



**Parenting with Love and Limits®**  
[www.gopll.com](http://www.gopll.com)

# **PLL GROUP INTERMEDIATE PROCESS IPR'S**

© 2005-2012 Savannah Family Institute, Inc. All rights reserved. Patent Pending (US 61/429,536)  
With the exceptions noted below, no part of these handouts may be reproduced or transmitted in any form without written permission from PNCV Dissemination, LLC.

#### **LIMITED PHOTOCOPY LICENSE**

Savannah Family Institute grants to PLL's certified mental health professionals non-assignable permission to reproduce pages of these handouts for personal use in clinical practice and not for resale or redistribution. These materials are intended for use only by qualified mental health professionals. This license is limited to the individual participant and does not extend to others. The license does not grant the right to reproduce these materials for other purposes (including but not limited to books, pamphlets, articles, video or audio tapes, handouts or slides for lectures or workshops.) Permission to reproduce these materials for these and any other purposes must be obtained in writing from Savannah Family Institute, Inc.

## IPR Video Supervision

### PLL Group#1 – INTERMEDIATE PROCESS IPR MEASURE

<b>Therapist's Name:</b>					
<b>Co-Facilitator's Name</b>					
<b>Date of IPR Review:</b>					
<b>Number of Video IPR Measure Checks for this PLL Group Session:</b>					
KEY COMPONENTS					
Legend:	Extremely Poor: Gross neglect/deficit in domain	Poor: Deficit in domain	Average: Domain met with basic competency	Well: Domain met with above average competency	Extremely Well: Domain met with exceptional competency
Group #1: Hour One & Two "Parent Breakout"					
1. How well did the group leader integrate usage of self to get the group engaged (i.e. humor, high energy, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
2. How well did the group leader motivate the parents to come to future groups and coaching sessions during the Overview of the program section?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
3. How well did the group leader elicit responses from the group regarding their theories on "why teens misbehave" (i.e. use of names, sticking and moving, providing safe atmosphere, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
4. How well did the group leader demonstrate a smoothness or flow of delivery of the group material with a natural segue to each of the 6 Reasons why teens misbehave?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
5. How well did the group leader integrate usage of self into motivating the parents to do their reading assignments in the PYOCT book (i.e., personal examples, stories, humor, voice inflection, drama, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
6. How well did the group leader elicit feedback and respond to the group's feedback during the Venting Section (verbal and/or non-verbal cues, and provide emotional and factual linkages to build group cohesiveness, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
7. How well did the group leader elicit feedback and respond to the group's feedback during the Solution-Talk Section (verbal and/or non-verbal cues, and provide emotional and factual linkages to build group cohesiveness, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
8. How well did the group leader demonstrate joining and rapport with the parents during the Compliment section?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
9. How well did the group leader use the rubber band to help each parent express their stress levels with their teenager and move parents into contemplation regarding their commitment to the program (i.e. have each parent pull on the rubber band, share the animal analogy with drama, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5

10. How well did the group leader move the parents into Contemplation regarding their part in the solution to their teen's problems by utilizing the Glass Half-Full/Half-Empty section?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
11. How well did the group leader demonstrate Choreographic integration with props, group materials and technology?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
<b>Group #1: Hour Two "Teen Breakout"</b>					
12. How well did the group leader elicit feedback and respond to the group's feedback during the Venting Section (verbal and/or non-verbal cues, and provide emotional and factual linkages to build group cohesiveness, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
13. How well did the group leader demonstrate a smoothness and natural segue into the role play of a parent who is "getting on the nerves" of a teen in the group?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
14. How well did the group leader elicit responses to the "Golden Questions" #3 and #4 (i.e. respond to verbal and non-verbal cues, provide linkages, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
15. How well did the group leader use the rubber band to help each teen express their stress levels with their parent and move teens into contemplation regarding how decreasing stress will result in greater closeness in the family (i.e. have each teen pull on the rubber band, share the animal analogy with drama, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
16. How well did the group leader demonstrate joining and rapport with the teens during the Compliment section?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
17. How well did the group leader demonstrate Choreographic integration with the flip chart, props and group materials?	Extremely Poor 2	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5

**Rating: 17 domains = 85 total points**

**We are now focusing on solely process variables or how well a therapist does with a particular part of this class.**

**PLL Supervisor's Review of Entire Video:**

Key Fidelity Issues –

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

**IPR Clip Review: (Self, Peer, Supervisor Review)**

**Clip Link – [www.vimeo.com/](http://www.vimeo.com/)**

**Password –**

<i>Scene (Clip)</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>

## IPR Video Supervision

### PLL Group#2 – INTERMEDIATE PROCESS IPR MEASURE

<b>Therapist's Name:</b>					
<b>Co-Facilitator's Name</b>					
<b>Date of IPR Review:</b>					
<b>Number of Video IPR Measure Checks for this PLL Group Session:</b>					
<b>KEY COMPONENTS</b>					
<b>Legend:</b>	<b>Extremely Poor:</b> Gross neglect/deficit in domain	<b>Poor:</b> Deficit in domain	<b>Average:</b> Domain met with basic competency	<b>Well:</b> Domain met with above average competency	<b>Extremely Well:</b> Domain met with exceptional competency
<b>Group #2: Hour One &amp; Two "Parent Breakout"</b>					
1. How well did the group leader motivate parents to continue doing their reading assignments (i.e. get feedback from parents who did the reading, give out stickers or provide some type of reward/incentive, energy and enthusiasm, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
2. How well did the group leader introduce Button Pushing" with the Rubber Band and the "Toys-R-Us" story (drama, use of self, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
3. How well did the group leader integrate usage of self and props to facilitate smoothness and clarity during the Hot Button Identification Exercise (i.e. humor, playfulness, use of flipchart for competition, different color post-it notes for Parent versus Teen Hot Buttons, etc)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
4. How well did the group leader set up the Button Pushing Role Play? (clear instructions of everyone's roles, connection to the parent/child's specific buttons, group vote of who will win, explanation of purpose of "Age Dropping" flash cards, quick explanation of recent argument to role play)	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
5. How well did the group leader facilitate the Button Pushing Role Play (role play kept short, group leader making first move by pushing a parent button, use of "Age Dropping" cards, high energy, etc.)	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
6. How well did the group leader assist the families in recognizing that in reality "no one won the Button Pushing game" (i.e. use of power point slides, clear connection to role play, etc.)	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
7. How well did the group leader demonstrate smoothness and flow of delivery of the material in presenting the 5 Button Busters?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
8. How well did the group leader inspire each parent to do an Unpredictable Assignment (use of props, use of scaling, pairing up parents, use of humor, etc.)	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
9. How well did the group leader consolidate gains by eliciting feedback from the parents regarding "what was most helpful" in the group session?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5

10. How well did the group leader demonstrate Choreographic integration with props, group materials and technology?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
<b>Group #2: Hour Two "Teen Breakout"</b>					
11. How well did the group leader explain a few reasons why parents may push their teenager's buttons by looking at the "underlying motives on p.9 in the Teen Workbook (i.e. nonchalant stance, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
12. How well did the group leader demonstrate a smoothness and flow of delivery of the Button Buster Filter material?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
13. How well did the group leader do the role play on a Button Buster Filter (i.e. set up of role play, humor, drama, etc.)	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
14. How well did the group leader inspire each teen to do an Unpredictable Assignment (use of props, use of scaling, use of humor, etc.)	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
15. How well did the group leader demonstrate Choreographic integration with the flip chart, props and group materials?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5

**Rating: 15 domains = 75 points**

**We are now focusing on solely process variables or how well a therapist does with a particular part of this class.**

**PLL Supervisor's Review of Entire Video:**

Key Fidelity Issues –

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

**IPR Clip Review: (Self, Peer, Supervisor Review)**

**Clip Link – [www.vimeo.com/](http://www.vimeo.com/)**

**Password –**

Scene (Clip)	Strengths	Areas for Improvement

## IPR Video Supervision

### PLL Group#3 – INTERMEDIATE PROCESS IPR MEASURE

<b>Therapist's Name:</b>						
<b>Co-Facilitator's Name</b>						
<b>Date of IPR Review:</b>						
<b>Number of Video IPR Measure Checks for this PLL Group Session:</b>						
<b>KEY COMPONENTS</b>						
<b>Legend:</b>	<b>Extremely Poor:</b> Gross neglect/deficit in domain	<b>Poor:</b> Deficit in domain	<b>Average:</b> Domain met with basic competency	<b>Well:</b> Domain met with above average competency	<b>Extremely Well:</b> Domain met with exceptional competency	
<b>Group #3: Hour One &amp; Two "Parent Breakout"</b>						
1. How well did the group leader motivate parents to continue doing their reading assignments (i.e. get feedback from parents who did the reading, give out stickers or provide some type of reward/incentive, energy and enthusiasm, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5	
2. How well did the group leader teach the 5 Reasons parents are defeated by their teenager when they do not have an "Ironclad Contract"?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5	
3. How well did the group leader use Regina's contract to move parents into contemplation around why their previous efforts at contracting or setting rules have not worked (playfully engaging both parents and teens in finding Regina's loopholes, use of power point to demonstrate Regina's loophole free contract)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5	
4. How well did the group leader help each parent identify their top 3 problems they want their teenager to change (i.e. use of the "four-question test", converting complaints into categories in real time, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5	
5. How well did the group leader help the "inner circle" parent convert their #1 problem into an ironclad rule (i.e. use of a sample contracts, use of the outer circle, throwing out suggestions, sticking and moving)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5	
6. How well did the group leader move parents into Contemplation around the need/use of the Village to help them stop their teen's problems (i.e. use of group as village, role play how to ask for help, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5	
7. How well did the group leader consolidate gains by eliciting feedback from the parents regarding "what was most helpful" in the group session?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5	
8. How well did the group leader demonstrate Choreographic integration with props, group materials and technology?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5	
<b>Group #3: Hour Two "Teen Breakout"</b>						
9. How well did the group leader help the teens to identify the top 3 problems their parents want them to stop doing?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5	

<b>10.</b> How well did the group leader help the teens identify the top 3 problems they want their parents to stop doing?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
<b>11.</b> How well did the group leader help the teens to identify their top 3 rewards they would like if they stopped doing the #1 problem their parents want them to stop?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
<b>12.</b> How well did the group leader role play the Art of Negotiation (i.e. high energy, humor, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
<b>13.</b> How well did the group leader demonstrate Choreographic integration with the flip chart, props and group materials?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5

**Rating: 13 domains = 65 points**

**We are now focusing on solely process variables or how well a therapist does with a particular part of this class.**

**PLL Supervisor's Review of Entire Video:**

Key Fidelity Issues –

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

**IPR Clip Review: (Self, Peer, Supervisor Review)**

**Clip Link – [www.vimeo.com/](http://www.vimeo.com/)**

**Password –**

<i>Scene (Clip)</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>

## IPR Video Supervision

### PLL Group#4 – INTERMEDIATE PROCESS IPR MEASURE

<b>Therapist's Name:</b>					
<b>Co-Facilitator's Name</b>					
<b>Date of IPR Review:</b>					
<b>Number of Video IPR Measure Checks for this PLL Group Session:</b>					
<b>KEY COMPONENTS</b>					
<b>Legend:</b>	<b>Extremely Poor:</b> Gross neglect/deficit in domain	<b>Poor:</b> Deficit in domain	<b>Average:</b> Domain met with basic competency	<b>Well:</b> Domain met with above average competency	<b>Extremely Well:</b> Domain met with exceptional competency
<b>Group #4: Hour One &amp; Two "Parent Breakout"</b>					
1. How well did the group leader motivate parents to continue doing their reading assignments (i.e. get feedback from parents who did the reading, give out stickers or provide some type of reward/incentive, energy and enthusiasm, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
2. How well did the group leader stick and move to avoid brainstorming while reviewing what makes the rule ironclad that was drafted in the previous group?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
3. How well did the group leader help the inner circle parent identify the Top 10 Areas their teenager cares?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
4. How well did the group leader emphasize the importance of the "privileges versus rights" concept?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
5. How well did the group leader help the inner circle parent identify the rewards (i.e. use their Top 3 areas, stick and move to avoid brainstorming, use sample contracts, etc.)	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
6. How well did the group leader help the inner circle parent identify the consequences (i.e. explain the hierarchy of offenses, use their Top 3 areas, stick and move to avoid brainstorming, use sample contracts, emphasize consequences start over each week)	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
7. How well did the group leader help the inner circle parent identify <u>only one</u> possible classic move their teenager might make to attempt to derail the contract?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
8. How well did the group leader storyboard the rule (i.e. stick and move by making suggestions, writing the parent's specific countermoves on the flip chart, utilizing the outer circle, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
9. How well did the group leader role play the countermoves for the rule with the inner circle parent (i.e. follow the 5 rules of thumb: success first, therapist plays the teen, rehearse each countermove, freeze quickly, switch places if needed; and rate parent's "battle readiness")	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5



10. How well did the group leader consolidate gains by eliciting feedback from the parents regarding “what was most helpful” in the group session?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
11. How well did the group leader demonstrate Choreographic integration with props, group materials and technology?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
<b>Group #4: Hour One &amp; Two “Teen Breakout”</b>					
12. How well did the group leader assist each teenager in writing their PPR (i.e. sell it as a “secret weapon” to soften up their parents, use of magnifying glass to illustrate how to find “small things”, etc.)	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
13. How well did the group leader inspire each teen to give one PPR a day before the next group session (use of scaling, giving creative ideas for giving the PPR, etc)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
14. How well did the group leader elicit responses from the teenagers to the question – “What do your parents have to start doing differently to make you want to act better?”	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
15. How well did the group leader help the teens identify effective consequences (integrate use of self, nonchalant demeanor, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
16. How well did the group leader demonstrate Choreographic integration with the flip chart, props and group materials?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
<b>Group #4: Hour Two “Delivery of Positive Parent Report”</b>					
17. How well did the group leader assist each teenager and parent dyad to deliver their Positive Parent Report?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5

**Rating: 17 domains = 85 points**

**We are now focusing on solely process variables or how well a therapist does with a particular part of this class.**

**PLL Supervisor’s Review of Entire Video:**

Key Fidelity Issues –

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

**IPR Clip Review: (Self, Peer, Supervisor Review)**

**Clip Link – [www.vimeo.com/](http://www.vimeo.com/)**

**Password –**

Scene (Clip)	Strengths	Areas for Improvement

## IPR Video Supervision

### PLL Group#5 – INTERMEDIATE PROCESS IPR MEASURE

<b>Therapist's Name:</b>					
<b>Co-Facilitator's Name</b>					
<b>Date of IPR Review:</b>					
<b>Number of Video IPR Measure Checks for this PLL Group Session:</b>					
<b>KEY COMPONENTS</b>					
<b>Legend:</b>	<b>Extremely Poor:</b> Gross neglect/deficit in domain	<b>Poor:</b> Deficit in domain	<b>Average:</b> Domain met with basic competency	<b>Well:</b> Domain met with above average competency	<b>Extremely Well:</b> Domain met with exceptional competency
<b>Group #5: Hour One &amp; Two</b>					
1. How well did the group leader poll the parents for how they liked receiving their Positive Parent Reports and issue the PPR Teen Challenge?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
2. How well did the group leader motivate parents to continue doing their reading assignments (i.e. get feedback from parents who did the reading, give out stickers or provide some type of reward/incentive, energy and enthusiasm, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
3. How well did the group leader review the 7 Aces Consequences and the "Surgeon General Warnings" to using any of the 7 Aces Consequences?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
4. How well did the group leader motivate the parents to the idea of the Positive Teen Report (i.e. Dale Carnegie's quote in his Classic Book, "How to Win Friends and Influence People", review of Surgeon General Warnings, timing and creative delivery methods, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
5. How well did the group leader assist each parent to create their first Positive Teen Report in the group session and inspire them to give 7 additional PTR's for the next week?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
6. How well did the group leader demonstrate an extreme teen response during the role play so the parents are battle ready for the worst case scenario?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
7. How well did the group leader storyboard the rewards (i.e. stick and move by making suggestions, identify the time, reminder and praise words for giving the rewards, writing the parent's specific countermoves on the flip chart, utilize the outer circle, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
8. How well did the group leader role play the countermoves for the rewards with the inner circle parent (i.e. follow the 5 rules of thumb: success first, therapist plays the teen, rehearse each countermove, freeze quickly, switch places if needed; and rate the parent's "battle readiness")	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
9. How well did the group leader storyboard the consequences (i.e. stick and move by making suggestions, writing the parent's specific countermoves on the flip chart, utilizing the outer circle, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5

<p><b>10.</b> How well did the group leader role play the countermoves for the consequences with the inner circle parent (i.e. high energy when demonstrating “Piling On” and how “Not to Pile On”, for the remaining countermoves, follow the 5 rules of thumb: success first, therapist plays the teen, rehearse each countermove, freeze quickly, switch places if needed; and rate the parent’s “battle readiness”)</p>	<p>Extremely Poor 1</p> <p>Poor 2</p> <p>Average 3</p> <p>Well 4</p> <p>Extremely Well 5</p>
<p><b>11.</b> How well did the group leader consolidate gains by eliciting feedback from the parents regarding “what was most helpful” in the group session?</p>	<p>Extremely Poor 2</p> <p>Poor 2</p> <p>Average 3</p> <p>Well 4</p> <p>Extremely Well 5</p>
<p><b>12.</b> How well did the group leader demonstrate Choreographic integration with the flip chart, props, group materials and technology?</p>	<p>Extremely Poor 2</p> <p>Poor 2</p> <p>Average 3</p> <p>Well 4</p> <p>Extremely Well 5</p>
<p><b>Group #5: Hour Two “Delivery of Positive Teen Report”</b></p>	
<p><b>13.</b> How well did the group leader assist each teenager and parent dyad to deliver their Positive Teen Report?</p>	<p>Extremely Poor 1</p> <p>Poor 2</p> <p>Average 3</p> <p>Well 4</p> <p>Extremely Well 5</p>

**Rating: 13 domains = 65 points**

**We are now focusing on solely process variables or how well a therapist does with a particular part of this class.**

**PLL Supervisor’s Review of Entire Video:**

Key Fidelity Issues –

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

**IPR Clip Review: (Self, Peer, Supervisor Review)**

**Clip Link – [www.vimeo.com/](http://www.vimeo.com/)**

**Password –**

Scene (Clip)	Strengths	Areas for Improvement

## IPR Video Supervision

### PLL Group#6 – INTERMEDIATE PROCESS IPR MEASURE

<b>Therapist's Name:</b>					
<b>Co-Facilitator's Name</b>					
<b>Date of IPR Review:</b>					
<b>Number of Video IPR Measure Checks for this PLL Group Session:</b>					
<b>KEY COMPONENTS</b>					
<b>Legend:</b>	<b>Extremely Poor:</b> Gross neglect/deficit in domain	<b>Poor:</b> Deficit in domain	<b>Average:</b> Domain met with basic competency	<b>Well:</b> Domain met with above average competency	<b>Extremely Well:</b> Domain met with exceptional competency
<b>Group #6: Hour One &amp; Two</b>					
1. How well did the group leader ask which parents did their reading assignment, get feedback from them, and give out stickers or provide some type of reward/incentive?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
2. How well did the group leader integrate usage of self in asking the key questions around the "Great Santini" movie clip in order to move the families into Contemplation around Nurturance?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
3. How well did the group leader integrate Bruce's Story from the PYOCT book into the Big Chill Timeline (smooth delivery, drama, parallel storytelling, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
4. How well did the group leader elicit feedback from the families regarding their stage on the Big Chill Timeline?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
5. How well did the group leader create emotional intensity during the "Healing Phrases" experience (use of prop, voice inflection, etc.)?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
6. How well did the group leader help the families connect the health of the plant with the health of their relationships with one another by asking key questions as directed in the Group Manual?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
7. How well did the group leader review the "5 Deadly Toxins"?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
8. How well did the group leader elicit feedback from the families on which toxins exist in their family?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
9. How well did the group leader challenge the families to take the "Nurturing Your Plant Back to Emotional Health Challenge"?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5
10. How well did the group leader review the 7 Strategies to Reclaim Lost Love and emphasize that "Relapse is Normal"?	Extremely Poor 1	Poor 2	Average 3	Well 4	Extremely Well 5

<p>11. How well did the group leader demonstrate warmth and genuineness in the compliments section?</p>	<p>Extremely Poor 1</p>	<p>Poor 2</p>	<p>Average 3</p>	<p>Well 4</p>	<p>Extremely Well 5</p>
<p>12. How well did the group leader demonstrate Choreographic integration with the flip chart, props, group materials and technology?</p>	<p>Extremely Poor 1</p>	<p>Poor 2</p>	<p>Average 3</p>	<p>Well 4</p>	<p>Extremely Well 5</p>

**Rating: 12 domains = 60 points**

**We are now focusing on solely process variables or how well a therapist does with a particular part of this class.**

**PLL Supervisor's Review of Entire Video:**

Key Fidelity Issues –

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

**IPR Clip Review: (Self, Peer, Supervisor Review)**

**Clip Link – [www.vimeo.com/](http://www.vimeo.com/)**

**Password –**

<i>Scene (Clip)</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>