

EX2 SERIES SUMMARY REPORT

QUALIFICATION TITLE	Level 4 Diploma in Therapeutic Counselling
QAN	D4102-04
UNIT NUMBER (URN)	F/601/7636
SERIES DATE	September – November 2018 (028)

The report below summarises the findings of the examiner team following the recent examination/assessment series. Tutors are required to take note of the recommendations made by the Lead Examiner to ensure that candidates are supported in achieving the best possible outcome in future assessments.

LEARNING OUTCOME	COMMENTS
1. Be able to demonstrate an understanding of one of their placement agencies	<p><u>1.1 Explain the following for their placement agency: main purpose, organisational structure, ways of working, policies and procedures</u></p> <p>In some cases, when an organisation chart was submitted in an attempt to meet this criterion, the organisation structure was shown but the relevance of the roles and responsibilities was not explained.</p> <p>Although policies and their application (procedures) were listed, their relevance was not always explained. Candidates must explain the main purpose, organisational structure, and ways of working in addition to the relevance/importance of policies and procedures to that organisation.</p> <p><u>1.2 Explain the relevance and application of one piece of statutory legislation to their placement agency</u></p> <p>Statutory legislation was often identified but had limited relevance to the placement agency in question. Occasionally, a policy was offered rather than a piece of legislation.</p> <p>N.B. Centres need to be aware that the Data Protection Act changed in May 2018. Learners who started their portfolios in, or after May 2018 should be referring to the GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation).</p>

	<p><u>1.3 Evaluate your own placement experience</u></p> <p>In some cases, not all aspects of the placement were being evaluated. The evaluation must cover the particulars explained in 1.1. Sometimes, the evaluation bordered on descriptive rather than being evaluative.</p>
<p>2. Understand the importance of working agreements.</p>	<p><u>2.1 Enter into a working agreement with the following: each of their placement agencies and each of their supervisors</u></p> <p>In some cases, there were no signatures and/or dates on working agreements. Some candidates failed to submit agreements. This does not result in a referral on its own but will delay the marking process whilst they are requested.</p> <p><u>2.2 Evaluate the importance of all these working agreements</u></p> <p>On occasion, the evaluation of the working agreements was more descriptive than evaluative, and sometimes there was a lack of evaluation of the importance of the contents of the working agreements.</p> <p>Occasionally, not all of the working agreements submitted were evaluated.</p>
<p>3. Maintain records of placement practice.</p>	<p><u>3.1 Produce verified records of their own placement practice over a minimum of 100 client hours</u></p> <p>Sometimes, logs were not in date order. Logs should be completed chronologically; clients should not be grouped together.</p> <p>Occasionally, not all details on the logs were completed. It should be clearly stated whether supervision was individual or group, and if group supervision is counted, it should be identified how many individuals were in the group.</p> <p>If the counselling of young people is included, then their age should be clearly stated.</p> <p>Occasionally, ABC Awards templates were not used for client/supervision logs. These forms were made mandatory in September 2017 and future submissions that do not use these forms will not be accepted.</p> <p>On occasion, running totals were not offered, which required examiners to add up individual totals themselves.</p>

	<p><u>3.2 Produce verified records of their own supervision throughout their placement(s)</u></p> <p>In some cases, there was insufficient supervision for the 100 client hours and thus submissions were rejected. Other common issues seemed to result in inaccuracies first identified in outcome 3.1, such as the number and length of group supervisions not being recorded.</p> <p>There were also instances of supervision times exceeding the 31 days stated in the supervision guidance without sufficient explanation given, and these logs were returned for further clarification as to why the supervision requirements had not been met.</p> <p>Note: any anomalies with verified records of placement practice or supervision should always be clearly explained to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>It is now the centre’s responsibility to check that logs hold all the information required.</p>
<p>4. Relate theory of theoretical approach(es) they have been trained in to practice with one client</p>	<p><u>4.1 Outline, through the main key concepts, the theoretical approach(es) they have been trained in to their placement practice</u></p> <p>Common issues in this outcome include not outlining the main key concepts from the theoretical approach (approaches if an Integrated approach is used). There is a requirement that the key concepts approach are outlined in 4.1, their application to one client analysed in 4.2 and their application to the same client evaluated in 4.3.</p> <p>Sometimes, not all concepts are outlined (brief summary), not simply listed in 4.1, but brought in for the first time for analysis in 4.2. If a concept is analysed in 4.2 and/or evaluated in 4.3, it must be outlined in 4.1.</p> <p>There was a tendency on occasion for some learners to simply name a key concept with no outline. Also, outlining the model and the methods used rather than the main key concepts of the counselling theories that underpin the model does not sufficiently meet the assessment criterion.</p> <p>Some candidates did not use their own words to outline the key concepts, instead quoting from books and handouts, which not only invalidates the learning outcome, but risks the learner being disqualified for plagiarism.</p>

	<p><u>4.2 Analyse the application of the theoretical approach(es) they have been trained in to their work with one client over several sessions</u></p> <p>The client content overshadowed the main body of the evidence - an analysis of the application to the chosen client, with information on the key concepts of the theoretical approach(es).</p> <p>Strategies, techniques and interventions were often focused on without reference to the underlying concept. Chunks of verbatim transcript were sometimes offered that did not show any analysis of the key concepts.</p> <p>On occasion, the use of key concepts as headings rather than integrating these into the case study over the counselling sessions weakened the candidate's response. The key concepts should flow throughout the sessions.</p> <p>Some candidates offered evidence that is not a case study; others were overly dependent on description rather than analysis.</p> <p>In addition to this, some learners presented evidence that makes the client relate to the key concepts rather than the relevant key concepts relate to the chosen client.</p> <p><u>4.3 Evaluate the application of the theoretical approach(es) they have been trained in to their work with this client</u></p> <p>As previously mentioned, the outline-analyse-evaluate model should flow through all three criteria of this unit. Some approaches that were outlined in 4.1 and analysed in 4.2 were not evaluated in 4.3.</p> <p>Some learners did not sufficiently evaluate, instead relying on description. On some occasions, new key concepts were introduced here that should have been outlined in 4.1.</p> <p>In some cases, learners evaluated the counselling process holistically rather than the applied key concepts.</p>
<p>5. Relate supervision to practice with a different client</p>	<p><u>5.1 Analyse the learning gained from a minimum of two supervision sessions in relation to their work with one client</u></p> <p>The analysis here must be in depth and must demonstrate reflective practice.</p> <p>In some cases, there was very little analysis of learning gained from issues taken to supervision. Also, learning being applied to the chosen client was referred to here, when it should be included in 5.2.</p>

	<p>Some learners only offered one supervision session, and other learners only offered one issue with one client.</p> <p><u>5.2 Evaluate how this learning informed their work with this client over a minimum of two counselling sessions</u></p> <p>Some learners offered no evaluation on the learning gained from 5.1 as it is put into practice with the chosen client in subsequent counselling sessions. Occasionally, some learners took the opportunity to discuss their supervision experiences rather than evaluating how this learning informed their work with a client.</p> <p>Sometimes, there was a general evaluative nature to some submissions rather than specific issues taken to supervision.</p> <p>Occasionally, learning gained put into practice does not relate to learning gained from 5.1.</p>
<p>6. Reflect on own professional practice.</p>	<p><u>6.1 Evaluate own practice using feedback received from supervisor(s) confirmatory reports</u></p> <p>Some candidates did not include all of the necessary supervision reports. All supervisors need to complete a report and currently the supervisor with the majority of hours needs to complete the 100 hour report. In some cases, up to date supervision reports were not submitted, or they were not signed or dated.</p> <p>There was a tendency by some candidates to evaluate supervision in general terms without referring to the reports, or the evidence only relates to a couple of aspects of the report, ignoring some others.</p> <p><u>6.2 Evaluate own practice using feedback received from placement report(s)</u></p> <p>Some candidates did not include all of the necessary placement reports. Others included evidence that did not relate to what had been written in the placement reports. Some candidates submitted action plans and reviews as evidence. Only the ABC Awards placement report is required.</p> <p>As with other units where evaluate is the key command verb, insufficient evaluation was provided, instead relying too heavily on description.</p> <p><u>6.3 Identify areas for further professional development</u></p> <p>On some occasions, candidates offered areas of personal development rather than recognising further professional</p>

	<p>development. In some cases, future plans were not discussed or candidates provided evidence of professional development already undertaken.</p>
<p>General comments</p>	<p>One of the most common issues with this series is that portfolios were submitted with unnecessary paperwork. In order to make the marking of portfolios as smooth and efficient as possible, it is requested that learners only submit the required evidence as per the checklist provided by ABC Awards.</p> <p>As mentioned under 3.2, any anomalies with verified records of placement practice or supervision should always be clearly explained to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>Appendices are sometimes offered in portfolios, which are not required unless it is in order to clarify any ambiguities. Evidence should specifically relate to each learning outcome and assessment criteria.</p> <p>Some learners provided evidence in bullet points, which does not offer explanation, analysis or evaluation.</p> <p>Evidence for e-portfolios on Achieve Live must be typed into the appropriate learner response boxes and not uploaded as documents. This slows down marking significantly. Documents that relate to specific outcomes are occasionally uploaded into the wrong sections.</p> <p>In order to make marking more efficient, some learners may wish to consider combining pages from one document as one attachment, rather than uploading each page as a separate document. Care should also be taken to ensure that uploaded documents are scanned in with the correct orientation.</p> <p>The most common outcome for the uploading of unnecessary documentation is 3.1 and 3.2. The only required documentation is the client and supervision log provided by ABC Awards. Summaries of client and supervision are not required.</p> <p>When resubmitting, the new evidence offered must be integrated into the original evidence submitted and the full assessment criterion submitted again so that new evidence can be viewed 'in context'. Standalone paragraphs submitted separately from the original submission will not be marked.</p>