****

**PROFESSIONAL ISSUES ASSIGNMENT 1**

**Examiner Booklet**

***Please return this feedback sheet to:***

*Jennifer Whitfield, Programme Assistant (Academic),*

*Doctoral Programme in Clinical Psychology,*

*Whewell Building, Fylde Avenue, Lancaster University, Lancaster, LA1 4YF.*

*Direct Line 01524 592970. Fax: 01524 592981.*

**Title: …………………………………………………………………………**

 **…………………………………………………………………………**

 **…………………………………………………………………………**

**Trainee number …………………………………………………………………………**

**Feedback** Please attempt to give as constructive, legible and detailed feedback as possible in each of the following sections. Comments from trainees suggest that feedback should highlight strengths as well as weaknesses and should give specific examples of how the PIA 1 could have been improved. In order to facilitate the legibility of feedback we would prefer these forms to be completed on a word processor. If this is possible please contact the Programme Administrator on 01524 592970 for a copy of these forms in either Microsoft Word or Corel WordPerfect format. Alternatively forms may be downloaded from the web: <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/shm/dhr/courses/dclinpsy/assessment.htm>

**Marking** ***Each report is double marked ‘blind’ by internal examiners using the Mark Sheet and mark sheet formula. Assessors agree a single mark for each piece of work. The External Examiner will be sent work when: internal assessors cannot agree a single mark for any report or there is a fail mark allocated. The External Examiner will also be sent a sample of at least three reports given a low, middle and high mark. All work is returned to the Programme Office by an agreed date. Marks are ratified at the corresponding Examination Board. Trainees receive written feedback from the internal examiners plus the single agreed mark. The programme staff request that markers do not write on the submitted work but confine comments to these feedback sheets.***

**Note 70+distinction; 60-69 good pass; 50-59 pass; 40-49 fail and resubmit assignment; marks below 40 fail and either resubmit or present new assignment, at the discretion of the Examination Board.**

**1. Written communication**

*This competency refers to the adequate written expression of the range of ideas, concepts and arguments that comprise the assignment*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Positive indicators*** | ***Negative indicators***  |
| Trainee adapts writing well to communicate effectively with intended audience. An appropriate academic writing style is used within the assignment | Written style is inappropriate for the target audience, or colloquial language is used |
| Appropriate spelling, punctuation and grammar throughout | Consistently poor spelling, punctuation and/or grammar |
| Consistent and appropriate tense | Frequent misuse of tense |
| Consistently good written expression | Inconsistent style or use of language |
| Follows APA guidelines throughout | Inappropriate deviation from APA guidelines  |
| Accurate use of language and terminology, and terms explained at first mention | Misuse of words and terms, or unexplained terms or abbreviations |
| Complex concepts and theories are described for the reader | Complex concepts, theories and ideas are undefined or described inadequately |
| The assignment is written in an economical manner and ideas are expressed effectively | Unnecessarily technical or complicated language is used. Long, rambling sentences are used |
| There is a logical flow of ideas, developing an overall argument in order to answer the question | The flow of ideas is not logical, and the overall argument becomes lost or confused |

***Evidence collected from assignment:***

**2. Knowledge and skills**

*This competency refers to the demonstration of knowledge and skills which are necessary to ensure that the information is relevant, and that inform the trainee’s understanding of professional issues.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Positive indicators*** | ***Negative indicators*** |
| Relevant policy documents from the NHS, HPC, BPS and elsewhere are presented and referenced within the assignment | Key policy documents from the NHS, HPC, BPS and elsewhere are not presented or referenced within the assignment |
| The most recent research, guidelines or policies inform the assignment | The trainee is not aware of obvious recent and relevant policy, initiatives or literature. Obvious gaps in policy or evidence are apparent |
| Literature presented in the assignment is relevant to the topic area | Literature unrelated to the topic area is presented |
| Policy, guidelines and research has been gathered from a range of appropriate sources | The trainee has focused on literature from a narrow range of sources (e.g. only peer reviewed journals, or only policy documents) |
| The trainee conveys a clear and correct understanding of the information presented | The trainee is unclear, incorrect or shows misunderstanding of the information |
| Arguments formulated in the report are informed by research, guidelines or policy | The report does not form coherent arguments, or arguments made are not backed up by research, guidelines or policy |

***Evidence collected from assignment:***

**3. Analysis and critical thinking**

*This competency refers to the attainment of a sufficient level of critical analysis for the assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Positive indicators*** | ***Negative indicators*** |
| Evidence of bringing ideas, literature and research from one area to bear on an issue in another area | The trainee has used information from an area to illustrate a point, but has not recognised obvious flaws in the transfer of context |
| Literature is analysed and synthesised into ideas, themes and conclusions | Literature is simply described with little analysis of the meaning or implications |
| The trainee demonstrates an appropriate critique of the concepts, theories or guidelines presented | All information is presented as ‘fact’ and no attempt is made to critically appraise it |
| The trainee has synthesised information from a variety of sources, and has arrived at a an appropriate conclusion | Only one viewpoint or approach is considered. The trainee fails to consider alternative views on a topic or issue  |
| The assignment forms firm opinions and conclusions about the information presented | The assignment fails to adequately form a conclusion about the information presented |
| Any implications and recommendations for research or practice are well described, logical and relevant | No effort is made to generalise the conclusions of the assignment into recommendations or implications |

***Evidence collected from assignment:***

***4.* Professional behaviour**

*This competency refers to an awareness of and use of relevant guidelines and standards of professional conduct*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Positive indicators*** |  ***Negative indicators*** |
| Issues for professional and ethical practice are highlighted appropriately within the assignment | Opportunities to highlight professional and ethical issues apparent in the subject matter are missed or dealt with inadequately |
| The trainee demonstrates a fair and ethical stance in their arguments and conclusions | Statements, arguments and conclusions within the assignment indicate a discriminatory or unethical stance |
| The trainee indicates an appropriate understanding of diversity issues within the assignment | The trainee fails to acknowledge or shows an inappropriate understanding of diversity issues within the assignment |
| Statements, arguments and conclusions within the assignment imply that the trainee behaves in a professional manner in their practice | Statements, arguments and conclusions within the assignment imply that the trainee may be unprofessional in their practice |
| Non-discriminatory and appropriate (e.g. non-psychiatric and non-medical) language for clinical psychology is used throughout | Inappropriate language or terminology is used (e.g. pejorative terms, psychiatric labels, or unexplained medical terminology) |

***Evidence collected from assignment:***

**5. Contextual awareness**

*This competency refers to an awareness of the contexts that clinical psychologists work in, and the professional role of a clinical psychologist within them.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Positive indicators*** | ***Negative indicators***  |
| Demonstrates an understanding of psychological problems in a social, economic, political and cultural context | Does not acknowledge or understand the social, economic, political and cultural context of psychological problems |
| Demonstrates a good understanding of the role of a clinical psychologist, and how this may differ from other professional roles | Demonstrates a poor understanding of the role of a clinical psychologist |
| Clearly describes the ‘added value’ of clinical psychology | Indicates little understanding of the value or contribution of clinical psychology in applied settings |
| Understands the strategic structure of services | Shows a lack of understanding of how services are organised and structured |
| Demonstrates a capacity and willingness to contribute to and develop the profession | Does not appear interested in clinical psychology developing as a profession |
| Engages critically with accepted practice | Appears to agree with all current practice, despite obvious weaknesses or gaps in the evidence-base |

***Evidence collected from assignment:***

**Allocating a Mark for the Professional Issues Assignment 1 (PIA1)**

There are two stages in allocating a mark to the PIA 1. In the first you will allocate your own grades and mark using the below marking formula. In the second stage you will compare and discuss your grading of each competency with a second marker and agree a conciliated mark.

**Allocating your grades and mark.**

Based on your reading of the review and the provision of comments for each competency above, allocate a grade for each competency using the below guide. The possible grades for each competency are:

**WEAK (W)** – The evidence collected suggests that this competency is significantly below the expected standard at this stage in training.

**BELOW THE EXPECTED STANDARD (BES)** – The evidence collected suggests that this competency is below the expected standard at this stage in training.

**AT THE EXPECTED STANDARD (ES)** – The evidence collected suggests that the competency is at the expected standard for the stage in training, but does not excel in any way.

**ABOVE THE EXPECTED STANDARD (AES)** – There is evidence that good skills in the competency exist, above average for a piece of work submitted at this stage of training.

**EXCELLENT (E)** – Strong evidence has been collected that the trainee has developed this competence to a degree well beyond what would be expected at this stage of training.

**Record your individual grades here:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Competency** | **Grade****(W/BES/ES/AES/E)** |
| *1) Written communication* |  |
| *2) Knowledge and skills* |  |
| *3) Analysis and critical thinking* |  |
| *4) Professional behaviour* |  |
| *5) Contextual Awareness* |  |

**Now, calculate the overall mark for the PIA 1 as a whole in the following way:**

**Highlight the appropriate adjustment, and transfer this into the final column. Then starting from a base figure of 55, apply the adjustments to obtain a final single grade for the PIA 1. (An example of this appears later).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Competency** | **Weak****(W)** | **Below the expected standard (BES)** | **At the expected standard (ES)** | **Above the expected standard (AES)** | **Excellent (E)** | **Running****total** | **Adjustment** |
| *1) Written communication* | -5 | -3 | 0 | +3 | +5 | (baseline score) = **55** | +/- |
| *2) Knowledge and skills* | -5 | -3 | 0 | +3 | +5 | = | +/- |
| *3) Analysis and critical thinking* | -5 | -3 | 0 | +3 | +5 | = | +/- |
| *4) Professional behaviour* | -6 | -4 | 0 | +4 | +6 | = | +/- |
| *5) Contextual Awareness* | -5 | -3 | 0 | +3 | +5 | = | +/- |
|  |  |  |  |  | **Final PIA 1****Score>>>**  | =  |  |

**Your resulting score should fall somewhere within the range 29-81.**

**In the exceptional circumstance that a piece of work scores 29 or 81 using this system, the markers may at their discretion award additional marks (for pieces of work initially scored at 81) or deduct further marks (for pieces of work initially scored at 29) if they believe that the piece of work merits this. If this takes place, the final amended score should be recorded here:**

**Amended Score = ------------------Now, please check that your final score represents your view on the level of the piece of work, as per these criteria:**

**70+ (distinction):** A piece of work in the 70+ range is one of exceptional quality, requiring a high level of ability and an extremely thorough and conscientious approach.

**60-69 (Good pass):** A piece of work of an overall good to very good standard

**50-59 (Pass):** A piece of work of an overall moderate to good standard. It will be descriptively strong. It is distinguished from the 60-69 piece by the level of analysis displayed and by the coherence with which the material is organised. There may be some errors or omissions of details.

**40- 49 (Fail):** A piece of work in this category shows signs of engagement with the exercise, but shows inadequacies at the doctoral or professional clinical level.

**Marks below 40 (Fail):** Marks in the 30 - 39 range indicate that the piece of work is inadequate.

**Marks below 30 (Poor Fail):** These scores are reserved for pieces of work that show extremely poor skills in multiple competencies.

**Example of final grading of a PIA 1**

**If the two markers had arrived at the following set of competency grades:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Competency** | **Grade****(W/BES/ES/AES/E)** |
| *1) Written communication* | AES |
| *2) Knowledge and skills* | ES |
| *3) Analysis and critical thinking* | W |
| *4) Professional behaviour* | AES |
| *5) Contextual Awareness* | E |

**…then the worksheet would be completed like this:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Competency** | **Weak****(W)** | **Below the expected standard (BES)** | **At the expected standard (ES)** | **Above the expected standard (AES)** | **Excellent (E)** | **Running****total** | **Adjustment** |
| *1) Written communication* | -5 | -3 | 0 | **(+3)** | +5 | (baseline score) = **55** | +/-+3 |
| *2) Knowledge and skills* | -5 | -3 | **(0)** | +3 | +5 | = **58** | +/-0 |
| *3) Analysis and critical thinking* | **(-5)** | -3 | 0 | +3 | +5 | = **58** | +/--5 |
| *4) Professional behaviour* | -6 | -4 | 0 | **(+4)** | +6 | = **53** | +/-+4 |
| *5) Contextual Awareness* | -5 | -3 | 0 | +3 | **(+5)** | = **57** | +/-+5 |
|  |  |  |  |  | **Final PIA 1****Score>>>**  | = 62 |  |

**So the final PIA 1 grade is 62, a good pass, reflecting the fact that it was good in most areas.**

The PIA 1 overall grading system has been set up such that:

* A piece of work that is ‘at the expected standard’ throughout (but no better) will receive a score in the mid 50s
* Pieces of work that are ‘at the expected standard’ in parts but have two or more areas of weakness will fail
* Pieces of work that are mainly ‘above the expected standard’ will score in the high 60s-70.
* The professional behaviour competency is weighted above others, so that good or poor performance on this competency will have a more significant effect on the final score.

**Agreeing a final mark with a second marker.**

You will have been paired up with a second marker in order to discuss the grades and numerical mark you have arrived at independently and to produce an agreed grading and mark for the PIA 1.

You should compare and discuss your evidence from the PIA 1 for each competency with your allocated second marker. For each competency, agree with your co-marker the grade to be given. Once this is complete repeat the above steps to arrive at a final numerical grade.

**If for any reason the grade description does not represent your view, return to your marking and discuss the evidence you have collected and your grading with your co-marker further.**

**Once you have allocated your final grade, complete the PIA 1 Mark Award Sheet (next page) and return this document in its entirety to the programme office. The trainee will receive your typed comments on the Trainee Feedback Sheet (starting on page 2) and the agreed grades / mark.**

## *PIA 1 Mark Award Sheet*

### Please see the preceding pages for further notes and description of the marking scheme before allocating a mark

**Trainee number:**

**Name of marker (please print):**

**Signature of marker:**

**Date:**

Please complete the central column of the table below prior to discussion with second marker. As well as providing an agreed letter grade for competencies 1-5, please also provide the final numerical mark awarded.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Competency** | **Grade prior to discussion****(W/BES/ES/AES/E)** | **Grade following****discussion****(W/BES/ES/AES/E)** |
| *1) Written communication* |  |  |
| *2) Knowledge and skills* |  |  |
| *3) Analysis and critical thinking* |  |  |
| *4) Professional behaviour* |  |  |
| *5) Contextual Awareness* |  |  |
| **Agreed Numerical Mark** |  |  |

**Key:**

**WEAK (W)** – The evidence collected suggests that this competency is significantly below the expected standard at this stage in training.

**BELOW THE EXPECTED STANDARD (BES)** – The evidence collected suggests that this competency is below the expected standard at this stage in training.

**AT THE EXPECTED STANDARD (ES)** – The evidence collected suggests that the competency is at the accepted standard for the stage in training, but does not excel in any way.

**ABOVE THE EXPECTED STANDARD (AES)** – There is evidence that good skills in the competency exist, above average for a piece of work submitted at this stage of training.

**EXCELLENT (E)** – Strong evidence has been collected that the trainee has developed this competence to a degree well beyond what would be expected at this stage of training.

**JUSTIFICATION OF MARK**

Where the agreed mark differs from the mark given before conferring with a second marker please give a brief justification for the final mark. Also if you have given a final score of below 30 or above 80 please give your reasons for this.

**Format (Extracts from Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th Edition, 2009)**

* All material must be typed or word-processed and double-spaced throughout
* The first line of all paragraphs should be indented by one tab space
* No additional lines should be placed between paragraphs or between headings and paragraphs
* Use left justification throughout
* Use a 12-point serif font (e.g., Times New Roman), do not use sans serif fonts (e.g., Arial)

**Headings**

* Five levels of headings can be used but must be used

**Heading Styles**

**Method (Level 1)**

**Materials and Procedure (Level 2)**

**Questionnaire measures (Level 3).**

 ***Trauma questionnaires (Level 4).***

*Situation subscale (Level 5).*

Sequentially.

* All headings should be in the same font and point size as the main text
* 1st level headings should be bold face and centred using ‘Title Case’
* 2nd level headings should be flush left in bold face and use ‘Title Case’
* 3rd level headings should be indented, flush left in bold face, using ‘Lowercase’ and should end with a full stop.

NB: Lower case means that only the first word is capitalised.

# Organisation of Manuscript

The main section headings in an APA style manuscript tend to be: Method, Results, Discussion, Results and Discussion, Conclusions. Specific headings will depend on the nature of the paper. However, the main heading **Introduction** is never used in APA style papers as it is assumed that the first section of the paper will be the introduction.

**Citations and References**

* If a references has just one or two authors you should always cite all authors in the following format (Hatton, 1999; Ashcroft & Gray, 2000). Note: (1) name should be followed by a coma; (2) use ‘&’, not ‘and’.
* If a references has three to five authors you should cite it in full the first time it is used (e.g., Hatton, Ashcroft, Murphy & Gray, 1998). On all subsequent instances it should be cited as first author et al., date (e.g., Hatton et al., 1998) unless this creates confusion with another reference. So, if you have two multi-author references with the same first author and same year (e.g., Hatton, Ashcroft, Murphy & Gray, 1998; Hatton, Murphy, Ashcroft & Emerson, 1998), shorten both to the minimum number of authors that allow them to be distinguished (e.g., Hatton, Ashcroft et al., 1998; Hatton, Murphy et al., 1998). Note: remember the full stop and comma after ‘et al’.
* References with six or more authors should be cited as first author et al, date on all occasions (e.g., Hatton et al., 1998) unless (as above) this creates confusion with another reference. Again, shorten to as few authors as possible to resolve this confusion.
* In order to avoid confusion between references with identical authors/dates use a,b,c etc . (e.g., Amor & Dunn, 2000a).
* For papers/books etc. you did not read (but did read about in a secondary source) only include the secondary source in citations and reference list. For example, if Hatton (1999) discusses a paper by Ashcroft (1988) and you have not actually read Ashcroft (1988), in the text you would write ‘Ashcroft’s study (as cited in Hatton, 1999) ....’ and in the reference list only include the full reference to Hatton (1999)
* All references should be typed double spaced in the same font and point size as the main text
* Examples of appropriate styles for more common referenced materials are given below.

 Azmi, S., Hatton, C., Emerson, E., & Caine, A. (1997). Listening to adolescents and adults with intellectual disabilities from South Asian communities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 10*, 250-263.

 Edgerton, R.B. (1967). *The Cloak of Competence: Stigma in the Lives of the Retarded*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

 Felce, D. (1996). Quality of support for ordinary living. In J. Mansell & K. Ericsson (Eds.), *Deinstitutionalization and community living: intellectual disability services in Britain, Scandinavia and the USA* (pp. 117-133). London: Chapman and Hall.