

Northern Ireland

**Social**

**Care**

**Council**

**PROFESSIONAL IN PRACTICE**

**INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT ROUTE**  
**(IAR)**

**METHOD FOR SUBMISSION: VERBAL**  
**PRESENTATION HANDBOOK**

Produced by:

NISCC  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Millennium House  
25 Great Victoria Street  
Belfast  
BT2 7AQ

Tel: 028 95 362600

Web: [www.niscc.info](http://www.niscc.info)

Email: [info@niscc.hscni.net](mailto:info@niscc.hscni.net)

July 2021 (updated February 2022)

## Contents

Verbal Presentation Submission .....	4
Verbal Presentation Guidelines .....	4
Assessment Process.....	4
Panel .....	4
The Preparatory Statement must include: .....	4
The Verbal Assessment Panel .....	5
Verbal Presentation Guidance .....	5
Presentation Duration .....	5
Content of the Submission .....	6
Marking Grid .....	7

## **Verbal Presentation Submission**

### **Eligibility Criteria**

- Candidates must be enrolled with the Professional in Practice Framework.
- Candidates must be registered with the NISCC (on Part 1 of the Social Care Register).

**Candidates should discuss with their agency Professional in Practice representative their particular work focus and which requirements are best met by the verbal presentation method.**

The emphasis of this method of submission is on the verbal presentation therefore the following word limits apply to the critical analysis:

**The Preparatory Statement is 1500 words across all three awards regardless of the number of PiP Requirements being claimed.**

## **Verbal Presentation Guidelines**

### **Assessment Process**

There are two stages to the assessment process:

- **Submission of a written preparatory statement, to be received no less the 5 days prior to the Verbal Presentation, to inform the panel of assessors how you have prepared for the presentation as well as outlining how the presentation will meet the requirements being claimed (see Appendix A)**
- **Verbal presentation to a panel of assessors appointed by the Assessment panel members.**

**NB: Both elements must be passed for a successful outcome.**

### **Panel**

Candidates submit a written preparatory statement of the work they intend to present to the verbal assessment panel using the proforma available on the Learning Zone.

### **The Preparatory Statement must include:**

- Introduction – outlining current work setting, roles and responsibilities.\*
- Outline of the work to be presented incorporating a critical analysis of knowledge, skills and ethics.
- References section. \*

*\* Not included in the word count.*

## The Verbal Assessment Panel

The panel consists of two assessors drawn from the existing pool of Professional in Practice approved assessors. If the candidate has indicated they are seeking academic credits for their verbal submission, at least one of the assessors will be an approved academic assessor

### Verbal Presentation Guidance

Prior to the panel convening, the members will have read the candidate's written preparatory statement.

#### Presentation Duration:

For Consolidation and Specialist Awards, time required is 30 minutes presentation time followed by 20 minutes question time.

For Leadership and Strategic Award, time required is 40 minutes presentation time followed by 30 minutes question time.

The presentation and discussion will be audio recorded for the purposes of quality assurance, external scrutiny and where required, academic assessment in line with GDPR regulations.

The External Assessor to the Assessment Panel reserves the right to observe a number of verbal assessment panels in action to ensure standardisation of the process.

The candidate should send their presentation to PiP admin team in advance of the presentation date. A NISCC email address will be provided.

The verbal presentation should consider each PiP requirement being claimed and provide evidence that can be referred to in order to demonstrate knowledge, skills, values and anti-oppressive practice.

The following guidance **can** be used during the presentation:

- Consider adult learning theory and what techniques are being applied to address different learning styles when presenting to a group of people.
- Consider a range of theory to inform and theory to intervene to link theory to practice as well as demonstrate an understanding of the PiP requirements being claimed.
- Provide a critical analysis of the theory being applied.
- Outline and critique ethical dilemmas making links to practice experience and the PiP requirements being claimed.
- Refer to and critique legislation, policies and procedures to demonstrate an understanding of the PiP requirements being claimed.
- Consider values, critique power and authority and anti-oppressive practice.
- Expand on points within the preparatory written statement.

## Content of the Submission

Each submission must use the Individual Assessment Route Booklet format which is available on the Learning Zone. This booklet contains the: Front Sheet, Candidate Checklist, Statement of Consent, Statement of Confidentiality, your written submission and the Line Manager Verification Report.

Where part of your submission is in a PDF format (for example: evidence in an APL submission or Assessor Report for a Direct Observation), these can be uploaded to the NISCC Portal as a separate document / documents.

Each Submission should contain the following:

	Number of words	Included in word count
IAR Booklet Forms: Front Sheet, Candidate Checklist, Statement of Consent, Statement of Confidentiality, Line Manager Verification Report.		No
<b>Introduction, Roles and Responsibilities</b> Candidates should provide a short introduction within the preparatory statement.	200-300 words	No
<b>Preparatory statement and verbal presentation power point should demonstrate:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient knowledge, skills and values to demonstrate understanding of the requirements being claimed</li> <li>• Legal and organisational context – legislation, policy and procedures</li> <li>• Application of professional knowledge including theory and research</li> <li>• A critique of the relevant theory, models and methods of practice.</li> <li>• Summary of own professional development</li> </ul>	A maximum of 1500 words across all awards for up to 3 requirements claimed.  To be submitted no less than 5 days prior to the Verbal Presentation.	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Conclusion and Recommendations</b> A summary of key points and/or the recommendations drawn from writing of the assignment and/or completing the work.  <b>Learning</b> Reflect upon the professional development acquired through the work, research and writing the assignment. Outline current learning needs and how these are to be met.		<b>No</b>  <b>This should be referred to in the verbal presentation</b>
<b>References</b> The references should be up to date and relevant and adhere to the recommended Harvard format.		No

## Marking Grid

<b>% Range</b>	<b>Content* (must include professional ethics)</b> <b>30</b>	<b>Application of theory and research</b> <b>20</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b> <b>20</b>	<b>Evidence of reading</b> <b>15</b>	<b>Referencing (Harvard)</b> <b>5</b>	<b>Presentation, grammar and spelling</b> <b>10</b>
70 – 100	Critical insightful evaluation and synthesis of complex issues and materials. A high level of originality and reflection. Demonstrates the ability to pursue research at Doctoral level. Originality. (21 – 30)	Extensive evidence of advanced applications and/or empirical data, where applicable, informed extensively by current research and practice in the area. Innovative and original use of knowledge. (14 – 20)	Exceptional knowledge and conceptual understanding of complex and/or specialised principles and concepts and the development and advancement of ideas and practice. High level critical judgement and confident grasp of complex issues. (14 – 20)	Extensive evidence of integrating current supplementary sources. (12 – 15)	Outstanding referencing with current sources. (5)	Outstanding, well-directed presentation, logically and coherently structured, using correct grammar, spelling and referencing. (8 – 10)
60 – 69	Critical evaluation and synthesis of complex issues and materials which includes some originality and a reflective approach. Well argued. (18 – 20)	Clear evidence of relevant applications and/or empirical data, where applicable, informed by current research and practice in the area. Critical judgement and a grasp of complex issues. (12 – 13)	Wide knowledge and depth of understanding of complex and/or specialised principles and concepts and the development of ideas and practice. (12 – 13)	Evidence of extensive reading of current supplementary sources. (9 – 10)	Comprehensive referencing with current sources. (4)	Very good presentation, logically structured, using correct grammar, spelling and referencing. (7)
50 – 59	Some critical evaluation and synthesis of key issues and material. Reasonably well argued. Largely descriptive. (15 – 17)	Evidence of relevant applications and/or empirical data, where applicable, with some links to current research in the area. (10 – 11)	Good and appropriate knowledge and depth of understanding of key principles and concepts with some understanding of the development of ideas and practice. (10 – 11)	Evidence of reading supplementary sources. (7 – 8)	Adequate referencing. Some current sources. (3)	Orderly presentation, clear structure and acceptable grammar, spelling and referencing. (6)
<b>COMPETENT</b>						
<b>REQUIRING FURTHER WORK</b>						
45 – 49	Some evaluation and synthesis of issues and material. (12 – 14)	Occasional relevant applications and/or empirical data, where applicable. (8 – 9)	Basic knowledge and depth of understanding of key principles and concepts only. (8 – 9)	Limited evidence of current reading. (6)	Limited referencing. Sources not up to date. (2)	Weak presentation and structure, grammar, spelling and referencing. (5)
31 – 44	Limited evaluation and synthesis of issues and material. (11)	Limited applications and/or empirical data, where applicable. (7)	Limited and/or superficial knowledge of key principles and concepts. (7)	Minimal evidence of current reading. (5)	Inadequate referencing. (1)	Poor presentation and structure, grammar, spelling and referencing. (4)
0 – 30	Little or no evaluation and synthesis of issues and material. (0 – 10)	Little or no evidence of relevant application and/or empirical data. (0 – 6)	Virtually devoid of any evidence of knowledge and understanding. (0 – 6)	Little or no evidence of reading. (0 – 4)	Inadequate referencing. (0 – 1)	Inadequate presentation, structure, grammar, spelling and referencing. (0 – 3)