

Involving Children & Young People in Research and Consultation

Assessment 2016

10 credits, Level 11 in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (postgraduate level)

Equivalent to 5 credits in ECTS (European system)

Two forms of assessment will be required:

1. Two contributions to the course's on-line discussion. Each should be an initiating contribution, with a critical evaluation of a resource relevant to the course's aim. The resources should not already be identified in the course resources.

500 words (or less) would be expected for each contribution. (This assessment will form 10% of your mark).

Due date: 22nd April 2016

2. 2500 word comparison of two of the course's case studies. Students are asked to compare critically: the fieldwork methodology; the ethical issues; and the knowledge exchange (dissemination) strategy. References should be made to reputable external sources (e.g. journal articles, reliable web resources, books). (This assessment will form 90% of your mark).

Due date: 13th May 2016

Please note: if you are taking other CRFR CPD courses you must differentiate between your assessments: i.e. they should not be on the same resources (on-line contributions) nor topics (assignment).

To submit assessment 2:

- E-mail it to Laura Marshal (l.marshall@ed.ac.uk) by the above deadlines.
- Ensure your assessment is within in a word file, and has an initial cover sheet with the following details: your name, title of paper and word count (excluding the bibliography). Do not put your name on the assessment itself as it will be marked anonymously.

Further information is provided below in terms of grading criteria and advice.

Assessments will be marked and moderated by Susan Elsley and Kay Tisdall. A copy will be returned to you with a provisional mark and comments.

Marks are provisional until confirmed by the board of examiners (which, for this assessment, will be June 2016). The board of examiners is composed of the MSc in Childhood Studies teaching staff together with the external examiner (Professor Jo Moran-Ellis). All work is available to the external examiner as an independent marker. External examiners may be invited to conduct oral examinations and to comment on selected cases.

Plagiarism is considered a serious offence which will be penalised. Plagiarism is the unacknowledged use of the work of another, so as to pass it off as one's own. This includes the copying of work from both published and unpublished sources. Further information and advice for students on plagiarism can be found at <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/students/postgraduate-taught/discipline/plagiarism>

Procedures for academic appeals are described in section 10.3 of the Code of Practice for Taught Postgraduate Programmes
<http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/academicservices/codes/coptaughtpgprogrammes.pdf>

Assessment 1: On-line contributions

Identify a web resource that you want to critically assess. It should be a resource which is not on the course resources. The resource can be a research report, toolkit, ethical guidelines or some other resource of relevance to the course.

You should state the title of the resource and how to locate the resource (e.g. website link).

The on-line contribution should be a critical comment/assessment of the resource. The contribution should include two separate findings that you have arrived at and should refer to at least one course reading.

500 words (or less) for each contribution. (see below for penalties if you are over the word length).

You must provide 2 on-line contributions.

Due date: 22nd April 2016

Assessment 2: General advice

You are expected to make some reference to external sources (journal articles, books and reliable websources). We recognise, though, that you may not have extensive access to library resources; the text book and course resources on CRFR website may be useful to you.

Please follow referencing conventions in your written assessment (see Appendix 1) and include a bibliography in your submission. You are not required to use the 'Harvard' system, as outlined in Appendix 1, but please ensure you use a consistent referencing system and provide full information to the reader. The marking scheme, an elaboration on this, and the standard feedback sheet are included in Appendix 2.

The overall length of the assessment should be 2500 words. This excludes the bibliography and any appendices. You will be penalised if your work is over the word length. Five marks will be deducted for every 10% over the word limit or fraction thereof up to a maximum of 10 marks.

We have a set deadline of 13th May 2016. If you keep in touch with us, we can extend this up until **30th June 2016**.

Assessment 2: A comparison of two of the course's case studies

These can be case studies contained within the textbook (Tisdall et al. 2009) or case studies that are on the CRFR course website.

Using the two case studies, briefly summarise the research/ consultation aims and how the research/ consultation was undertaken. Please do not use more than 500 words (no more than 250 per case study).

Then write a section on each of the following issues:

1. Consider whether each piece of research focuses on the most appropriate unit of analysis or type of respondent, makes appropriate selection or sampling decisions, and uses the most appropriate method or methods of data collection and recording, given the overall aims and objectives of the study. Are the aims and objectives and the rationale for each of these aspects of the methods clearly specified? Is it clear whether alternatives were considered and eliminated? Is there anything you think should have been done differently or in addition? Do you think one was better designed in these respects than the other? (No more than 1000 words in total)
2. Discuss whether ethical issues were fully and equally taken on board in your two case studies. Discuss whether anything should have been done differently. (No more than 500 words)

3. Finally, compare the types of knowledge exchange (e.g. dissemination) activities and outputs mentioned by the two case studies. Which audiences were they trying to reach and was this done appropriately? How did they deal with feedback to the participants? Are there other audiences or forms of dissemination that you think should ideally have been covered? Do you know anything about the impact of the research or its likely impact? Has the dissemination helped it achieve its original aims? (no more than 500 words)

Appendix 1: Creating a list of references

The reference list is given at the end of your written work in a prescribed order using a standard format and punctuation.

a) References are arranged alphabetically by the author's name; different works by the same author are arranged in order of year of publication,

b) If works are published by the same author in the same year, they should be listed in alphabetical order of title, using a, b, etc. after the year,

e.g. Burnard, P. (1998a) Personal qualities or skills? A report of a study of nursing students' views of the characteristics of counsellors. *Nurse Education Today* 18(8) Nov 649-654.

Burnard, P. (1998b) Simplicity is genius. *Practising Midwife* 1(12) Dec 20-21

In the body of your writing, they are correspondingly referred to as Burnard (1998a), Burnard (1998b) etc.

Format

a) Book

Author, Initials. (Year) *Title*. edition (if not the first). Place of publication: Name of publisher (Series – if relevant).

e.g. Cleland, A. (1995) *Infection control in clinical practice*. London: Bailliere Tindall.

b) Article

Author, Initials. (Year) Article title. Name of journal Volume number (Issue number NB: This is not included for journals published weekly) Date of issue First and last pages.

e.g. Sullivan, P.J. (1993) Occupational stress in psychiatric nursing. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 18(4) Apr 591-601.

Brodie, L. (1996) Help for teens with asthma. *Nursing Times* 92 16 Oct 36-37.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCE DETAILS

a) Two authors

Both are named in the body of your writing, e.g. Aggleton and Chalmers (2000). Publication details in your list of references are given under the author named first,

e.g. Aggelton, P. and Chalmers, H. (2000) *Nursing models and nursing practice*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

b) More than two authors

In the body of your writing use the first name followed by "et al" (a Latin abbreviation meaning "and others"),

e.g. In a recent study, Broadbent et al (1991) examine management of the health services after Griffiths.

In your list of references it is preferable to name all the authors.

c) A collection of works by different authors

If the whole work has been drawn on, give details under the editor's name,

e.g. Hinchcliffe, P. ed. (1986) *Teaching clinical nursing*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone.

If, however, a quote has been made from one chapter of the collection, or only one chapter is relevant to your study, cite under the author of that chapter,

e.g. Bushy, A.. (1996) Cultural and ethnic diversity: cultural competence. In: Tisdall, K., Davis, J. and Hill, K. (Eds) *Advanced practice nursing: changing roles and clinical applications*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 91-106.

d) Organisations as authors

Where the work is not the responsibility of individuals it should be listed under the organisation. The full name of any organisation must be spelt out in full. Abbreviations can only be used if the full name has already been used in the same reference. The only exception is HMSO when the abbreviation is always used.

e.g. Royal College of Nursing (1992) *A philosophy for midwifery*. London: RCM.

Health Education Authority (1993) *Health promotion hospitals : principles and practices*. London: HEA.

Department of Health (1992) *The health of the nation: a survey for health in England*. London: HMSO.

Referencing other sources of information

The same principle applies to other sources of information as to printed texts. As before, it should enable the reader to locate and obtain a copy of the works you have referred to. When listing references ensure that information is consistent.

For electronic sources of information, it is acceptable to include additional information such as type of medium and the date when the site was accessed (ISO 690-2, 2000).

Audio visual

Author, Initials. (Year) Title [type of medium]. Edition statement if given. Place of publication: Publisher. If no Author is available, use the title as the first part of the citation.

e.g. *Now wash your hands*. [Videocassette]. (1996). Southampton: University of Southampton, Teaching Support & Media Services.

CD-ROM

Author, Initials. (Year) Title [type of medium]. Edition statement if given. Place of publication: Publisher. If no Author is available, use the title as the first part of the citation.

e.g. *Sickle cell disease*. [CD-ROM]. (1998). London: Wellcome Trust. (Topics in International Health).

Internet sources

Individual works

Author, initials. (Year) *Title* [type of medium]. Edition statement if given. Place of publication: Publisher. Available from: <URL>. [Accessed date].

e.g. Ward, R. (1997) *Nursing and health care resources on the net* [online]. 2nd ed. Sheffield: University of Sheffield. Available from: <<http://www.shef.ac.uk/~nhcon>>. [Accessed 9 October 2000].

No specified author

Organisation. (Year) *Title* [type of medium]. Edition statement if given. Place of publication: Publisher. Available from: <URL>. [Accessed date].

e.g. University of Reading (2000) *Education: a brief guide to internet resources* [online]. Reading: University of Reading. Available from: <<http://www.reading.ac.uk/libweb/Lib/Subj/lr/ireduc.html>>. [Accessed on 6 October 2000].

Full text articles

Authors, Initial. (Year) Article title. *Name of journal* [type of medium]. Volume number (Issue number) Date of issue. First and last pages. [Date of citation required for online documents if available] Available from: <URL>. [Accessed date]

e.g. Helvi, K. (1999) A theoretical model of compliance in young diabetics. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* [online]. 8(1) Jan 73-80. Available from: <<http://gateway.ovid.com/athens/redirect.cgi/ovidweb/ovidweb.cgi>> [Accessed on 11 October 2000]

Mailbase/Listserv email lists

Authors, Initials. <Email address if given>. (Day Month Year). Subject of message. Discussion list [online]. Available from: Mailbase/Listserv email address [Accessed date].

e.g. Anthony, D. <if63@dial.pipex.com>. (27 Sep 1999) Clinical guidelines and clinical procedures. *Nurse-uk* [online]. Available from: <<http://www.mailbase.ac.uk/lists/nurse-uk/1999-09/0024.html>> [Accessed on 12 October 2000].

Usenet Newsgroups/Bulletin boards

These follow the layout given for mailbase and listserv. Replace the name of the discussion list with the name of the newsgroup or bulletin board.

Personal email

It is advisable to get permission from the sender of any personal emails before quoting their opinions and email address (University of Sheffield Library, 2000).

Citing from databases that include citation instructions

If databases include instructions for citing references, these must be followed. In brackets at the end of the citation state that the item has been cited as instructed (University of Sheffield Library, 2000).

e.g. Woods, S, Ticher, A. and Davis, J. Dietary marine fatty acids (fish oil) for asthma Cochrane Review). In: The Cochrane Library, Issue 3, 2000. Oxford: Update Software. (Citation as instructed)

Appendix 2: Marking Criteria

UNIVERSITY POSTGRADUATE COMMON MARKING SCHEME

Mark	Grade	Description
90-100	A1	An excellent performance, satisfactory for a distinction
80-89	A2	
70-79	A3	
60-69	B	A very good performance
50-59	C	A good performance, satisfactory for a masters degree
40-49	D	A satisfactory performance for the diploma, but inadequate for a masters degree
30-39	E	Marginal fail
20-29	F	Clear fail
10-19	G	Bad fail
0-9	H	

GRADUATE SCHOOL of SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE Postgraduate marking scheme

Mark	Description
90-100% (A1)	Fulfils all criteria for A2. In addition is a work of exceptional insight and independent thought, deemed to be of publishable quality, producing an analysis of such originality as potentially to change conventional understanding of the subject.
80-89% (A2)	Outstanding work providing insight and depth of analysis beyond the usual parameters of the topic. The work is illuminating and challenging for the markers. Comprises a sustained, fluent, authoritative argument, which demonstrates comprehensive knowledge, and convincing command, of the topic. Accurate and concise use of sources informs the work, but does not dominate it.
70-79% (A3)	A sharply-focused, consistently clear, well-structured paper, demonstrating a high degree of insight. Effectively and convincingly argued, and showing a critical understanding of conflicting theories and evidence. Excellent scholarly standard in use of sources, and in presentation and referencing.
60-69% (B)	Good to very good work, displaying substantial knowledge and understanding of concepts, theories and evidence relating to the topic. Answers the question fully, drawing effectively on a wide range of relevant sources. No significant errors of fact or interpretation. Writing, referencing and presentation of a high standard.
50-59% (C)	Work which is satisfactory for the MSc degree, showing some accurate knowledge of topic, and understanding, interpretation and use of sources and evidence. There may be gaps in knowledge, or limited use of evidence, or over-reliance on a restricted range of sources. Content may be mainly descriptive. The argument may be confused or unclear in parts, possibly with a few factual errors or misunderstandings of concepts. Writing, referencing and presentation satisfactory.

40-49% (D)	Work which is satisfactory for Diploma. Shows some knowledge of the topic, is intelligible, and refers to relevant sources, but likely to have significant deficiencies in argument, evidence or use of literature. May contain factual mistakes and inaccuracies. Not adequate to the topic, perhaps very short, or weak in conception or execution, or fails to answer the question. Writing, referencing and presentation may be weak.
30-39% (E)	Flawed understanding of topic, showing poor awareness of theory. Unconvincing in its approach and grasp of the issues. Perhaps too short to give an adequate answer to the question. Writing, referencing and presentation likely to be very weak. A mark of 38/39 may indicate that the work could have achieved a pass if a more substantial answer had been produced.
20-29% (F)	An answer showing seriously inadequate knowledge of the subject, with little awareness of the relevant issues or theory, major omissions or inaccuracies, and pedestrian use of inadequate sources.
10-19% (G)	An answer that falls far short of a passable level by some combination of short length, irrelevance, lack of intelligibility, factual inaccuracy and lack of acquaintance with reading or academic concepts.
0-9% (H)	An answer without academic merit; conveys little sense that the course has been followed; lacks basic skills of presentation and writing.



Provisional Mark	
-----------------------------	--

School of Social and Political Science – PG Feedback Form

Course Instance	
Course Name	
Component Name	

Please note that both the comments and the grade remain provisional until ratified by the external Exam Board in June and will be subject to change, moderation and review by our external examiners. This includes whether or not any penalties imposed are upheld.

Student Identifier	
---------------------------	--

Overview

Marking criterion	Comment	Grade A-H (if appropriate)
Critical/conceptual analysis		
Strength/cohesion of argument		
Use of sources/evidence		
Structure & organisation		
Breadth and relevance of reading		
Clarity of expression, presentation and referencing		
Suggestions for future work		n/a

Susan Elsley and Kay Tisdall, the course convenors, would like to keep a copy of the essay, for future students to consult. Please let Kay know if you would like this not to happen. Neither your name nor examination number would feature on the kept copy.