of the clinician alone. The students in these groups will be able to achieve the same learning outcomes as those who may interact with both the client and clinician. In either case, the input from the clinician is prioritized as they will serve as a model for the profession in which students may have an interest in pursuing.

The evaluative component of this activity will include a group presentation (15% of final grade) describing the details of the interview that was conducted and an individual written reflection of the Experiential Learning activity (15% of final grade). The grading rubric for the presentation and interview reflection can be found at the end of this document (page 13 and 15).

Group presentations will take place during the last 3 sessions of the course. Your presentation will be 15-20 minutes in duration and there will be 5 minutes of questions/discussion. The final schedule for presentations will be established later in the term. Your grade for the group presentation will be based on professor, TA, self, and peer evaluation (see rubric on page 11).

The reflection should be no more than **5 pages** in length (left justify, double spaced, 12pt Times New Roman font, 2cm margins) with **1 extra page** for a title page (name, date of submission, student IDs).

3. Midterm examination: There will be one midterm examination. The examination must be written at the date and time noted in the lecture schedule. Students must make themselves available to write the exam at the specified date and time.

The format of the exam will be short answer and essay style questions based on case studies presented in the exam. Students must apply the knowledge they have developed to answer questions related to the cases. On the specified date, all students will receive the exam at the same time and will be given a **1.5 hour window** to complete the exam. The midterm exam is worth **25% of the final grade**.

4. Case Study: One way to demonstrate learning is to apply course-specific knowledge to solve a problem described in a specific case or scenario. The application of in-class knowledge to real-world scenarios facilitates opportunities to translate knowledge into action, similar to what you will do when you transition into the workforce upon completion of your degree. For this exercise, students will work in the same groups of 4-5 students (depending on class size) as in the EE activity. As a group, students will develop the details of the case and will develop a question/problem based on the case that is to be addressed. Students will then provide a detailed description of how the problem is to be addressed, based on the relevant information that was taken into consideration to address the problem. As an example, if students describe a case about a 65-year-old man with stroke with a history of falls, students may task themselves with developing a neurorehabilitative approach for reducing fall risk. The problem-solving description may include pathophysiology of stroke (in contrast to an intact central nervous system), a description of the fall prevention program based on current knowledge and best practice, and a justification of the choice of intervention, all in the context of the details provided in the case. The grading rubric for this activity can be found on Page 9 of this document.

The report (1 per group) should be no more than **10 pages** in length (left justify, double spaced, 12pt Times New Roman font, 2cm margins) with **1 extra page** for a title page (title, names, date of submission, student IDs) and **unlimited additional** pages for references (minimum of 15 appropriate references). Include a running header (top left) and page numbers (bottom right) on all pages. In-text referencing should follow AMA style. No more than 2 references can come from websites – the rest must come from relevant peer-reviewed literature.

Evaluation of the report will include 25% as graded by the Course Director using the attached rubric and 5% as determined by self- and peer-evaluation using the attached rubric (page 12) (30% total).

Grading: The grading scheme for the course conforms to the 9-point grading system used in undergraduate programs at York (e.g., A+ = 9, A = 8, B+ = 7, C+ = 5, etc.). Assignments and tests will bear either a letter grade designation or a corresponding number grade (e.g. A+ = 90 to 100, A = 80 to 90, B+ = 75 to 79, etc.) (For a full description, see the York University Undergraduate Calendar:

http://calendars.registrar.yorku.ca/pdfs/ug2004cal/calug04_5_acadinfo.pdf)

An appeal against a grade assigned to an exam must be made in writing to the Course Director. The entire exam will be regarded by the Course Director. The result of an appeal may cause the grade to increase, decrease or remain the same.

Assignment Submission: Proper academic performance depends on students doing their work not only well, but on time. Accordingly, assignments for this course must be received on the due date specified for the assignment. Case studies and Interview Reflections are to be submitted on eClass by 11:59pm EDT (or EST, as appropriate) on the date specified in the course schedule.

Lateness Penalty: Written assignments received later than the due date will be penalized one-half letter grade (1 grade point) per day that assignment is late. Exceptions to the lateness penalty for valid reasons such as illness, compassionate grounds, etc., may be entertained by the Course Director but will require supporting documentation (e.g., a doctor's letter).

RE-EVALUATION POLICY

During the term: Any requests for remarking of in-class tests must be received in writing by the course instructor within 7 days of the item's mark being posted. Note that your mark may be ***raised, lowered, or confirmed.***

Re-appraisal of a final grade: Any requests for re-appraisal of a final mark must be received by the course instructor within 7 days of the final grade posting. Please note that your mark may be ***raised, lowered, or confirmed.*** For further details, go to: <http://gradstudies.yorku.ca/current-students/regulations/courses-grading/#reappraisals>.

MISSED TESTS

Only students with a legitimate reason for missing a class test, which is confirmed by official documentation*, may request accommodation from the Course Instructor. Written documentation should be submitted to the Course Director at the next meeting of the class. If an exam is missed, a make-up test will be scheduled at a mutually agreed upon date and time during the Final Exam period. If a student misses a test with no legitimate excuse, the student will receive a grade of zero for the missed test. Further extensions or accommodation will require students to submit a formal petition to the Faculty. In the case of a sudden emergency, contact the Course Director and/or TA as soon as possible. If the Course Director/TA cannot be reached by email, a message can be left on the Course Director's voicemail, which records the date and time of your call.

*Official Documentation - Documentation must be provided by a registered clinical psychologist, psychiatrist, or medical doctor indicating that you were indeed unable to attend on the specific date of the examination because of your specific problem.

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS

Academic Honesty and Integrity: York students are required to maintain the highest standards of academic honesty and they are subject to the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty (<https://secretariat-policies.info.yorku.ca/policies/academic-honesty-senate-policy-on/>). The Policy affirms the responsibility of faculty members to foster acceptable standards of academic conduct and of the student to abide by such standards. Students are expected to review and familiarize themselves with the materials on the Academic Integrity website at: <https://spark.library.yorku.ca/academic-integrity-what-is-academic-integrity/>.

Access/Disability: York University is committed to principles of respect, inclusion and equality of all persons with disabilities across campus. The University provides services for students with disabilities (including physical, medical, learning and psychiatric disabilities) needing accommodation related to teaching and evaluation methods/materials. These services are made available to students in all Faculties and programs at York University. Students in need of these services are asked to register with disability services as early as possible to ensure that appropriate academic accommodation can be provided with advance notice. You are encouraged to schedule a time early in the term to meet with each professor to discuss your accommodation needs. Please note that registering with disabilities services and discussing your needs with your professors is necessary to avoid any impediment to receiving the necessary academic accommodations to meet your needs. Additional information is available at the following websites:

Counselling & Disability Services - <https://counselling.students.yorku.ca/>

York Accessibility Hub - <http://accessibilityhub.info.yorku.ca/>

Religious Observance Accommodation: York University is committed to respecting the religious beliefs and practices of all members of the community and making accommodations for observances of special significance to adherents. Should any of the dates specified in this syllabus for an in-class test or examination pose such a conflict for you, contact the Course Director within the first three weeks of class. Please note that to arrange an alternative date or time for an examination scheduled in the formal examination periods (December and April/May), students must complete an Examination Accommodation Form, which can be obtained from Student Client Services, Student Services Centre or online at:
https://registrar.yorku.ca/pdf/exam_accommodation.pdf.

Student Conduct in Academic Situations: Students and instructors are expected to maintain a professional relationship characterized by courtesy and mutual respect. Moreover, it is the responsibility of the instructor to maintain an appropriate academic atmosphere in the classroom and other academic settings, and the responsibility of the student to cooperate in that endeavour. Further, the instructor is the best person to decide, in the first instance, whether such an atmosphere is present in the class. The policy and procedures governing disruptive and/or harassing behaviour by students in academic situations is available at:
<https://secretariat-policies.info.yorku.ca/policies/disruptive-andor-harassing-behaviour-in-academic-situations-senate-policy/>.

Case Study Grading Rubric

Category	Scale
Background	<p>3=provides adequate introduction to the case and is within the scope of the course and appropriately develops a problem to solve.</p> <p>2= provides non-specific background information that does not tie in well to the course. The presented problem does not fully link to the background.</p> <p>1= provides a very generic background. The presented problem does not align with the background.</p> <p>0= provides an inappropriate background and/or was very difficult to read and/or understand. No problem is identified.</p>
Patient (age, sex, primary complaint, relevant medical history)	<p>3= thorough, relevant, and understandable patient demographics, chief complaint, and any pertinent medical history.</p> <p>2= generic patient data provided, provides chief complaint, may or may not discuss medical history.</p> <p>1= some patient data missing or unclear; very wordy and does not communicate effectively the exact primary complaint and/or medical history.</p> <p>0= no relevant information provided concerning this patient, injury or patient/client was identified, and/or was very difficult to read and understand.</p>
Findings	<p>3= provides a stepwise temporal outline that details the objective findings.</p> <p>2= provides incomplete but orderly objective findings.</p> <p>1= provides a few random objective findings.</p> <p>0= very difficult to read or understand basic objective findings.</p>
Pathophysiology of disease/mechanism of injury	<p>3= provides a thorough description of the pathophysiology of disease/mechanism of injury presented in the case in the context of healthy central nervous system function.</p> <p>2= provides an incomplete description of the pathophysiology of disease/mechanism of injury presented in the case in the context of healthy central nervous system function.</p> <p>1= provides an incomplete description of the pathophysiology of disease/mechanism of injury presented in the case and does not relate the description to the healthy central nervous system.</p> <p>0= does not describe the pathophysiology of disease/mechanism of injury.</p>
Treatment/intervention	<p>3= provides a final diagnosis along with a chronological and detailed list of interventions.</p> <p>2= provides a minimum amount of information specific to interventions or does not list interventions in a precise, chronological order.</p> <p>1= provides a generic, non-detailed summary of treatments provided.</p> <p>0= provides no real interventions nor a legitimate timeline.</p>
Expected outcomes from intervention	<p>3= provides a strong case as to why this therapeutic approach is likely to be effective.</p> <p>2= provides a weak case as to why this therapeutic approach is likely to be effective or fails to make a compelling case as to why this approach will be effective.</p> <p>1= fails to provide evidence as to why this therapeutic approach is likely to be effective or claims that the approach is unproven or novel.</p> <p>0= does not expound upon why the approach will be effective.</p>
Conclusion	<p>3= provides a clear and concise summary of the facts of the case study as well as what can be learned from this case.</p> <p>2= provides a wordy or overly-summarized summary of the case.</p> <p>1= provides information that does not adequately summarize the case.</p> <p>0= fails to provide a real conclusion to the case study.</p>
Formatting	<p>3= Thoroughly follows formatting guidelines as outlined for case study.</p> <p>2= Generally follows formatting guidelines with minimal errors.</p> <p>1= Submits case study with several significant formatting errors.</p> <p>0= Fails to adhere to general formatting requirements.</p>

Grammar	<p>3= No grammatical/spelling errors.</p> <p>2= Minimal grammatical/spelling errors (e.g. < five errors).</p> <p>1= Several significant grammatical/spelling errors (e.g. > five errors).</p> <p>0= Case study is difficult to read due to the level of grammatical/spelling errors.</p>
Quality of writing	<p>3= Uses clear and coherent writing style consistent with professional writing standards: sentences can stand alone, solid flow, professional terminology.</p> <p>2= Generally clear writing with minimal deviation from professional writing standards.</p> <p>1= Several significant deviations from professional writing standards.</p> <p>0= Often incomprehensible writing style due to significant deviation from professional writing standards.</p>

Formatting a Clinical Case Study: The clinical case study will be evaluated for content using the above qualifications, along with formatting requirements as follows: Prepare your case study in accordance with the following requirements (failure to follow the formatting requirements will likely result in an automatic disqualification of your case study):

The report (1 per group) should be no more than **10 pages** in length (double spaced, 12pt Times New Roman font, 2cm margins) with **1 extra page** for a title page (title, names, date of submission, student IDs) and **unlimited additional** pages for references (minimum of 15 appropriate references). No more than 2 references can come from online sources; the rest should come from peer-reviewed sources. Include a running header (top left) and page numbers (bottom right) on all pages. In-text referencing should follow AMA style (https://www.bcit.ca/files/library/pdf/bcit-ama_citation_guide.pdf).

Grading of the Clinical Case Study:

- Main case study body (21 points)
- Formatting (3 points)
- Grammar (3 points)
- Quality of writing (3points)
- Total possible points: 30 points

Self and Peer Evaluation of Experiential Education Activity (interview and presentation)

Please assess your work and the work of your colleagues by using the following criteria. I will consider your feedback in assigning the grade for the project. Please try to be as honest and fair as possible in your assessment.

- 5 = Excellent work; was crucial component to group's success
- 4 = Very strong work; contributed significantly to group
- 3 = Sufficient effort; contributed adequately to group
- 2 = Insufficient effort; met minimal standards of group
- 1 = Little or weak effort; was detrimental to group*
- 0 = No contributions were made*

SELF Evaluation (Name: _____):

- _____ Participation in developing ideas and planning project
- _____ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others
- _____ Cooperation with other group members
- _____ Interest and enthusiasm in project
- _____ Participation in leading/facilitating discussion
- _____ Ease and familiarity with discussion material

PEER Evaluation (Partner 1: _____):

- _____ Participation in developing ideas and planning project
- _____ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others
- _____ Cooperation with other group members
- _____ Interest and enthusiasm in project
- _____ Participation in leading/facilitating discussion
- _____ Ease and familiarity with discussion material

* An assessment of "1" or "0" requires a written explanation.

PEER Evaluation (Partner 2: _____):

- _____ Participation in developing ideas and planning project
- _____ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others
- _____ Cooperation with other group members
- _____ Interest and enthusiasm in project
- _____ Participation in leading/facilitating discussion
- _____ Ease and familiarity with discussion material

* An assessment of "1" or "0" requires a written explanation.

PEER Evaluation (Partner 3: _____):

- _____ Participation in developing ideas and planning project
- _____ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others
- _____ Cooperation with other group members
- _____ Interest and enthusiasm in project
- _____ Participation in leading/facilitating discussion
- _____ Ease and familiarity with discussion material

* An assessment of "1" or "0" requires a written explanation.

PEER Evaluation (Partner 4 – if needed: _____):

- _____ Participation in developing ideas and planning project
- _____ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others
- _____ Cooperation with other group members
- _____ Interest and enthusiasm in project
- _____ Participation in leading/facilitating discussion
- _____ Ease and familiarity with discussion material

* An assessment of "1" or "0" requires a written explanation.

Self and Peer Evaluation of Case Study group project

Please assess your work and the work of your colleagues by using the following criteria. I will consider your feedback in assigning the grade for the project. Please try to be as honest and fair as possible in your assessment.

- 5 = Excellent work; was crucial component to group's success
- 4 = Very strong work; contributed significantly to group
- 3 = Sufficient effort; contributed adequately to group
- 2 = Insufficient effort; met minimal standards of group
- 1 = Little or weak effort; was detrimental to group*
- 0 = No contributions were made*

SELF Evaluation (Name: _____):

- _____ Participation in developing ideas and planning project
- _____ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others
- _____ Cooperation with other group members
- _____ Interest and enthusiasm in project
- _____ Participation in leading/facilitating discussion
- _____ Ease and familiarity with discussion material

PEER Evaluation (Partner 1: _____):

- _____ Participation in developing ideas and planning project
- _____ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others
- _____ Cooperation with other group members
- _____ Interest and enthusiasm in project
- _____ Participation in leading/facilitating discussion
- _____ Ease and familiarity with discussion material

* An assessment of "1" or "0" requires a written explanation.

PEER Evaluation (Partner 2: _____):

- _____ Participation in developing ideas and planning project
- _____ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others
- _____ Cooperation with other group members
- _____ Interest and enthusiasm in project
- _____ Participation in leading/facilitating discussion
- _____ Ease and familiarity with discussion material

* An assessment of "1" or "0" requires a written explanation.

PEER Evaluation (Partner 3: _____):

- _____ Participation in developing ideas and planning project
- _____ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others
- _____ Cooperation with other group members
- _____ Interest and enthusiasm in project
- _____ Participation in leading/facilitating discussion
- _____ Ease and familiarity with discussion material

* An assessment of "1" or "0" requires a written explanation.

PEER Evaluation (Partner 4 – if needed: _____):

- _____ Participation in developing ideas and planning project
- _____ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others
- _____ Cooperation with other group members
- _____ Interest and enthusiasm in project
- _____ Participation in leading/facilitating discussion
- _____ Ease and familiarity with discussion material

* An assessment of "1" or "0" requires a written explanation.

Experiential education reflection and summary grading rubric

	Excellence (demonstrates critical reflection)	Good (demonstrates reflection)	Fair (demonstrates understanding)	Poor (demonstrates habitual action/non-reflection)
Reflection on existing knowledge	Critically reviews existing knowledge, questions assumptions, and articulates new perspectives as a result of experience.	Active and careful consideration of existing knowledge and articulates new understanding of knowledge as a result of experience.	Makes use of existing knowledge without an attempt to evaluate/appraise knowledge; demonstrates understanding but does not relate to other experiences or personal reaction.	Automatic/superficial responses with little conscious/deliberate thought or reference to existing knowledge; responses are offered without attempting to understand them.
Connection to academic concepts	Demonstrates superior connection between experience and class content (concepts/theories) and literature; evidence of application of theory and reconstruction of perspective.	Demonstrates clear connections between experience and class content (concepts/theories); evidence of application of theory.	Connects experience with class content (concepts/theories) but remains superficial or abstract.	Connections are not drawn between experience and class content (concepts/theories) or literature.
Evidence of development	Articulates transformation of their perspective of themselves or about a particular issue/concept/problem as a result of experience.	Articulates new understanding/insights about self or particular issue/concept/problem as a result of experience.	Limited/superficial insight about self or particular issue/concept/problem as a result of experience.	No evidence of insights about self or particular issue/concept/problem as a result of experience.
Style and clarity of writing	Well organized and easy to follow; writing style is uniform and professional; sentences are clear, complete and concise; paper has been proof-read and checked and has no errors.	Organization is logical and generally clear; sentences generally well-structured; wording is adequate; generally correct grammar/spelling.	Some organization but jumps around; sentences sometimes awkward; words are uninspiring; more than one spelling/grammatical error.	Paper is disorganized and information is hard to follow; sentence structure is poor, lacks clarity; too many short or run-on sentences; words are used incorrectly; multiple errors present.

Grading rubric for weekly Reflective Writing pieces

	Excellence	Good	Fair	Poor
Self-awareness	Student questions own biases, stereotypes, preconceptions, and/or assumptions and defines new modes of thinking as a result.	Student questions own biases, stereotypes, and preconceptions.	Student attempts self-criticism, but the reflection fails to demonstrate a new awareness of personal biases, etc.	Student makes no attempt at self-criticism.
Critical thinking/analyzing perspectives	Student assesses and evaluates perspectives, knowledge, and opinions gained from course concepts and experience. Student links these assessments to own perspectives and opinions on the issue.	Student assesses and evaluates perspectives, knowledge and opinions gained from course concepts and experience.	Student asks questions and shows awareness of multiple perspectives. Opinions are stated with some analysis and support.	Student accepts things at face value; opinions are stated without analysis or support.
Depth of reflection	Metacognitive: Student examines the learning process, showing what learning occurred, how learning occurred, and how newly acquired knowledge or learning altered existing knowledge.	Analytical: Student applies learning to a broader context of personal and professional life.	Empathic: Student demonstrates thoughts about or challenges to beliefs, values, and attitudes of self and others.	Descriptive: Student demonstrates acquisition of new content from significant learning experiences but does not apply new content to self.
Synthesis and integration	Writing provides examples of evaluation or revision of real and fictitious interactions as well as discussion of how insights will shape future action.	Writing provides evidence of student's use of readings, observations, and discussions to examine, appraise, compare, contrast, plan for new actions or response, or propose remedies to use in and outside structured learning experiences.	Writing provides examples of self-projection into the experiences of others, sensitivity towards the values and beliefs of others, and/or tolerance for differences. New understanding is not directly linked to future practice.	Writing provides minimal/no evidence of gaining knowledge, making sense of new experiences, or making linkages between old and new information.
Academic writing standards	Final version has no more than 2 errors; errors do not impact readability.	Finished draft contains 3-5 errors; errors do not impact readability.	Finished draft contains 3-5 errors; errors impact readability in a few places.	Finished draft contains more than 5 errors; errors impact readability throughout assignment.
Language and style	Word choice and tone appropriate to academic writing; sentences vary in length and complexity.	Appropriate word choice and tone; some attention to sentence structure and variety.	Occasional use of slang or inappropriate or inaccurate language; minimal discernible attention to sentence length and variety.	Frequent use of slang or inappropriate or inaccurate language; no explicit attention to sentence length and variety.
Assignment components and format	Assignment meets all page length, drafting, and feedback requirements; uses appropriate and correct citation style.	Assignment meets all page length, drafting, and feedback requirements; 1-2 stylistic errors.	Assignment misses 1 requirement; 3 or more stylistic errors.	Assignments misses 2 or more requirements; 3 or more stylistic errors.

Collaborative Presentation Rubric (with Oral Delivery)

Criteria	Unsatisfactory-Beginning	Developing	Accomplished	Excellent	Total
Presentation / Content (Group grade)	Presentation content shows a lack of engagement with the interview activity. There is inadequate evidence of evidence of conveying perspectives of the clinician and client. Content is confusing and/or contains frequent inaccuracies. Required elements are missing and/or randomly organized.	Presentation content shows general account of the interview activity. There is limited evidence of conveying perspectives of the clinician and client. Content contains some inaccuracies, inconsistencies, misinterpretations, and/or somewhat unclear. A required element may be missing.	Presentation content shows an adequate account of the interview activity. Some effort is evident in conveying perspectives of the clinician and client. Content is mostly accurate and reasonably organized. May contain some inconsistencies in content or some connections made may not be supported. Required elements are included for the most part.	Presentation content is a thorough account of the interview activity. Substantive effort is evident in conveying perspectives of the clinician and client. Content is accurate and sequenced in a clear, logical way. All required elements are included.	/10
Presentation / Design (Group grade)	Slides generally lack visual appeal and are text-heavy with little or no visuals and/or exhibit an overuse of color or animations. Media, (e.g., images), if used, are rarely cited on each slide. No theme is evident and the presentation appears disjointed rather than unified and/or frequent errors (grammar, punctuation, spelling, formatting, etc.) on the slides	Slides generally include a mix of white space, visuals, and/or text but not consistently and/or some overuse or inappropriate use of color or animations. Theme (e.g., template) is not consistently evident throughout the presentation and/or some errors (grammar, punctuation, spelling, formatting, etc.) on the slides.	Slides are effectively designed with visual appeal including white space, visuals, and minimal text for the most part. Color and animations are used appropriately. Theme (e.g., template) is evident in the presentation for the most part to produce a cohesive presentation and/or minor errors (grammar, punctuation, spelling, formatting, etc.) on the slides.	Slides are visually well designed, aesthetically pleasing with appropriate use of white space, visuals, and minimal text, on each slide. Color and animations are used judiciously. Theme (e.g., template) is evident throughout to produce a highly cohesive presentation. Free from errors (grammar, punctuation, spelling, formatting, etc.) on the slides.	/10
Presentation / Oral Delivery (Group grade)	Ineffective in delivering the oral presentation demonstrating below average/poor communication skills. Substantially over/under the time limit to present and/or not all members presented. Lack of preparation was evident. Names are not anonymized.	Somewhat effective in delivering the oral presentation demonstrating average communication skills. Slightly over/under the time limit. Some members presented more than others. More preparation was needed.	Effective in delivering the oral presentation demonstrating good communication skills and generally close to the time limit for the group to present (12 minutes total). All group members presented and preparation was evident for the most part.	Highly effective in delivering a well-polished oral presentation within the time limit for the group to present (12 minutes total). All group members presented equally. Preparation was strongly evident. Names are anonymized.	/10
Contribution to Group (Individual grade)	Based on students' self and peer evaluation forms, group member rarely participated or contributed to the project towards achieving the goals and meeting the deadline. Did not share workload fairly and/or was a disruptive influence.	Based on students' self and peer evaluation forms, group member participated in the project but emphasis was in completing own work. Allowed others to assume leadership and/or may have not shared workload fairly towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline.	Based on students' self and peer evaluation forms, group member participated in the project and shared the workload. Contributed to the development of the presentation. Worked towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline.	Based on students' self and peer evaluation forms, group member participated fully in the project and shared the workload fairly. Contributed to the development of the presentation and assisted in editing others' work to produce a polished presentation. Coordinated group's efforts and/or demonstrated leadership to facilitate and achieve the project goals and meet deadline.	/10
Total					/40