I. Course Description
CNEP 6335, Consultation Theory and Professional Advocacy, 3 semester hrs. This course is designed to identify effective consultation approaches/styles and advocacy action planning. Students will acquire skills in assessing needs of counselors in training, developing programs and techniques for change, and program evaluation.

II. Rationale
Counselor educators must understand and be able to utilize various approaches to consultation and advocacy. A foundation in theories and methods of consultation and social change theories as related to multicultural issues, and an understanding of political and topical issues that impact the field are critical components of leadership in the field.

III. State Adopted Proficiencies for Teachers and/or Administrators/Counselors

Standard I. Learner-Centered Knowledge: The certified school counselor has a broad knowledge base. The certified school counselor must know and understand (2) counseling and consultation theories and practices.

Standard II. Learner-Centered Skills: The certified school counselor applies the knowledge base to promote the educational, personal, social, and career development of the learner. The certified school counselor must (1) develop processes and procedures for planning, designing, implementing, and evaluating a developmental guidance and counseling program and (10) advocate for a developmental guidance and counseling program that is responsive to all students.

IV. TExES Competencies (if applicable)

Competency 004 (Program Management): The school counselor understands how to plan, implement, and evaluate a developmental guidance program, including counseling services, that promotes all students' success.

V. Course Objectives/Learning Outcomes

This course is designed to enable students to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and practices beyond the entry-level in the following areas:

CACREP Doctoral Standard II-C-1: Theories pertaining to the principles and practice of career counseling, career development, group work, systems, consultation, and crises, disasters, and other trauma-causing events.
CACREP Doctoral Standard II-C-4: Pedagogy relevant to multicultural issues and competencies, including social change theory and advocacy action planning.

CACREP Doctoral Standard II-C-7: Legal and ethical considerations in counselor education and supervision.

CACREP Doctoral Standard IV-C-1: Major roles, responsibilities, and activities of counselor educators.

CACREP Doctoral Standard IV-D-3: Ability to assess the needs of counselors in training and develop techniques to help students develop into competent counselors.

CACREP Doctoral Standard IV-E-4: Models and methods of program evaluation.

CACREP Doctoral Standard IV-F-6: Ability to create and implement a program evaluation design.


CACREP Doctoral Standard IV-I-5: Current topical and political issues in counseling and how those issues affect the daily work of counselors and the counseling profession.

CACREP Doctoral Standard IV-J-1: Ability to provide leadership or contribute to leadership efforts of professional organizations and/or counseling programs.

CACREP Doctoral Standard IV-J-2: Ability to advocate for the profession and its clientele.

**Student learning objectives for this course include the following:**

1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of consultation theories as evidenced by evaluations of adequate or above on evaluations of presentations regarding theory, consultation papers, and critiques of peer developmental plans and papers.

2. Students will demonstrate understanding of evaluation models as evidenced by professor rankings of adequate or above on evaluation plans for their consultation projects and critiques of peer evaluation.

3. Students will demonstrate understanding of advocacy models and the ability to advocate for clients and for the profession. Assessment will be based on ratings of adequate or above on journal article discussion both in class and online, as well as on participation in advocacy issues addressed in class.

**VI. Course Topics**

The major topics to be considered include but are not limited to consultation theories and models, advocacy models and action planning (for profession and for clients, at local, state, and national levels), program evaluation, political issues and current topics impacting counseling.

**VII. Instructional Methods and Activities**

Methods and activities for instruction include, but are not limited to, the following:

A. Traditional experiences, including reading and discussion of text and selected materials, including seminar-style discussion of case conceptualization and conferencing. The text and other required readings will be the primary basis for meaningful class discussions and critical analysis.
activities.

B. Clinical/field experiences, including student presentation development and delivery, group consultation and advocacy project, small group work, project evaluation, and reflective dialogs. Additional sources of information and study will be through skill building role plays, presentation, implementing technologies, and other experiential classroom activities. Since this course is a doctoral level course in counselor education, students will engage in and practice a wide range of activities to enhance their research, teaching, and writing skills.

VIII. Evaluation and Grade Assignment

The methods of evaluation and the criteria for grade assignment are:

A. Methods and Percentage of Final Course Grade Each Assessment Constitutes

1. **Team Consultation Project (50%)**:

   Course participants will conduct a team consultation project in an actual setting (i.e., mental health agencies, schools, professional associations, etc.). This project will be both meaningful and challenging. Teams will have no more than 3 members. As a group, you will conduct this project based on consultation models, stages, and strategies appropriate for the site and project. You have **two weeks** to gather information from the setting you chose to study. The instructor will serve as a supervisor of consultation teams. Before implementing theories/models and techniques into practice, your team and project must be approved by the instructor.

   Once you have obtained the information required, you will complete **three assignments**: a) write the consultation paper (25%), b) conduct a semi-formal class presentation (15%), and c) submit a personal journal (10%). The paper and presentation will describe your consultation project from the beginning to end including a) consultation models/theories, b) case conceptualization, c) stages of consultation (in detail), and d) developmental plan. Please note that you will need to incorporate professional literature in your paper to support your consultation methods. A personal journal is intended to help you be self reflective about your thoughts and feelings during the consultation process. You will write this journal individually and submit it directly to the instructor. This journal will be kept confidential from your consultation team members and classmates.

   Your paper will be critiqued by the instructor and peers. You, as a team, are responsible to make all corrections from the constructive feedback you receive. The **final report** will be sent to the consultation setting you chose as a contribution.

2. **Critique of a Developmental Plan (10%)**:

   Each **team** will evaluate and critique a developmental plan that another group presented to enhance the quality of the plan. The evaluation and critique include a) characteristics of the plan, b) strengths and challenges, c) implementing the plan, d) multicultural considerations, and e) suggestions and recommendations. The critique will be written in narrative format.

3. **Profession Journal Article (10%)**:

   Each **individual** will select, summarize, and present **two professional journal articles** pertaining to advocacy to classmates and the instructor. Presentation (10 minutes) will be in a discussion format. Bibliographic information and a brief synopsis shall be posted in BlackBoard prior to the class period in which the article is to be presented.

4. **Consultation Model (15%)**:

   Each **individual** will select **one consultation model** and present it to the class. The presenters will submit PowerPoint slides and/or handout(s) to the instructor **a week** prior to their presentation. All slides and handouts will be posted on BlackBoard or emailed to course
participants. Presentations are to be suitable for use in a master’s-level class. Topics must be approved by the instructor.

5. **Program Evaluation (15%)**: Each consultation team will prepare a program evaluation plan for the site where consultation was provided. The evaluation must be appropriate for the site and include all stages of the evaluation plan, including questions to be addressed, techniques and processes to be used, format of any reporting, and rationale for choices. Each team is responsible for having the plan critiqued by one member of another team and will incorporate comments and suggestions as appropriate. Each class member is responsible for providing at least one critique.

**Attendance & Participation**: Attendance and participation are critical to the learning process in this class. You are expected to actively participate in every class as this is important to creating a shared learning environment that will benefit each student. Therefore, attendance, punctuality, preparation, and participation are crucial. Individuals who cannot commit to regular attendance are asked to withdraw and take the course when they are able to attend and participate. I expect to be notified of an absence prior to class, unless it is deemed an emergency. Students who miss more than 15% of the class time will not be eligible for a final grade of A.

**B. Grading Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>80-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IX. Course Schedule and Policies**

**Course Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Assignments &amp; Readings Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/28</td>
<td>Introduction to Course Discussion and Planning Current Issues in Advocacy</td>
<td>Text, Intro to Part I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>02/04</td>
<td>Program Evaluation, Advocacy cont.</td>
<td>PowerPoint, notes in Bb Kellogg Foundation material (see bibliography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>02/11</td>
<td>Introduction to Consultation and Collaboration Pragmatics of Working with Organizations</td>
<td>Text, Chapters 1-2, 8 Casebook, Chapter 1 Consultation Site Selection*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>02/18</td>
<td>Stages of Consultation and Collaboration</td>
<td>Text, Chapters 2-6 Written Consent from a Selected Consultation Site*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>02/25</td>
<td>Consultation Models Consultation Model Presentation (1) Group Supervision</td>
<td>Text, Chapters 9-10 Casebook, Chapters 2-4 Enter a selected consultation site (the Beginning of Data Collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Session Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6/03/04 | Consultation Models  
Consultation Model Presentations (2)  
Data-Based Decision-Making  
Group Supervision  
Text, Chapters 11-12  
Casebook, Chapters 5-9  
Report: Progress and Difficulties |
| 7/03/11 | Developmental Plans in Consultation  
Discussion: Professional Journal Articles, Advocacy  
Report: Progress and Difficulties (the End of Data Collection)  
Professional Journal Articles Presentation* |
| 8/03/25 | Program Evaluation revisited  
Discussion: Professional Journal Articles, Advocacy  
Readings as assigned  
Report: Progress and Difficulties  
Professional Journal Articles Presentation* |
| 9/04/01 | Multicultural and Current Issues in Consultation  
Consultation Model Presentation (1)  
Report: Progress and Difficulties  
Other Required Readings  
Individual Journal* |
| 10/04/08 | Legal and Ethical Considerations  
Other Issues in Consultation and Collaboration  
Text, Chapter 7  
Team Consultation Project* |
| 11/04/15 | Consultation Model Presentation (2)  
and Report Preparation  
Presentation Materials  
Presentation Readings  
Other Required Readings |
| 12/04/22 | Consultation Model Presentation (2)  
Presentation Readings  
Other Required Readings  
Critique of a Developmental Plan* |
| 13/04/29 | Consultation Model Presentation (2)  
Final Consultation Report* |
| 14/05/06 | Consultation Report Discussion  
Final Report to Sites* |
| 15/05/13 | Program Evaluation Plan Due |

**Attendance:** Attendance and participation for this course are mandatory and necessary. Experiences that are conducted within the course are highly interactive and they cannot be replicated. Excessive absence will impact the grade, as indicated above.

**Late Work:** Late work is not appropriate for this course. Work depends in large part on collaboration among class colleagues. If for any reason you are unable to be prepared for a class, it is your responsibility to notify your team members and me.

**Preparation:** It is important and expected that you complete assignments prior to coming to class, including any assigned readings and other practice-based assignments. I will not generally facilitate by covering all the material in the assigned readings; however, you are responsible for any information...
assigned and expected to draw from assigned readings in completing assignments.

**Writing:** To get full credit on written assignments, course participants are required to strictly follow the guidelines in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.)*. Written assignments are weighted equally across four categories: mechanics, structure, completeness, and content.

**Note:** Student presentations will be scheduled according to the total enrollment in the class. The syllabus and schedule are subject to change in the event of extenuating circumstances. If you are absent from class, it is your responsibility to check on announcements made while you were absent.

**X. Textbook**

*The textbook adopted for this course is:*


Other reading materials will be assigned in class.

**XI. Bibliography**

*The knowledge bases that support course content and procedures include but are not limited to:*


Counseling, 8, 56-63.


You are also encouraged to look at the following materials regarding program evaluation.

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Logic Model Development Guide

http://www.unr.edu/colleges/educ/captta/preve/evaluate.htm

Also try www.hfrp.org/evaluation/publications-resources/indicators-definition-and-use-in-a-results-based-accountability-system (this is part of Harvard's Family Research Project). They have another article in this area that is Learning From Logic Models: An Example of a Family/School Partnership Program

www.innonet.org

http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/WC041

www.insites.org/documents/logmod.htm

XII. Grade Appeals

As stated in University Rule 13.02.99.C2, Student Grade Appeals, a student who believes that he or she has not been held to appropriate academic standards as outlined in the class syllabus, equitable evaluation procedures, or appropriate grading, may appeal the final grade given in the course. The burden of proof is upon the student to demonstrate the appropriateness of the appeal. A student with a complaint about a grade is encouraged to first discuss the matter with the instructor. For complete details, including the responsibilities of the parties involved in the process and the number of days allowed for completing the steps in the process, see University Rule13.02.99.C2, Student Grade Appeals, and University Procedure 13.02.99.C2.01, Student Grade Appeal Procedures. These documents are accessible through the University Rules Web site at http://www.tamucc.edu/provost/university_rules/index.html. For assistance and/or guidance in the grade appeal process, students may contact the Office of Student Affairs.

XIII. Disabilities Accommodations

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please call or visit Disability Services at (361) 825-5816 in Driftwood 101.

If you are a returning veteran and are experiencing cognitive and/or physical access issues in the classroom or on campus, please contact the Disability Services office for assistance at (361) 825-5816.
Grading Rubrics

Team Consultation Project

The project should reflect a particular consultation model, including relevant stages and strategies for the model. The final project will have three parts: the written consultation paper (25%), the class presentation (15%), and the journal (10%). Instructions for the assignment (presented earlier in this syllabus) should be reviewed and adhered to carefully.

Excellent—Paper: Clear and thorough discussion of the model, clear case conceptualization, detailed discussion of the stages in the project, appropriate developmental plan. Professional literature to support the use of the model in the setting is included. Consideration of multicultural issues is included. Presentation: Includes concise and clear description of the above, allowing peers to have an accurate understanding of what is being done. Journal: Demonstrates self reflective process concerning your development as a consultant, your strengths as well as areas for growth, and the progress of the project overall. Well organized and logically presented. Grammar, punctuation, spelling, citations, and references are correct.

Good—Paper: Generally clear discussion, but may be somewhat difficult to follow. Includes elements listed above, but may not always demonstrate excellent analysis of information. Presentation: Includes description of the above, but may not be as clear or concise, and may leave peers with some questions. Journal: Demonstrates self reflective process concerning your development as a consultant, your strengths as well as areas for growth, and the progress of the project overall. Major mechanics of the material are strong, despite occasional mistakes.

Adequate—Paper: Discussion of material may be unclear, vague, or offer insufficient information. Elements outlined above are present, but are not well presented, or essential concepts are not fully covered. Presentation: May reflect similar lack of clarity or insufficient information. Journal: May demonstrate only limited insight about one’s own development in consultation, or may indicate lack of care in documenting process of development. Errors in punctuation, citation, style, spelling, and other mechanics may be present.

Inadequate—Paper: Demonstrates minimal effort or comprehension. Presentation: Discussion difficult to understand. Journal: Demonstrates little or no regard for journaling assignment, little understanding of reflective process. Significant mechanical problems, and frequent major errors in APA style, punctuation, and spelling may be present.

Critique of Developmental Plan

Excellent: Critique reflects thorough understanding of the model being used, and includes all elements listed in assignment. Feedback is constructive, useful, and appropriate. Strengths and challenges are clearly identified. Writing is clear, concise, and free of errors.

Good: Critique reflects understanding of the model being used, and includes all elements listed in the assignment. Feedback may lack clarity or be somewhat difficult to follow. Most strengths and challenges are identified. Major writing mechanics of the paper are strong, though there may be some mistakes.
Adequate: Critique reflects basic understanding of the model, but lacks clarity. Some minor elements of assignment may be lacking, and feedback may be somewhat lacking in utility. Some strengths and challenges are identified. Errors in punctuation, citation, style, spelling, and other mechanics may be present.

Inadequate: Critique reflects little understanding of the model, or major elements listed in the assignment are missing. Feedback is inappropriate for the model or the setting. There is little evidence of thoughtfulness about strengths or challenges. Significant mechanical problems, and frequent major errors in APA style, punctuation, and spelling may be present.

Professional Journal Article Presentations

Excellent: Summary is clear, concise, and well-organized. Discussion and ability to respond to peer questions and comments reflect thorough understanding of the material presented.

Good: Summary is clear, though it may lack some organization. Discussion and ability to respond to peer questions and comments generally reflect understanding of the material presented.

Adequate: Summary may be somewhat confusing. There may be too much reliance on referring to the article itself in order to provide summary. Discussion and ability to respond to peer questions and comments may reflect some difficulty with the material.

Inadequate: Summary not clear or is confusion, or demonstrates lack of familiarity with article. Discussion and ability to respond to peer questions and comments may demonstrate lack of understanding of material or a failure to prepare.

Consultation Model Presentation

The presentation should demonstrate thorough understanding of a particular theoretical model. The presentation should thoroughly cover the theory, population, multicultural considerations, and any other pertinent information about the topic. Evaluation will be multi-faceted, and shall include: 1. thoroughness of presentation; 2. appropriate use of PowerPoint or other materials; 3. presentation style. Thoroughness will account for 45% of the evaluation, appropriate use of materials will account for 35%, and style will account for 20%. Specifics for excellent, good, adequate, and inadequate ratings are outlined below.

Thoroughness:
Excellent—Clear outline or discussion of theory, including critical evaluation, theoretical assumptions, factors that impact change, ideas about future research that would build on existing literature, and multicultural and diversity issues. Well organized and logically presented. Grammar, punctuation, spelling, citations, and references are correct.

Good—Generally clear outline or discussion, but may be somewhat difficult to follow. Includes elements listed above, but may not always demonstrate excellent analysis of information. Major mechanics of the material are strong, despite occasional mistakes.

Adequate—Outline or discussion of material may be unclear, vague, or offer insufficient information. Elements outlined above are present, but are not well presented, or essential concepts are not fully
covered. Errors in punctuation, citation, style, spelling, and other mechanics.

Inadequate—Demonstrates minimal effort or comprehension. Outline or discussion difficult to understand. Significant mechanical problems, and frequent major errors in APA style, punctuation, and spelling.

Program Evaluation

Each student must demonstrate knowledge of program evaluation procedures, both by preparing an evaluation for the site where consultation was provided and by providing a critique for one other individual’s evaluation procedures. The critique may not be done for a peer working with you on your project.

Excellent: The evaluation is appropriate for the site and includes questions to be addressed, techniques and processes to be used, format of any reporting, and rationale for choices. The evaluation plan is consistent with the objectives of the consultation as well as the model used. The critique of another’s evaluation plan provides useful and appropriate feedback concerning each of these elements.

Good: The evaluation is appropriate for the site and includes questions to be addressed, techniques and processes to be used, format of any reporting, and rationale for choices. The evaluation plan is largely consistent with the objectives of the consultation as well as the model used, although methods of evaluation may not clearly address the objectives. The critique of another’s evaluation plan provides useful and appropriate feedback concerning each of these elements, though it may lack some clarity.

Adequate: The evaluation is generally appropriate for the site. Questions, techniques, and process to be used may be somewhat unclear or may not entirely fit the objectives of the consultation. The critique of another’s evaluation plan may provide limited useful feedback or may reflect similar issues with clarity of evaluation in relationship to objectives.

Inadequate: The evaluation is inappropriate for the site, for the model, or for the objectives of the consultation project. Questions, techniques, and processes do not address the goals of the project. The critique reflects little understanding of elements of program evaluation, or appears to be done at the last minute, with little consideration of the project evaluated.