The PLAY Project Fidelity Chart and Self-Assessment

Score each section of your PLAY Plan and Video Review Form, by highlighting your self as Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor per The PLAY Project's Fidelity Manual criteria. Complete the Self-Assessment questions and submit this along with your VRF assignment.

PLAY Plan	5	4	3	2	1
Main Points: Keys integrate the principles and methods of PLAY into main points that summarize the most important suggestions for (CG). Special attention is given to the child's profile (CZ, SMP, FDL) and the CG's interactional process (IP). Keys should accurately summarize a set of overall strategies that help the CG know what to do to improve interactions with this child and promote this child's FDL. Keys should be consistent with the PLAY Plan/VSR.	**Excellent:** • All MP accurately recommend Principles, Methods, Techniques, Activities that most effectively promote child's progress, w/examples. • All are relevant to child's profile (CZ, SMP, FLD) and/or CG IP. • They are completely consistent with the PLAY Plan and Video Suggestion Report. • Specific to child/parent and presented in terms that are always constructive and honest. • Progress, when present, is referenced.	**Very Good.** • 90% MP points accurately recommend Principles, Methods, Techniques, Activities that most effectively promote child's progress, w/ examples. • Most are relevant to child's profile (CZ, SMP, FLD) and/or CG IP. • Largely consistent with the PLAY Plan and VSR. • Specific to this child/ parent and presented in terms that are largely constructive and honest. • Progress, when present, is referenced.	**Good:** • 75% of main points accurately recommend Principles, Methods, Techniques, Activities that effectively promote the child's progress w/ examples. • Most are relevant to child's profile (CZ, SMP, FLD) and/ or CG IP. • They are, on the whole, consistent with the PLAY Plan and VSR. • Recommendations are often specific to child/s parent but some generic recommendations are included. • Keys are presented in terms that are mostly constructive and honest. • Progress, when present, may or may not be referenced.	**Fair:** • <50% accurately recommend Principles, Methods, Techniques, Activities that promote the child's progress w/examples. • Only some are relevant to the child's profile (CZ, SMP, FLD) and/or CGs IP or may be inaccurate. • 50-75% not consistent with the PLAY Plan and/or VSR. • Recommendations are vague and/or not specific to child/ parent though some generic recommendations that are acceptable may be included. • Keys may or may not be presented in terms that are constructive and honest. • Progress, when present, may or may not be referenced.	**Poor:** • 75% do not recommend strategies that promote the child's progress and may be clinically 'off' and not helpful. • Most are not relevant to the child's profile (CZ, SMP, FLD) and/or CG IP. • >75% are not consistent with the PLAY Plan and/or VSR (assuming that other aspects of the Plan or VSR are accurate). • Recommendations are vague and/or not specific to this child/parent and even generic recommendations are not relevant to the child. • Keys may or may not be presented in terms that are constructive and honest. • Progress, when present, may or may not be referenced.
Comfort Zone Activities: CZA are defined as 'what the child will do when you let them do whatever they want to do'. CZA take the child OUT of the relationship. Evidence of CZA is often limited in a 15 minute video and may not be seen but should still be noted.	**Excellent:** • Gives a brief definition of CZA. • All CZA observed on the video are accurately listed. • In addition, there is a list of 'other' CZA of the child's not seen on the video.	**Very Good:** • Gives brief definition of CZA. • 90% of CZA observed on the video are accurately listed. • In addition, there is a list of 'other' CZA not seen on the video if the child has other CZA.	**Good:** • Accurately lists >50% of the CZA observed on the video. • In addition, there may be a list of 'other' CZA not seen on the video if the child has other CZA.	**Fair:** • Lists <50% of CZA observed on the video. • A list of 'other' CZA not seen on the video is absent from the report.	**Poor:** • Lists <25% of CZA observed on the video. • A list of 'other' CZA not seen on the video is absent.

PLAY Plan	5	4	3	2	1
Sensory Motor Profile: The SMP section of the PP should include: • All SM modalities (e.g. proprioception, emotional reactivity, tactile, vestibular, visual, auditory, oral, motor planning, olfactory) considered. • Over-reactive and/or under-reactive considered and described. Ex: if a child is 'under reactive' to sound, then he/she will seek rather than avoid that modality and vice versa. • SM modalities not used by CG are noted. • Suggestions should be made to CG about what to do more of/less of related to each modality	**Excellent:** • Gives a brief definition of SMP/ refers CG to glossary. • PPC accurately lists/precisely &succinctly describes all SMP modalities observed during the video including the reactivity profile. • There may be a list of 'other' SMP modalities not seen on the video. • Integrates SMP w/ clinical implications by providing a brief example or explanation of how the CG played or could play with their child based on most of the nine SMP domains.	**Very Good:** • Gives brief definition of SMP/ refers CG to the glossary. • Accurately lists all SMP modalities including the reactivity profile but may not be as precise as an excellent SMP. • May list 'other' SMP modalities of the child's that are not seen on the video. • Gives a brief example/ explanation of how CG played/ could play with their child based on several of the nine SMP.	**Good:** • Accurately lists most of the important SMP modalities observed during the video including the reactivity profile. • May list 'other' SMP modalities of the child's not seen on the video. • Gives a brief example/ explanation of how the CG played/could play with their child based on some of the most important of the nine SMP domains.	**Fair:** • Misses some of the important SMP modalities observed on the video & may not describe the reactivity profile. • May or may not list 'other' SMP modalities of the child's not seen on the video. • Provides few if any examples/explanations of how the CG could use the SMP to play with their child.	**Poor:** • Misses most of the important SMP modalities observed on the video & may not describe the reactivity profile. • May not be a list of 'other' SMP modalities of the child's not seen on the video. • Does not provide any examples/explanations of how the CG could use the SMP to play with their child.
Functional Developmental Levels: • Each FDL described & useful to CG • The FDL analysis is useful to the degree that it links FDL to strategies (e.g. 'sweating' for FDL II, 'waiting' for FDL III, 'going for continuous flow' at FDL IV, etc.) as well as methods, activities, and techniques • Note percentage of how 'solid' the child is on a 9-point scale : • FDL % is described using a 9-point scale: 0, 0-25, 25, 25-50, 50, 50-75, 75, 75-100, 100	**Excellent FDL profile.** • Systematically describes all relevant FDLs, not only accurately perceiving the general qualities but also noting almost all subtle and harder to detect elements of the profile. All descriptions are clear, understandable, and useful for the CG. • The FDL profile helps the CG focus on almost all of the important strategies for engaging the child. • The PPC will often draw on language from the FDL criteria descriptions to describe the child's FDL levels. • Notes the affective level at which the child is primarily functioning and what activities the child likes to do most of the time.	**Very Good FDL profile.** • Systematically describes all relevant FDLs. The profile is very accurate but might miss some subtle and harder to detect elements. • Almost all descriptions are succinct, clear, understandable, and useful for the CG. • The profile helps the CG focus on most of the important strategies for engaging the child. • Uses language from the FDL Criteria descriptions to describe the child's FDL levels. • Notes the affective level at which the child is primarily functioning and what the child likes to do most of the time.	**Good FDL profile.** • Systematically describes all relevant FDLs. Accurately perceives the general features of the child's profile but may not note the more subtle and harder to detect elements. • Descriptions of the levels are somewhat succinct, clear and understandable and/or useful. • Uses FDL profile to direct the CG to some of the important strategies for engaging the child. May or may not use language from the FDL Criteria to describe the child's FDL levels. • The PPC may or may not note the affective level at which the child is primarily functioning and what the child wants to do most of the time	**Fair FDL profile.** • Describes most of the relevant FDLs (i.e. misses one or two relevant FDL descriptions); or may list all relevant FDLS but does not accurately describe some of the important general features of the child's profile. • Descriptions of the levels may not be that clear or understandable. This profile may still direct the CG to some of the important strategies for engaging their child. • May inaccurately use language from the FDL Criteria to describe the child's FDL levels. • May or may not make note of the affective level at which the child is primarily functioning and what the child wants to do most of the time. Does not provide percentages on FDL descriptions; or the PPC may provide percentages, but the other criteria above are not met.	**Poor FDL profile.** • Misses most of the relevant FDLs or lists all relevant FDLs but does not accurately describe most of the important general features of the child's profile. • Descriptions of the levels may not be clear or understandable. May direct the CG to some of the important strategies for engaging their child. • May or may not use language from the FDL Criteria to describe the child's FDL levels. • May not note the affective level at which the child is primarily functioning and wants to be most of the time. Does not provide percentages on FDL descriptions; or the PPC may provide percentages, but the other criteria above are not met.

PLAY Plan	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Techniques & Methods: • Methods are more fundamental and used more often than specific techniques. Techniques are designed to help CGs expand their PLAY ideas in ways that are fun and help a child progress in their functional development.	**Excellent Techniques.** • Technique recommendations are highly specific to the child's CZA, SMP, and/or FDL profile. SMP, and/or FDL profile. • Technique recommendations almost always provide a 'just right challenge' that promotes the child's functional and/or language development. • Recommends 4-7 techniques. All of the PLAY Methods are listed.	**Very Good Techniques.** • Combines basic and more specific techniques, but not all specific to child profile. • Technique recommendations often provide a 'just right challenge' that promotes the child's functional and/or language development. • Recommends 4-7 techniques. All of the PLAY Methods are listed.	**Good Techniques.** • Provides a list of basic techniques (including methods) almost all of which match the child's profile. • May suggest too few (<4) or too many (>7) techniques but still provides enough support to help the CG promote the child's functional progress. Most of the PLAY Methods are listed.	**Fair Techniques.** • Provides a list of techniques (including methods) where 25-50% of the recommendations do not match the child's profile. There may be some specific suggestions, but they are undermined by the inaccuracy of other recommendations. • May suggest too few techniques (<4) in a way that does not provide enough support for the CG or too many techniques (>7) that would seem to overwhelm the CG. The PLAY Methods may or may not be listed.	**Poor Techniques.** • Provides a list of techniques where >50% do not match the child's profile. • May still be some specific suggestions, but they are undermined by the inaccuracy of other recommendations. • May suggest too few techniques (<4) in a way that does not provide enough support for the CG or too many techniques (>7) that would seem to overwhelm the CG. The PLAY Methods may or may not be listed.
Activities: • Activities represent our ideas about what would be fun for a child based on their functional developmental profile. • All activities will be dependent on the child's reaction to the activities and PLAY Methods takes precedence.	**Excellent Activity Suggestions.** • Provides 4-7 activities that are all easy to implement and are all appropriate to the child's profile. • Refers caregivers explicitly to the list of activities by FDL and notes that PLAY Methods are more important than PLAY Activities. • All activities make sense and fun for this child based on profile.	**Very Good Activity Suggestions.** • Provides 4-7 activities, 90% are easy to implement and appropriate to the child's profile. • Refers CG explicitly to the list of activities by FDL and notes that PLAY Methods are more important than PLAY Activities. • 90% of the activities make sense and fun for this child.	**Good Activity Suggestions.** • Provides 4-7 activities, 75% are easy to implement and appropriate to the child's profile. • May or may not refer caregivers explicitly to the list of activities by FDL and may or may not note that PLAY Methods are more important than PLAY Activities. • 75% of the activities make sense and fun for this child.	**Fair Activity Suggestions.** • Provides a list of activities, 50% are easy to implement and appropriate to the child's profile. • May include too many (>7) or too few (< 4) activities. • May or may not refer CG explicitly to the list of activities by FDL or note that PLAY Methods are more important that PLAY Activities. • 50% the activities make sense for this child.	**Poor Activity Suggestions.** • Provides too many (>7) or too few (< 4) activities; OR few activities are easy to implement; OR most activities are not appropriate to the child's profile. • <50% activities make sense for this child.

Please share what you have assessed as the strengths of your PLAY Plan?

Please share what you have assessed as the areas of your PLAY Plan that need improvement and what will you do differently in the future?

Video Review Section	5	4	3	2	1
Observations: • Accurate and focused on key interactions. • Highlight CG successes: at least 2/3 positive CG/child interactions. • Used as 'evidence' for suggestions • Generally match observations supervisor might highlight.	**Excellent Observations.** • Observations are accurate and focused on key interactions. • Rarely misses noting when the CG is being sensitive to, responsive to, and/or effective with the child or when the CG is successfully using PLAY methods and/or techniques. • References to the PLAY model (e.g. "You guys opened and closed 3-4 circles there! Great job!") are commonly incorporated into observations. • Observations largely note positive events with selected critiques that point out places where the CG could improve.	**Very Good Observations:** • Observations are accurate and focused on key interactions. • 90% notes when the CG is being sensitive to, responsive to, and/or effective with the child or when the CG is using PLAY methods and/or techniques. • References to the PLAY model (e.g. "You stretched out that interaction and kept Johnny's engagement. We call that 'taffy pulling.'") are commonly incorporated into observations. • Uses both positive and critical observations as a set up for precise and helpful suggestions 90% of the time.	**Good Observations:** • Observations are 75% accurate and focused on key interactions. • 75% of the observations catch the CG being sensitive to, responsive to, and/or effective with the child or when the CG is using PLAY methods and/or techniques. • Uses both positive and critical observations as a set up for precise and helpful suggestions at least 50% of the time.	**Fair Observations:** • <50% of the observations are accurate and/or focused on key interactions. • >50% missed opportunities where the CG is being sensitive to, responsive to, and/or effective with the child or when the CG is using PLAY methods and/or techniques. • Observations may be too critical and focus too heavily on what the CG is doing wrong but there can still be an overall positive tone. • Observations are not used consistently to set up suggestions. Observations that are unnecessary or unhelpful may dominate the write up.	**Poor Observations:** • 75% of the observations are not accurate and/or not focused on key interactions. • 75% missed opportunities where the CG is being sensitive to, responsive to, and/or effective with the child or when the CG is using PLAY methods and/or techniques. • Observations may be too critical and focus too heavily on what the CG is doing wrong but there can still be an overall positive tone. • The observations consistently miss opportunities to set up suggestions. Observations that are unnecessary or unhelpful may dominate the write up.
Suggestions: • Key points bolded or highlighted for ease of identification • Connects to specific observation and/or time frame in video • Often references methods and general techniques • References techniques (and activities) specific to the child's profile (CZ, SMP, FDL) • Language understandable for the CG. • 3-5 suggestions for 3-5 minutes of activity.	**Excellent Suggestions:** • Specific to the play interaction (i.e. marked by activity and time) and almost always note how the CG can be more sensitive to, responsive to, and/or effective. • Suggestions are always relevant to the child's profile (CZ, SMP, FDL). • 3-5 suggestions per 3-5 minutes of activity. Terms are briefly and clearly defined, or the CG is referred to the glossary. Suggestions and techniques are always bolded.	**Very Good Suggestions:** • Specific to the play interaction (i.e. marked by activity and time) 90% of the time and consistently note how the CG can be more sensitive to, responsive to, and/or effective with this particular child. • 90% Suggestions have the child's profile (CZ, SMP, FLD) in mind. Refer to basic methods (e.g. reading the child's cues, following the child's lead, etc.) and common techniques (e.g. theme and variation, expectant waiting, etc); suggestions are more often than not specific to the unique profile of the child. • 2-4 suggestions per 3-5 minutes of activity. Suggestions and techniques are always bolded.	**Good Suggestions:** • Specific to the play interaction (i.e. marked by activity and time) >50% of the time and include some ways for CGs to be more sensitive to, responsive to, and/or effective. • Some suggestions may not be directly related to the situation. There may be a few suggestions that miss the child's profile—too high or too low for this child, however suggestions have the child's profile (CZ, SMP, FDL) in mind 75% of the time. • 2 suggestions per 3-5 minutes of activity or may have too many suggestions (6 or more). Suggestions and techniques may or may not be bolded.	**Fair Suggestions:** • Not specific to the play interaction (i.e. marked by activity and time) >50% of the time. • Suggestions are consistently not related to the situation. Suggestions may include some ways for CGs to be more sensitive to, responsive to, and/or effective. • There may be several suggestions that are 'off' demonstrating that the PPC does not have the child's profile (CZ, SMP, FLD) in mind 25-50% of the time. • General suggestions and refer primarily to basic methods and common techniques and may have few if any suggestions specific to the unique profile of this child. • Number of suggestions may be <2 or >6 per 3-5 minutes of activity . Suggestions and techniques may or may not be bolded.	**Poor Suggestions:** • Not specific to the play interaction (i.e. not marked by activity and time) >75% of the time. Suggestions are not related to the situation and there are few if any suggested ways for CGs to be more sensitive to, responsive to, and/or effective. • >75% suggestions are inappropriate though there may be occasional general suggestions for basic methods and/or common techniques that are appropriate. • Number of suggestions may be <2 or >6 per 3-5 minutes of activity. Suggestions and techniques may or may not be bolded.

Please share what you have assessed as your strengths in writing key observations in your Video Review?	Please share what you have assessed as areas in need of improvement with making suggestions based on your observations in your Video Review? What will you do differently in the future?
Please list the resources you used to assist you in writing your VRF and PLAY Plan?	What are your questions about PLAY Project VRFs?

My Total Score=

Additional Comments: