

## SERVICE RELATED PROJECT (SRP) Instructions to Markers

The SRP is a stand-alone assignment that is completed by all DCLinPsy trainees (more information [here](#)). You should initially use the Trainee Feedback Form to collect your evidence and write your feedback to the trainee. ***Please note that this form is returned to the trainee in its entirety.*** You should then use the first part of the Marker Booklet (blue) to rate each competency and allocate a provisional overall mark using the calculation system (example overleaf).

Each report is marked 'blind' by a pair of markers, so the next step is to compare and discuss your evidence and grades with your co-marker. For each competency, discuss and agree the final grade to be given. Then again use Marker Booklet (red sections) to arrive at a final agreed numerical mark.

Next, check that this final mark represents your overall view of the piece of work (as per the criteria on the last page of the Marker Booklet). If it does not, then please revisit the competency grading with your co-marker until an overall mark emerges that does represent your views. Once you have agreed your final marks, complete the front page of the Marker Booklet, transfer the agreed competency ratings and agreed final mark to the front page of your Trainee Feedback Form and return both documents to the programme office by the agreed date.

If the final mark given is a fail, then we will forward your marks and feedback along with the submission to one of the programme's external examiners for moderation. We also routinely send a sample of passing reports from across the mark range for external examiners to review.

Once marks and feedback have been returned (and moderated if necessary) then trainees receive the Trainee Feedback Forms you have completed, including their unrated mark. ***Please note that we do not send the marker booklet, provisional individual ratings, or the original assignment back to the trainee.*** Marks are then ratified at the corresponding Examination Board.

### Tips for completing the trainee feedback form

Please make your feedback to the trainee as constructive and detailed as possible in each section of the form. To this end please write in full sentences and as fully as is practical so that trainees can make best use of the feedback. Strengths as well as weaknesses should be highlighted, and specific examples of how the SRP could have been improved should be included. We suggest you address positive feedback directly to the trainee writing in the second person (e.g. "you write clearly"). However, as research suggests that critical feedback is most easily taken on board when directed at the piece of work rather than the author this is best delivered using more passive constructions (e.g. "there are frequent spelling errors in the paper" rather than "you frequently make spelling errors").

In order to ensure legibility, all feedback must be typed. The Trainee Feedback Form which has been sent to you electronically contains examples of positive and negative behavioural indicators for each competency which you may wish to highlight if they apply to the work being marked.

### Example of final grading of an SRP

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

Competency	Grade awarded (U/W/BES/ES/AES/E)
1) <i>Standard setting</i>	ES
2) <i>Written communication</i>	BES
3) <i>Knowledge and skills</i>	W
4) <i>Analysis and critical thinking</i>	AES
5) <i>Professional Behaviour</i>	AES
Final Mark (0-100)	52

...then the worksheet would be completed like this:

FINAL MARK CALCULATION TABLE							
Competency	Weak (W)	Below the expected standard (BES)	At the expected standard (ES)	Above the expected standard (AES)	Exceptional (E)	Adjustment	Running Total (baseline score) = 55
<i>Standard setting</i>	-5	-3	0	+3	+5	+/-	= 55
<i>Written communication</i>	-5	-3	0	+3	+5	+/-	= 52
<i>Knowledge and skills</i>	-7	-4	0	+4	+7	+/-	= 45
<i>Analysis and critical thinking</i>	-7	-4	0	+4	+7	+/-	= 49
<i>Professional Behaviour</i>	-5	-3	0	+3	+5	+/-	Final Agreed SRP Score =
							52
							Amended Score (if used) =

## Format (Extracts from Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6<sup>th</sup> 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 sequentially.
  - All headings should be in the same font and point size as the main text
  - 1<sup>st</sup> level headings should be bold face and centred using 'Title Case'
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> level headings should be flush left in bold face and use 'Title Case'
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> 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.

Heading Styles
Method (Level 1)
Materials and Procedure (Level 2)
Questionnaire measures (Level 3).
Trauma questionnaires (Level 4).
Situation subscale (Level 5).

### 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 reference 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 comma; (2) use '&', not 'and'.
- If a reference 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.