



OSCE FOR MANDATORY REPORTING

POST-OSCE REFLECTION RATING SCALE

Please circle the number corresponding to the participant's performance.

1. CRITICAL REFLECTION

Q.1 To what extent is the participant's reflection accurate to the behaviours observed?

Does not apply a critical reflection of their strengths and limitations. Unable to draw upon specific action behaviours to support their reflective assessment. Their reflections are not aligned with the observed behaviours.	Some critical reflection of their strengths and/or limitations, but do not draw upon specific action behaviours to support their reflective assessment.	Some critical reflection of their strengths and/or limitations. Identifies some action behaviours to support their reflective assessment. Some of their reflections are aligned with the behaviours observed.	A critical reflection of their strengths as well as limitations. Identifies some action behaviours to support their reflective assessment. Their reflections for the most part are aligned with the behaviours observed.	Offers a balanced and comprehensive critical reflection of their strengths as well as limitations. Provides nuanced examples of their action behaviours to support their reflective assessment. Their reflections are aligned with the behaviours observed.				
1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

2. CONCEPTUALIZATION OF CHILD MALTREATMENT ISSUE

Q.2 How was the participant able to identify the type of maltreatment and what was the evidence?

Does not identify a child maltreatment issue.	Identifies child maltreatment but cannot specify the type.	Identifies child maltreatment but the type is incorrect and provides no supporting evidence.	Identifies the correct type of child maltreatment issue and provides no supporting evidence.	Identifies the correct type of child maltreatment issue and can provide supporting evidence.				
1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

3. CONCEPTUALIZATION OF DECISION-MAKING/USE OF KNOWLEDGE

Q.3 How does information gathered in session inform participants' thinking of the child maltreatment issue?

Does not gather information around the circumstances of maltreatment.	Gathers information but discounts what is gathered.	Gathers some information around the circumstances of maltreatment but from limited perspectives (i.e. only parent or child).	Gathers information around the circumstances of maltreatment from multiple perspectives but does not assess severity.	Recognizes the complexity of circumstances and seeks to gather information from multiple perspectives and severity levels to inform decision-making.				
1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

Q.4 How does the participant engage in the decision-making process?

Was not engaged in a decision-making process.	Aware they were engaged in a decision-making process, but not able to articulate how.	Engaged in a decision-making process and begins to identify one decision-making factor.	Engaged in a decision-making process and can identify more than one decision-making factor.	Actively engaged in the decision-making process. Carefully considers and grapples with multiple factors in the decision-making process.				
1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

Q5. How do participants approach the client with regards to reporting child maltreatment?

Does not believe the situation is reportable and does not discuss reporting with the client.	Identifies a reportable situation. Attempts once to discuss reporting but moves to other topics.	Identifies a reportable situation. Attempts to discuss reporting but allows client to close the conversation.	Identifies a reportable situation. Discusses with client the need to report but does not articulate the reason.	Identifies a reportable situation. Discusses with client the need to report and reasons for the report.				
1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

4. SELF-REGULATION

Q.6 How do participants manage their emotions to the child maltreatment issue?

Unaware of their emotions.	Self-focused, pre-occupied with own emotions which impede exploring the child maltreatment issue with the client.	Aware of their emotions but concerned about managing both theirs and the client's emotions in exploring the child maltreatment issue.	Raises child maltreatment issue but struggles to control their emotions while exploring child maltreatment issue.	Use emotions purposefully. The focus on self is balanced with exploring child maltreatment and remaining client-focused.				
1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

5. CLINICAL RELATIONSHIP

Q.7 How do participants recognize relationship rupture?

Unaware that a relationship rupture has occurred.	Recognize that the relationship has shifted but is not able to identify whether a relationship rupture has occurred.	Recognize that the relationship has shifted and is able to articulate the circumstances of this relationship rupture.	Recognizes a relationship rupture has occurred. Is able to articulate how client is presenting.	Recognizes a relationship rupture has occurred. Is able to articulate how client is presenting. Can identify their own position in this junction of the relationship.				
1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

Content:

Q.8 How do participants conceptualize relationship repair strategies?

Does not use relationship repair strategies or discounts the value of repair strategies with the case.	Can identify relationship repair strategies but unable to apply them to the case.	Lists one relationship repair strategy without elucidation.	Lists multiple relationship repair strategies without elucidation.	Considers strengths and challenges of multiple relationship repair strategies from both self and client perspectives.				
1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

Process:

Q.9 How do participants utilize relationship repair strategies in continued work with the client?

Unable to identify future relationship repair strategies or would refer client.	Can identify future relationship repair strategies but unable to apply them to the case.	Lists one relationship repair strategy without elucidation or exclusive focus on either self or client.	Lists multiple relationship repair strategies without elucidation or exclusive focus on either self or client.	Reflective conceptualization of future relationship repair strategies from self and client perspectives.				
1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

6. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Learning:

Q.10 What do participants focus on and talk about regarding their performance in the OSCE?

Excuses or rationalizes performance due to examination factors. Focused on their reactions and emotions or the performance of the actor.	Exploration is limited to facts of the case.	Explores only strengths of their performance. No reflection on weaknesses.	Explores strengths and weaknesses of performance from cognitive, affective, or behavioural aspects.	Emphasis on what they can take from this experience and apply to their practice. Reflective conceptualization of practice strengths and weaknesses.				
1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

Growth:

Q.11 What do participants say about how they would integrate this experience into their practice?

Does not consider impact to future practice but focuses on present interview only.	Considers impact to future practice but focus is limited to facts of the present case.	Considers impact to future practice but does not link to child maltreatment.	Considers impact to future practice of a similar child maltreatment issue but is focused solely on either decision-making or relationship repair.	Considers how this experience could inform future understanding, decision-making, and management of a similar child maltreatment issue.				
1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

