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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 N/A

IV. TExES Competencies N/A

V. Course Objectives/Learning Outcomes

This course is designed to meet 2016 CACREP standards outlined below:

1. CACREP Doctoral Standard B.5.g: Strategies of leadership in consultation.
2. CACREP Doctoral Standard B.5.i: Role of counselors and counselor educators advocating on behalf of the profession and professional identity.
3. CACREP Doctoral Standard B.5.j: Models and competencies for advocating for clients at the individual, system, and policy levels.
4. CACREP Doctoral Standard B.5.l: Ethical and culturally relevant leadership and advocacy practices.

Student learning outcomes in this course are:
1. Students will create and execute a consultation process as evidenced by 80% of students receiving a rating of good or above on professor’s rubric for the Team Consultation Project.
2. Students will evaluate consultation projects of peers, providing useful and appropriate feedback, as evidenced by 80% of students receiving a rating of good or above on professor’s rubric for Critiques of peer team consultation projects.
3. Students will analyze advocacy models and competencies for ethical and culturally relevant advocacy practices as evidenced by 80% of students receiving a rating of good or above on rubric for Advocacy Leadership project.
4. Students will analyze applicability of current literature to advocacy issues important to issues related to advocacy for the profession, professional identity, and clients as evidenced by 80% of students earning a rating of good or above on professor’s rubric for journal article discussion threads.
VI. Course Topics

The major topics to be considered include but are not limited to advocacy competencies and models, current issues in counselor advocacy for the profession and for clients at local, state, and national levels, policy issues relevant to clients and the counseling profession, and consultation.

VII. Instructional Methods and Activities

Methods and activities for instruction include, but are not limited to, the following:
A. Traditional and online experiences, including reading and seminar-style discussion of text and selected materials and use of discussion threads. The text and other required readings will be the primary basis for meaningful class discussions and critical analysis activities.
B. Clinical/field experiences, including group consultation project and advocacy project, and reflective dialogs. Additional sources of information and study will include presenting and critiquing projects 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 (30%): Course participants will conduct a team consultation project in an actual setting (e.g., mental health agency, school, professional association, university, etc.). This project should be both meaningful and challenging. Teams will have no more than 3 members. As a group, teams will conduct the 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 completed the project, you will do three assignments: (a) write the consultation paper (15 pts.), (b) conduct a semi-formal class presentation (9 pts.), and (c) submit a personal journal (6 pts.).

- The paper will describe consultation project from the beginning to end, including
  - consultation model/theory used and rationale for the choice,
  - case conceptualization,
  - stages of consultation (in detail),
  - evaluation plan, and
  - final report to be presented to consultee.

Please note that you will need to incorporate professional literature in your paper to support your consultation methods.

- The presentation should be geared for 15-20 minutes and will include
  - description of the setting,
  - problem/issue to be addressed,
  - brief identification consultation model used,
  - challenges encountered and/or anticipated, and
  - evaluation plan

The consultation paper and semi-formal class presentation will be completed as a team; the journal is maintained individually.
A personal journal is intended to help you be self-reflective about your thoughts, feelings, issues/concerns, and decisions during the consultation process. The journal will be submitted directly to the instructor either electronically via Bb messages or in hard copy. The journal will only be seen by the instructor.

Note: Each student is responsible for submitting a copy of the paper and presentation (notes, PP, etc.) via the assignments page for the purpose of tracking course alignments.

Your paper will be critiqued by the instructor and peers. You, as a team, are responsible to make all appropriate corrections from the constructive feedback you receive. The final report will be sent to the consultation setting you chose as a contribution. Each individual team member must also submit team member evaluations to the professor using the form provided on Bb. These will be kept private.

2. **Critiques (10%)**: Each consultation team will critique two peer Team Consultation plans, providing useful and appropriate feedback and suggestions that demonstrate ability to critically examine professional work of peers. The critique should include at minimum (a) strengths and challenges of the plan, (b) comments regarding implementation of the plan, (c) multicultural considerations, and recommendations and/or suggestions. Critiques must be written and submitted to each team critiqued as well as to the professor. Critiques should be at the level of professorial feedback.

3. **Advocacy article discussion threads (15%)**: Each individual will select, summarize, and present two professional journal articles pertaining to advocacy to classmates and the instructor. Presentation will be in a thread established by the instructor. The individual will be responsible for initiating and managing a discussion within the thread about each article. Bibliographic information and an outline of the article, including main points, shall be included in the initial post to each thread in order to orient peers to the article and its content. Clear invitation to peers that indicates what you would like them to consider in the thread should also be included.

4. **Advocacy Leadership Project (30%)**: Each individual will design a seminar concerning a specific aspect of advocacy that is appropriate for presentation to a professional conference. The seminar should reflect a specific focus on advocacy for the profession, for professional identity, or for consumers of counseling services at the individual, system, and/or policy levels. The seminar should include discussion of policies that impact the chosen focus. In addition, discussion of an advocacy model and references appropriate for the focus should be included. Utilize a PowerPoint or similar format that you would use in a professional presentation.

5. **Use of On-Line Community (15%)**: Each individual is responsible for active and timely participation in the on-line venues of this course. For instance, timely and full participation in the discussion threads which indicate thoughtful consideration of whatever topic is under discussion is expected. Participation in each thread by class members is required. Responses should be thoughtful and add to scholarly discussion. Responses may include reference to additional articles and previous learning on the topic of article being discussed. Failure to participate fully in discussion thread responses may result in loss of up to half of available points. Class members should keep in mind two things: (a) this is a blended class, which means that over half of your class time will be spent in other than a face-to-face setting—this does not mean you have less responsibility in the class; and (b) organizations and associations are making increasing use of on-line environments to accomplish the work of various groups. It is an economical and efficient use of people’s time and association/organization resources. However, successful use of on-line environments requires those responsible for tasks to give on-line work as much attention as would be given in a face-to-face meeting. I take this very seriously.

**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 in face-to-face classes, participation in on-line forums, including those that are not graded, preparation, and participation are expected for successful completion of the course. Failure to participate may result in a reduction of up to one letter grade.

B. Grading Scale

A = 90-100%  B = 80-89%  C = 70-79%  D = 60-69%  F = <60

IX. Course Schedule and Policies

Course Schedule: The schedule below, including F2F/Online plan, is tentative and may be adapted to meet the needs of the group. Deadlines for submitted work, however, are firm. Please inform instructor of conflicts for professional meetings as early as possible in the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>F2F/Online</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Assignments &amp; Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/22</td>
<td>Introduction to course</td>
<td>Text, Intro to Part I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2F 4:20-6:00</td>
<td>Discussion of assignments and teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of consultation theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CACREP Doctoral Standard B.5.g.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>01/29</td>
<td>Advocacy competencies review</td>
<td>Text, Chapters 2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2F 4:20-6:15</td>
<td>Continued overview of consultation theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q&amp;A, discussion re consultation planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CACREP Doctoral Standard B.5.g and B.5.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>02/05</td>
<td>Pragmatics of working with organizations</td>
<td>Text, Chapter 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2F 4:20-6:00</td>
<td>Leading teams</td>
<td>Consultation Site Selection*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal/ethical considerations in consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continued discussion of theories as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CACREP Doctoral Standard B.5.g and B.5.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>02/12</td>
<td>Team meetings</td>
<td>Submit Written Consent from a Selected Consultation Site* (BbMessages Oliver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Initiation of Discussion Thread 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team appointments with professor as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>02/19</td>
<td>Team meetings</td>
<td>Text, Chapters 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Initiation of Discussion Thread 1</td>
<td>Initial data gathering visit to consultation site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team appointments with professor as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>02/26</td>
<td>Q&amp;A and supervision re consultation projects</td>
<td>Text, Chapters 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2F 4:20-6:00</td>
<td>Impact of policies on clients, counselors, and educators</td>
<td>Report: Progress and difficulties (in class discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CACREP Doctoral Standard B.5.i, B.5.j, and B.5.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>Plans in consultation; supervision</td>
<td>Report: Progress and difficulties (the End of Data Collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2F 4:20-6:30</td>
<td>Advocacy Discussion</td>
<td>Responses to Discussion Threads should be on-going (Bb Discussions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/18</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>On-going online discussion of professional journal articles regarding advocacy</td>
<td>Readings as assigned Report: Progress and difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team appointments with professor as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/25</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Multicultural/diversity issues in consultation and in advocacy (Discussion thread by professor)</td>
<td>Report: Progress and Difficulties Other Required Readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team appointments with professor as needed (CACREP Doctoral Standard B.5.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/01</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Other Issues in Consultation and Collaboration</td>
<td>Text, Chapter 7 Initial Draft Due (post to thread!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team appointments with professor as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/08</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Report preparation</td>
<td>Advocacy Leadership Project Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critiques of Consultation Project Due (Post to thread)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/4/15</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Consultation presentations in class</td>
<td>Presentations of Projects Individual Journals Due (hard copy or BBMessages to Oliver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:20-6:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/4/22</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Individual/team meetings by appointment as needed</td>
<td>Final Consultation Report Due (BB Forum &amp; BbMessages to ALL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/4/29</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Consultation Report Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:20-6:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/5/06</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Reflective Evaluation</td>
<td>Submission of Final Report to Sites (BbMessages copy to Oliver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:20-6:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policies:**

This is a blended course, which means that up to 85% of the course may be delivered online. Blended courses do not require less work! As you look at assignments, including reading and any discussion in the community that I may post throughout the course, remember that your level of performance should account for the reality that over 70% of the time you would otherwise spend in class is now available for you to schedule as you wish, as long as deadlines are met. You should NOT expect to complete the work in that time period, however. You should anticipate an additional number of out-of-class hours just as you would need to spend in any other class.

**Attendance:** Attendance and participation is required for face-to-face meetings. Experiences conducted within the course are highly interactive and they cannot be replicated. Excessive absence will impact the grade, as indicated above. Likewise, full participation in on-line discussions is required.

**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 (7th ed.)*. Failure to utilize APA guidelines as appropriate for the assignment will impact the grade on that assignment.

**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:


You may also wish to utilize:


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:


*Note: See also ACA Advocacy Competencies (updated 2018)* at https://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/competencies/aca-2018-advocacy-
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 Rule 13.02.99.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 (15 pts.), the class presentation (9 pts), and the journal (6 pts). Instructions for the assignment (presented earlier in this syllabus) should be reviewed and adhered to carefully.

Excellent—(score of 27 or above of 30 available points). Paper: Clear and thorough discussion of the model, clear case conceptualization, detailed discussion of the stages in the project, appropriate 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 leader in consultation, 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—(score of 24-26 or above of 30 available points). 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—(score of 21-23 or above of 30 available points). 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—(score of 20 or below) Paper: Demonstrates minimal effort or comprehension. Presentation: Discussion difficult to understand. Journal: Demonstrates little or no regard for jounaling assignment, little understanding of reflective process. Significant mechanical problems, and frequent major errors in APA style, punctuation, and spelling may be present.

Critique of Peer Consultation Projects*
*(combination of two critique scores)*

Excellent—(score of 9 or above of 10 points). 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. Critique is appropriate for a faculty member’s feedback to a student and is clearly helpful to the consultation team. Writing is clear, concise, and free of errors.

Good—(score of 8 of 10 points). 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. May be more appropriate for peer-to-peer feedback rather than faculty member’s feedback to a student. Major writing mechanics of the paper are strong, though there may be some mistakes.

Adequate—(score of 7 of 10 points). 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. Of limited help to consultation team. Errors in punctuation, citation, style, spelling, and other mechanics may be present.

Inadequate—(score of 6 or below). 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. Not helpful to consultation team. Significant mechanical problems, and frequent major errors in APA style, punctuation, and spelling may be present.

Article Discussion Thread

Excellent—(score of 13.5 or above of 15 points). Summary is clear, concise, and well-organized. Initiation of thread discussion is appropriate and at the level a new faculty member might provide for a class. Discussion and ability to respond to peer questions and comments reflect thorough understanding of the material presented.

Good—(score of 12-13.49 of 15 points). Summary is clear, though it may lack some organization. May have limitations in initiation of discussion. Discussion and ability to respond to peer questions and comments generally reflect understanding of the material presented.

Adequate—(score of 10-11.5 of 15 points). Summary may be somewhat confusing. Initiation of the discussion may be awkward. 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—(below 10). Summary not clear, is confusing, or demonstrates lack of familiarity with article. Initiation of thread is cursory. Discussion and ability to respond to peer questions and comments may demonstrate lack of understanding of material or a failure to prepare.

Use of On-Line Community

Excellent—(score of 13.5 or above of 15 points). Responses are clear, concise, and well-organized. Responses to thread discussion is appropriate and at the level a new faculty member might provide for a class. Introduction of questions, information from additional sources, and addition to scholarly discourse is evident.

Good—(score of 12-13.49 of 15 points). Responses are clear, though may lack some organization. Responses to thread discussions may be limited in some ways and may not contribute fully to scholarly discourse about the topic/article presented. Some evidence of thoughtful consideration is provided.

Adequate—(score of 10-11.5 of 15 points). Responses may be confusing and/or limited. While some evidence of thought given to the topic/article is present, the response may appear to be off topic and connections may not be made. There may be little attempt to gain more information or understand.

Inadequate—(below 10). Responses are not clear or are confusing. Response appears to be made simply to complete the task rather than engage in scholarly discussion. Response to thread, whether initial post or of on-going discussion, appears cursory and demonstrates little thought.