

Skills development — Timepoint 2

COUN6013 · 800 words · summary review and analysis · Lecturer: Graham Gill Emerson

Module: Counselling Skills Development 1 (COUN6013)

Brief: Write a summary review and analysis of skills development to date based from the plan you developed in week 7 (800 words).

Online version (when live): psych-dashboard.duckdns.org/rubrics/skills-development-1-tp2

How the marks work

There are 7 criteria. Each one has a weight in marks. The weights add up to 100.

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.

Excellent (70-100%)	Excels in this area.
Very Good (60-69%)	Performs in a consistently competent and confident way.
Satisfactory (50-59%)	Performs at an adequate level but has scope for development.
Needs Work (40-49%)	Performs somewhat less than adequately and needs development.
Unsatisfactory (0-39%)	Performs considerably less than adequately and needs development.

CRITERION 1

Review of Skills Development Since Week 7 (LO1 and LO2)

Weight: 20 marks

Excellent 70-100% 14-20 marks	Provides a comprehensive, insightful, and well-supported review of skills development. Demonstrates substantial growth in counselling skills with clear evidence from practice experiences. Shows excellent understanding of learning gained and its application.
Very Good 60-69% 12-13 marks	Provides a detailed review of skills development with clear evidence of progress. Demonstrates good awareness of learning and professional growth, supported by relevant examples.
Satisfactory 50-59% 10-11 marks	Provides an adequate review of skills development. Some evidence of progress is presented, although discussion tends to be descriptive.
Needs Work 40-49% 8-9 marks	Provides a limited review of skills development. Evidence of learning is vague, incomplete, or inconsistent.
Unsatisfactory 0-39% 0-7 marks	Provides little or no meaningful review of skills development. Minimal evidence of learning or growth is demonstrated.

CRITERION 2**Analysis of Progress Against Week 7 Development Plan (LO1 and LO2)**

Weight: 25 marks

Excellent 70–100% 18–25 marks	Critically evaluates progress against all development goals. Clearly identifies achievements, challenges, barriers, and areas requiring further development. Uses specific evidence to demonstrate learning and achievement.
Very Good 60–69% 15–17 marks	Analyses progress against most development goals. Demonstrates good understanding of achievements and areas for improvement, supported by examples.
Satisfactory 50–59% 13–14 marks	Discusses progress against some goals but analysis lacks depth. Connections between goals and outcomes are evident but underdeveloped.
Needs Work 40–49% 10–12 marks	Makes limited reference to the development plan. Discussion is largely descriptive with little evaluation.
Unsatisfactory 0–39% 0–9 marks	Fails to meaningfully evaluate progress against stated goals. Limited or no engagement with the development plan.

CRITERION 3**Reflection on Feedback Received and Used (LO3)**

Weight: 15 marks

Excellent 70–100% 11–15 marks	Demonstrates sophisticated reflection on feedback received from tutors and peers. Clearly explains how feedback was accepted, interpreted, and applied to improve practice. Shows high levels of self-reflection.
Very Good 60–69% 9–10 marks	Demonstrates thoughtful reflection on feedback and provides evidence of how feedback informed learning and practice.
Satisfactory 50–59% 8 marks	Identifies feedback received and demonstrates some application of learning, though reflection remains limited.
Needs Work 40–49% 6–7 marks	Mentions feedback but shows little evidence of reflection or implementation.
Unsatisfactory 0–39% 0–5 marks	Little or no evidence of engaging with or applying feedback.

CRITERION 4**Reflection on Peer Learning and Giving Feedback (LO4)**

Weight: 10 marks

Excellent 70–100% 8–10 marks	Demonstrates excellent understanding of peer learning. Critically reflects on both giving and receiving feedback, showing sensitivity, professionalism, and awareness of collaborative learning processes.
Very Good 60–69% 7 marks	Reflects effectively on peer learning experiences and demonstrates understanding of constructive feedback processes.
Satisfactory 50–59% 6 marks	Discusses peer learning experiences adequately but reflection lacks critical depth.
Needs Work 40–49% 4–5 marks	Limited discussion of peer feedback experiences and learning gained from group.
Unsatisfactory 0–39% 0–3 marks	No meaningful discussion of peer learning or feedback experiences.

CRITERION 5**Self-Awareness and Reflection on Personal Process (LO5)**

Weight: 15 marks

Excellent 70–100% 11–15 marks	Demonstrates exceptional self-awareness and critical reflection. Explores strengths, limitations, emotional responses, and self-management strategies with considerable insight. Identifies realistic goals for future growth.
Very Good 60–69% 9–10 marks	Demonstrates good self-awareness and reflection. Identifies strengths, challenges, and areas for future development with reasonable insight.
Satisfactory 50–59% 8 marks	Demonstrates adequate self-awareness. Reflection is evident but tends to focus on description rather than analysis.
Needs Work 40–49% 6–7 marks	Reflection lacks depth and insight. Limited evidence of self-awareness or personal growth.
Unsatisfactory 0–39% 0–5 marks	Minimal or no evidence of self-reflection or understanding of personal process.

CRITERION 6**Analysis of Counselling Practice Experience (LO6)**

Weight: 10 marks

Excellent 70–100% 8–10 marks	Provides insightful analysis of counselling practice experiences, considering the client's experience, counsellor's experience, therapeutic process, and working alliance. Effectively links experience to counselling theory and research.
Very Good 60–69% 7 marks	Provides a clear analysis of practice experiences and demonstrates good understanding of counselling processes and skills.
Satisfactory 50–59% 6 marks	Provides an adequate discussion of practice experiences with some evidence of analysis.
Needs Work 40–49% 4–5 marks	Discussion remains largely descriptive. Analysis of counselling practice is limited or superficial.
Unsatisfactory 0–39% 0–3 marks	Little or no analysis of counselling practice experiences.

CRITERION 7**Academic Writing, Structure and Presentation**

Weight: 5 marks

Excellent 70–100% 5 marks	Exceptionally well organised and professionally presented. Writing is clear, coherent, and concise. Excellent academic style with virtually no grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors.
Very Good 60–69% 4 marks	Well-structured and clearly written. Minor language errors do not detract from overall quality.
Satisfactory 50–59% 3 marks	Adequately organised and generally clear. Some issues with grammar, structure, or academic style.
Needs Work 40–49% 2 marks	Weak organisation and frequent language errors reduce clarity and impact.
Unsatisfactory 0–39% 0–1 marks	Poorly organised and difficult to follow. Significant errors impede understanding.

Notes on the source

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

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