

# Counselling skills practice — transcript and analysis

COUN6011 · Transcript and analysis · Lecturer: Graham Gill Emerson

Module: Counselling Skills Application 1 (COUN6011)

**Brief:** Transcript and analysis of counselling skills practice.

Online version (when live): [psych-dashboard.duckdns.org/rubrics/skills-application-1-transcript](https://psych-dashboard.duckdns.org/rubrics/skills-application-1-transcript)

## How the marks work

There are 8 criteria. Each one has a weight in marks. The weights add up to 105 (as printed in the lecturer's rubric).

For each criterion, your work is placed in one of five bands. Each band shows the marks for that criterion and what the lecturer is looking for.

|                                |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Excellent (70-100%)</b>     | Excels in this area.                                              |
| <b>Very Good (60-69%)</b>      | Performs in a consistently competent and confident way.           |
| <b>Satisfactory (50-59%)</b>   | Performs at an adequate level but has scope for development.      |
| <b>Needs work (40-49%)</b>     | Performs somewhat less than adequately and needs development.     |
| <b>Unsatisfactory (20-39%)</b> | Performs considerably less than adequately and needs development. |

### CRITERION 1

#### Brief Description of session (ILO2, LO3, LO5)

Weight: 5 marks

|                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Excellent</b><br>70-100%<br><b>5 marks</b>         | Concise identifies key issues for presenting and underlying issues, demonstrating strong insight and prioritisation. Clinical needs are clearly identified with excellent understanding of the client's presenting and underlying needs. Provides a detailed, accurate description of the client's context, emotional, cognitive, and behavioural characteristics, supported by observation. |
| <b>Very Good</b><br>60-69%<br><b>4-4.5 marks</b>      | Identifies main issues accurately, though depth may be limited. Clinical needs are identified clearly, though depth may be limited. Describes presentation clearly with minor gaps in interpretation/analysis.                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>Satisfactory</b><br>50-59%<br><b>3 marks</b>       | Identifies some issues but analysis is broad or lacks clarity. Clinical needs are identified but are general or not focused. Basic description of presentation with minimal analysis.                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Needs work</b><br>40-49%<br><b>2-2.5 marks</b>     | Issues are unclear, poorly prioritised, or partially misunderstood. Clinical needs are unclear, narrowed, or weakly linked to the session. Presentation is vaguely described or lacks observational detail.                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Unsatisfactory</b><br>20-39%<br><b>1-1.5 marks</b> | Issues are not identified or are inaccurately described. Clinical needs are unidentified or are inappropriate. Presentation is inaccurately described or not observed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

**CRITERION 2****Interventions (ILO2, LO3, LO5)**

Weight: 25 marks

|                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Excellent</b><br>70–100%<br><b>18–25 marks</b>        | Clearly and insightfully articulates choice of interventions with clear justification. Choice of interventions based on sound clinical reasoning. Identifies multiple impact levels clearly. Evaluates impact thoughtfully, showing evidence of pausing/reflective choice points. Provides clear examples.                                  |
| <b>Very Good</b><br>60–69%<br><b>15.5–17.25 marks</b>    | Identifies and describes choice of interventions, but lack of clarity or justification in places. Choice of intervention based on clinical reasoning but may be less depth/broad. Identifies and describes key impact levels. Makes reasonable attempt to link interventions to clinical insight. Examples are relevant and support points. |
| <b>Satisfactory</b><br>50–59%<br><b>12.5–14.75 marks</b> | Choice of interventions is broad, vague, or only partially grounded in clinical reasoning. Identifies some interventions with limited or basic justification. Mentions impact but lacks depth or specific link. Provides limited examples.                                                                                                  |
| <b>Needs work</b><br>40–49%<br><b>10–12.25 marks</b>     | Choice of interventions is unclear, poorly justified, or poorly linked to session. Basic or minimal reference to choice of intervention, with limited understanding of impact. Choice points are vaguely identified or poorly explained. Few, unclear, or irrelevant examples.                                                              |
| <b>Unsatisfactory</b><br>20–39%<br><b>5–9.75 marks</b>   | Choice of interventions is inappropriate, unclear, or not linked to session. Choice points are unidentified or are inaccurately described.                                                                                                                                                                                                  |

**CRITERION 3****Internal/Personal Process of Counsellor (ILO4, LO5)**

Weight: 30 marks

|                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Excellent</b><br>70–100%<br><b>22–30 marks</b>       | Demonstrates deep, insightful, and comprehensive thought and awareness of thoughts arising during the session. Insightfully identifies and explores internal reactions. Thoughtfully explores feelings, imagery, or assumptions that arose. Clearly identifies reflexive reactions and links them meaningfully to reaction or interpretation. |
| <b>Very Good</b><br>60–69%<br><b>18–21.75 marks</b>     | Identifies thoughts and awareness with some exploration of their impact. Clearly identifies feelings with some exploration of their meaning. Identifies reflexive reactions or imagery with some insight into their relevance.                                                                                                                |
| <b>Satisfactory</b><br>50–59%<br><b>15–17.75 marks</b>  | Mentions thoughts but reflection is descriptive rather than analytical. Feelings are identified but explored superficially. Mentions reactions or assumptions briefly with limited explanation.                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>Needs work</b><br>40–49%<br><b>12–14.75 marks</b>    | Limited or unclear awareness of thoughts, minimal reflection. Feelings are vaguely described or poorly understood. Reactions or assumptions are unclear or weakly described.                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Unsatisfactory</b><br>20–39%<br><b>6–11.75 marks</b> | Thoughts are not identified or identified inaccurately. Feelings are not identified or misrepresented. No reference to feelings, imagery, or assumptions.                                                                                                                                                                                     |

**CRITERION 4****Clinical Process/Movement (ILO2, LO5)**

Weight: 5 marks

|                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Excellent</b><br>70–100%<br><b>5 marks</b>         | Clearly identifies and articulates the significant moments or shifts in the clinical relationship, with thoughtful exploration. Insightfully explains how movement or intervention facilitated movement. Consistently uses relevant and well-integrated examples from the session to support points. |
| <b>Very Good</b><br>60–69%<br><b>4–4.5 marks</b>      | Identifies major moments in the clinical process with reasonable clarity. Explains facilitation of movement with appropriate links to session evidence. Uses relevant examples, linking to general and specific points.                                                                              |
| <b>Satisfactory</b><br>50–59%<br><b>3 marks</b>       | Makes limited or tentative assessment without depth of explanation. Links somewhat relevant to movement in a basic and/or general way. Provides limited or general examples.                                                                                                                         |
| <b>Needs work</b><br>40–49%<br><b>2 marks</b>         | Moments are vaguely described or questionable. Limited or weak explanation of how movement was facilitated. Examples are unclear, irrelevant, or poorly linked.                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Unsatisfactory</b><br>20–39%<br><b>1–1.5 marks</b> | Moments unidentified, or inaccurately stated. No explanation of facilitation of movement or shifts. No examples provided.                                                                                                                                                                            |

**CRITERION 5****Review of feedback given and use or reversal of this (LO4, LO5)**

Weight: 25 marks

|                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Excellent</b><br>70–100%<br><b>18–25 marks</b>        | Insightfully and comprehensively identifies, summarises, and evaluates feedback. Insightfully and thoughtfully explores key issues. Insightfully captures learning from reactions, and builds connections arising while reviewing feedback, with new reflections. |
| <b>Very Good</b><br>60–69%<br><b>15–17.25 marks</b>      | Reviews and links some feedback clearly with thoughtful identification of main points. Clearly identifies inner experience with some reflection depth.                                                                                                            |
| <b>Satisfactory</b><br>50–59%<br><b>12.5–14.75 marks</b> | Summarises and reviews feedback with limited evaluation or analysis. Inner experiences are mentioned but reflection is surface level.                                                                                                                             |
| <b>Needs work</b><br>40–49%<br><b>10–12.25 marks</b>     | Poorly reviews feedback, briefly discussed or poorly researched. Inner experiences are vague, limited, or poorly reviewed.                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Unsatisfactory</b><br>20–39%<br><b>5–9.75 marks</b>   | Poor review of feedback; discussed or misinterpreted. No reference to inner experience while reviewing feedback.                                                                                                                                                  |

**CRITERION 6****Key Learnings from the session, process review and feedback (LO5)**

Weight: 5 marks

|                                                       |                                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Excellent</b><br>70–100%<br><b>5 marks</b>         | Clearly identifies and articulates specific, meaningful, and highly relevant learning. Identifies key learning points and links them to the session. |
| <b>Very Good</b><br>60–69%<br><b>4–4.5 marks</b>      | Identifies relevant learnings with some clarity and relevance.                                                                                       |
| <b>Satisfactory</b><br>50–59%<br><b>3 marks</b>       | Identifies some learnings, though they may be general or limited in depth.                                                                           |
| <b>Needs work</b><br>40–49%<br><b>2 marks</b>         | Learnings are vague, unclear, or weakly related to the session.                                                                                      |
| <b>Unsatisfactory</b><br>20–39%<br><b>1–1.5 marks</b> | Learnings are unidentified or are inappropriate.                                                                                                     |

**CRITERION 7****Plans & challenges to improve or maintain current performance (LO5)**

Weight: 5 marks

|                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Excellent</b><br>70–100%<br><b>5 marks</b>         | Future plans are clearly articulated, relevant, and well structured. Plans are clearly relevant to insights identified from session and evaluation of feedback received. |
| <b>Very Good</b><br>60–69%<br><b>4–4.5 marks</b>      | Plans are articulated, with some lack of specificity. Plans are clearly linked to session and/or feedback, though links may be limited.                                  |
| <b>Satisfactory</b><br>50–59%<br><b>3 marks</b>       | Plans are stated but are general or vague. Some connection to learning is evident but not well developed.                                                                |
| <b>Needs work</b><br>40–49%<br><b>2–2.5 marks</b>     | Plans are unclear, poorly articulated, or somewhat irrelevant. No clear connection to session or learning.                                                               |
| <b>Unsatisfactory</b><br>20–39%<br><b>1–1.5 marks</b> | Plans are absent or not described. No connection to session/learning demonstrated.                                                                                       |

**CRITERION 8****Presentation — Clarity & Layout (LO5)**

Weight: 5 marks

|                                                       |                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Excellent</b><br>70–100%<br><b>5 marks</b>         | Writing is professionally presented. Writing is clear, coherent, and precise.                                           |
| <b>Very Good</b><br>60–69%<br><b>4–4.5 marks</b>      | Presentation is clear and professional, with minor limitations. Writing is mostly clear with minor lapses in precision. |
| <b>Satisfactory</b><br>50–59%<br><b>3 marks</b>       | Writing is generally clear. Some lapses in presentation or grammar.                                                     |
| <b>Needs work</b><br>40–49%<br><b>2–2.5 marks</b>     | Clarity is frequently compromised by poor grammar or organisation.                                                      |
| <b>Unsatisfactory</b><br>20–39%<br><b>1–1.5 marks</b> | Writing lacks clarity, and meaning is often unclear.                                                                    |

**Notes on the source**

Only spelling and typing slips were fixed. Gaps and unclear values in the lecturer's rubric are shown, not guessed.

**F.** The weights in the lecturer's rubric add up to 105, not 100. That is how they are printed. Check with your lecturer or Canvas if you are unsure how this is used.

Typed from the lecturer's rubric (Oct 2026). Check the official copy on Canvas if in doubt.