|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Components** | | | | |
|  | **Emerging** | **Competent** | **Mentor Comments** | **Review Team Comments** |
| **Connections/ Integration** | 1. Identifies and connects theories perceived as related to their own interests and experiences. 2. Gives evidence of basic knowledge of at least two major concepts and references in the field. 3. Theories are compatible. 4. Uses primary resources. 5. Applies concepts to the practice of supervision. Shows ease of access to own life narrative. | 1. Effectively selects and develops examples of life experiences, drawn from a variety of contexts (e.g., family life, artistic participation, civic involvement, work experience), to illuminate their theory. |  |  |
| 1. Shows substantial knowledge of major concepts and references in the field. |  |  |
| 1. Gives evidence of a working familiarity with (same as above), and critical use of relevant literature in the field by demonstrating awareness of primary sources critical of the theory being espoused. |  |  |
| 1. Connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study, discipline, or perspective. |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrates how their theory connects with the components of CPE (e.g., application process, orientation, verbatim seminar, IPR, evaluations) |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrates compatibility of theories with life as they have lived it. |  |  |
| **Reflection and Self- Assessment** | 1. Describes their work and experiences in general terms of success and failure. 2. Articulates a basic understanding of their own strengths and challenges. | 1. Reflects on their own changes in learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk; deals with frustration and conflict). |  |  |
| 1. Clearly includes awareness of their own cultural and belief-system biases. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Components** | | | | |
|  | **Emerging** | **Competent** | **Mentor Comments** | **Review Team Comments** |
| **Utilization of Theory** | 1. Articulates a basic understanding of relevant literature in the field. 2. Can describe a method for the “what” as well as “how” of supervision.      1. Gives a basic description of how their theories are compatible. Uses primary resources.      1. Applies concepts to the practice of supervision. | 1. Develops their own theoretical position illustrating content competency. |  |  |
| 1. Illustrates critical use of relevant literature in the field. |  |  |
| 1. Articulates the theoretical “why” that informs their supervision, incorporating rather than elaborating upon on the methodological “what” or “how.” |  |  |
| 1. Represents theorists and resources accurately and in context |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrates how theories inform their practice of supervision (assessment/goals/strategies and interventions) |  |  |
| **Critical Purchase** | 1. Identifies implications of their theories      1. Describes the strengths and weaknesses of their theorists’ views      1. Describes strengths and weaknesses of their own theories. 2. Identifies the theoretical match and discrepancies between the primary assumptions of his/her theorists’ views and their own theories | 1. Addresses implications of and the strengths and weaknesses of their theorists’ views |  |  |
| 1. Examines the theoretical match and discrepancies between the primary assumptions of their theorists’ views and provides relevant examples from the literature and personal experience. |  |  |
| 1. Addresses what happens when their theory does not work. |  |  |
| **Congruence** | 1. Chooses theories that seem to be at odds with one another without showing awareness of same. | 1. Chooses theories compatible with each other and provides examples that demonstrate this. |  |  |
| **Overall Components** | | | | |
|  | **Emerging** | **Competent** | **Mentor Comments** | **Review Team Comments** |
| **Multi-Cultural/ Multi-Faith** | 1. Demonstrates a basic understanding of the multi-cultural, multi-faith dynamics and complexities that are inherent to the educational and supervisory process, but lacks depth and application | 1. Explicitly identifies and addresses multi-cultural, multi-faith dynamics and complexities both in theoretical constructs as well as in examples related to the educational and supervisory process and the clinical setting |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrates understanding of how cultural/ethnic identity impacts personality/theology and the educational process. |  |  |
| **Group Theory** | 1. Describes in a basic a theory of supervision (no mention of group) | 1. Demonstrates an understanding of theory, which promotes learning in groups. |  |  |
| 1. Describes alternate approaches when their group theory is not working. |  |  |
| **Use of Examples** | 1. Provides sufficient examples that illustrate therapeutic insights or interventions without connecting them to the student’s spiritual care or professional formation, identity and competence. | 1. Provides actual clinical examples which illustrate the theoretical underpinnings of supervisory practice. |  |  |
| 1. Gives examples including a variety of students and learning issues. |  |  |
| **Structure** | 1. Utilizes basic structure to organize thoughts and sources. | 1. Assimilates materials into a coherent and integrated whole rather than merely stringing together random ideas. Presentation has a clear beginning and ending and is clearly focused throughout. |  |  |
| 1. Uses endnotes and bibliography to document competent knowledge of their theory; without “padding.” |  |  |
| 1. Syntax, spelling, format, punctuation, etc., is of graduate-level quality. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Specific Educational Theory Components** | | | |
| **Emerging** | **Competent** | **Mentor Comments** | **Review Team Comments** |
| 1. Offers a basic view of how people learn and can articulate a basic understanding of educational theory 2. Does not sufficiently demonstrate the application of theory in the various components of the CPE Process. | 1. Articulates a comprehensive understanding of an educational theory of how persons learn (and fail to learn) individually and in groups, rooted in the sciences and behavioral sciences |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrates how theory informs one’s assessments and interventions. |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrates how theory makes use of the various components of the CPE Process including orientation, verbatim seminar, IPR and the evaluation process |  |  |
| 1. Presents a vision of CPE as a model for education in multiple professional contexts. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Specific Personality Theory Components** | | | |
| **Emerging** | **Competent** | **Mentor Comments** | **Review Team Comments** |
| 1. Offers a basic view of human nature and development. Identifies compatible theorists but does not apply to practice. 2. Focuses on therapeutic approaches without application to clinical practice and spiritual care education. | 1. Articulates an in-depth understanding of how personality is formed and shaped by cultural context. | . |  |
| 1. Articulates an in-depth understanding of how one grows and develops including factors that both contribute to and hinder growth and development. |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrates how one’s personality theory informs practice. Gives specific examples of one’s assessment of student learning and supervisory interventions. |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrates how one’s personality theory informs program design and CPE curriculum including, but not limited to, orientation, verbatim seminars, group process, didactics, and the evaluation process |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Specific Spiritual Belief System Components** | | | |
| **Emerging** | **Competent** | **Mentor Comments** | **Review Team Comments** |
| 1. Relies on vague and general concepts about God/The Transcendent without reference to historical movements or contexts. 2. Articulates an understanding of theory without critical reflection on its influence in the learning process. 3. Shows minimal awareness of the theological implications that are congruent with the mission and values of ACPE (i.e. inclusivity, justice, etc.) | 1. Describes a comprehensive understanding of God/The Transcendent and grounds the understanding in their individual religious/spiritual tradition. |  |  |
| 1. Articulates ideas of how humankind relates to God/The Transcendent and the impact/ramifications/ influence that these ideas have on their supervisory practice. |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrates a spiritual maturity that results in choosing theories of complexity and emotional and spiritual richness as the foundation for the ideas and examples presented. |  |  |
| 1. Articulates the interplay of ACPE’s culture and mission, to the work of theologians and teachers in the field and spiritual resources of a variety of religious/spiritual traditions. |  |  |
| 1. Clearly identifies religious/spiritual heritage and current beliefs/personal philosophy of theology and current beliefs/practice and how these relate to their theories and impact their work with students |  |  |
| 1. Includes references to cultural context, theological/spiritual perspective, personal formation, and development |  |  |