



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

LEVEL/ LEFEL 5

MODULE CODE/ COD Y MODIWL: BMHP 5004

Children, Young People and Families

ASSESSMENT TYPE/ MATH O ASESU: ASSIGNMENT

ASSESSMENT/COMPONENT/ ASESAD/CYDRAN: 1 (Case study- Written Report)

COMPONENT WEIGHTING/ PWYSAU'R CYDRAN: 50%

WORD COUNT/ NIFER Y GEIRIAU: 2000 WORDS

MODULE TUTOR(S) / TIWTOR Y MODIWL: Diya Ganguly

SUBMISSION DETAILS/ MANYLION CYFLWYNO:

- **Make sure that Your Name , Your Student Number, Your Module Title, Assignment Title and Your Module Lecturer's Name are clearly shown on the front page of your assignment**
- **All assignments must be submitted electronically to Moodle.**
- **DO NOT put this form into Turnitin or it will match many similarities with other students' submissions.**

BSc (Hons) Health and Social Care ASSIGNMENT SPECIFICATION

Programme:	BSc (Hons) Health and Social Care		
Lecturer(s):	Diya Ganguly	Internal Verifier:	Barbara Chinyani
Assignment Title:	Children, Young People and Families		
Hand Out Date:		Submission deadline:	Please refer to the assessments schedule published on Students’ Hall in Moodle and the Assessment Board on campus
Referencing:	In the main body of your submission you must give credit to authors on whose research your work is based. Append to your submission a reference list that indicates the books, articles, etc. that you have read or quoted in order to complete this assignment (e.g. for books: surname of author and initials, year of publication, <u>title of book</u> , edition, publisher: place of publication).		
<u>Late submission will result in a late penalty mark, as follows:</u> Up to one- week late, maximum mark of 40% for first attempts and 0% for resubmissions. No work will be accepted more than one week after the submission deadline (Academic Quality Handbook 2016/17 7.5 (5))			

AIM(S)

The aim of this module is to develop examination of social care services for children young people and families in the UK, covering historical and current major debates, perspectives and challenges associated with child care policy, provision and practice.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

Upon the successful completion of this module, the student should be able to demonstrate the ability to:

- Critically examine and offer a critique of policy responses with regard to the multi-disciplinary nature of health services in relation to children and families
- Analyse the historical emergence of concept of childhood including the social construction of the family.

READING

Please refer to your module descriptor for relevant reading for this module. Your tutor will also provide links to relevant articles on Moodle, which you will be expected to read and discuss as part of your weekly learning activities.

TASK DESCRIPTION

Assessment Component 1 –Case study- Written Report- 2000 Words

Identify a case-study that reports some important elements of vulnerability in children, young people and families (e.g. youth justice, disability, poverty, safeguarding, looked after children). Present your research into a logically structured case study report with supporting evidences. A critical evaluation should be provided on the effectiveness of the health and social care agencies involved in the case study and any relevant policy which currently apply.

The case-study report should identify:

1. Factors contributing to the risk of vulnerability of the child/young person/family and their impact.
2. Analysis of the effectiveness of the professional interventions of the health and social care agencies involved as well as the current policy and decision- making processes.
3. Discuss and evaluate current policy and the case management initiatives used by multi-disciplinary services to meet the diverse needs and vulnerabilities of the children, young people and/or families involved in the case study.

The paper needs to be submitted via Turnitin. Demonstrate reading of a variety of trustworthy academic sources. Correct and appropriate referencing of the information used is required. A reference list is also required for the supporting paper.

Task description:

You can structure your case study as follows:

Introduction:

1. Identify a case study which identifies examples of vulnerability children, young people and families can face.
2. Provide specific reasons why the child, young person and/ or family were in a position of vulnerability: what factors meant that there were specific issues in this case which might not be seen in the average family?

Case Study:

1. Demonstrate your knowledge of the specific issues of the case, including theoretical, policy and professional perspectives.

2. You can draw on any evidence you feel is relevant but it may be that the child, young person or family were living in specific circumstances which might have indicated a higher level of vulnerability. What do you feel were the risk factors?

Analysis:

1. Explain the process of intervention by relevant health and social care agencies and current relevant policy.
2. Identify the point at which the child, young person or family became the subject of assessment by health and social care agencies, and what action the agencies or a specific agency decided to take.
3. Discuss and evaluate current policy and the roles of multi-disciplinary services within the case study and the potential impact of their actions on the children, young people and family.

Evaluation:

1. Provide a critical analysis of the responses of the relevant agencies.
2. Having considered the specific details of the case as well as current policy and the actions taken by health and social care agencies, provide a critical evaluation based on your perspective of what could have been done differently. Provide recommendations for improvements required, which are appropriate to meet the needs of the children/young people and family involved in the case study. Provide valid reasons for your suggestions and support these with literature and references.

GUIDANCE FOR STUDENTS IN THE COMPLETION OF TASKS

NOTE: The guidance offered below is linked to the five common assessment criteria

Research-informed Literature-20%

Your work must be informed and supported by scholarly material that is *relevant* to and *focused* on the task(s) set. You should provide evidence that you have accessed a wide *range* of sources, which may be academic, governmental and industrial; these sources may include academic journal articles, textbooks, current news articles, organisational documents, and websites. You should consider the *credibility* of your sources; academic journals are normally highly credible sources while websites require careful consideration/selection and should be used sparingly. Any sources you use should be current and up to date, mostly published within the last five years or so, though seminal/important works in the field may be older. You must provide *evidence* of your research/own reading throughout your work, using in-text citations in the main body of your work and a reference list that is alphabetical at the end of your work. Please use the Harvard referencing system. Refer to C1 and C6 from the table above.

Knowledge and Understanding of Subject- 20%

Your work must demonstrate the growing extent of your knowledge and understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the subject area. *Knowledge* relates to the facts, information and skills you have acquired through your learning. You demonstrate your *understanding* by interpreting the

meaning of the facts and information (knowledge). This means that you need to select and include in your work the concepts, techniques, models, theories, etc. appropriate to the task(s) set. You should be able to explain the theories, concepts, etc. meaningfully to show your understanding. Your mark/grade will also depend upon the *extent* to which you demonstrate your knowledge and understanding; ideally each should be complete and detailed, with comprehensive coverage. Refer to C1 from the table above.

Analysis 20%

Your work must contain evidence of logical, analytical thinking, evaluation and synthesis. For example, to examine and break information down into parts, make inferences, compile, compare and contrast information. This means not just describing What! but also justifying: Why? How? When? Who? Where? At all times, you must provide justification for your arguments and judgements. Evidence that you have reflected upon the ideas of others within the subject area is crucial to you providing a reasoned and informed debate within your work. Furthermore, you should provide evidence that you are able to make sound judgements and convincing arguments using data and concepts. Sound, valid conclusions are necessary and must be derived from the content of your work. There should be no new information presented within your conclusion. Where relevant, alternative solutions and recommendations may be proposed. Refer to C3-C4 from the table above.

Practical Application and Deployment 20%

You should be able to demonstrate how the subject-related concepts and ideas relate to real world situations or a particular context. How do they work in practice? You will deploy models, methods, techniques, and/or theories, in that context, to assess current situations, perhaps to formulate plans or solutions to solve problems, some of which may be innovative and creative. This is likely to involve, for instance, the use of real-world examples and cases, the application of a model within an organisation and/or benchmarking one organisation against others based on stated criteria. You should show awareness of the limitations of concepts and theories when applied in particular contexts. Refer to C4 from the table above.

Skills for Professional Practice 20%

Your work must provide evidence of the attributes expected in professional practice. This includes demonstrating your individual initiative and/or collaborative working. You must communicate effectively in a suitable format, which may be written and/or oral, for example, essay, management report, presentation. Work should be coherent and well-structured in presentation and organisation. Refer to C5 from the table above.

GRADING CRITERIA AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

This section details the assessment criteria. The *extent* to which these are demonstrated by you determines your grade. The weightings available for each criterion are shown. Lecturers will use the space provided to comment on the achievement of the task(s), including those areas in which you have performed well and areas that would benefit from development/improvement.

Common Assessment Criteria Applied	Percentage weighting	Grade awarded
1. Research-informed Literature Extent of research and/or own reading, selection of credible sources, application of appropriate referencing conventions.	20	
2. Knowledge and Understanding of Subject Extent of knowledge and understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the discipline.	20	
3. Analysis Analysis, evaluation and synthesis; logic, argument and judgement; analytical reflection; organisation of ideas and evidence	20	
4. Practical Application and Deployment Deployment of methods, materials, tools and techniques; application of concepts; formulation of innovative and creative solutions to solve problems.	20	

5. Skills for Professional Practice Attributes in professional practice: individual and collaborative working; deployment of appropriate media; presentation and organisation.			20	
Late Submission Penalties (tick if appropriate)				%
Assignment Mark (Assessment marks are subject to ratification at the Exam Board. These comments and marks are to give feedback on module work and are for guidance			Up to one-week late	40 Max
			Over one week late	Fail only until they are confirmed.)

COMMON ASSESSMENT AND GRADING CRITERIA

Assessment Criteria	OUTRIGHT FAIL	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT	EXCEPTIONAL
	REFER (equivalent to 0-29%)	REFER (equivalent to 30-39%*	PASS (equivalent to 40-49%)	PASS (equivalent to 50-59%)	MERIT (equivalent to 60-69%)	DISTINCTION (equivalent to 70-79%)	DISTINCTION (equivalent to 80-100%)
1. Research informed Literature Extent of research and/or own reading, selection of credible sources, application of appropriate referencing conventions	Little or no evidence of reading. Views and findings unsupported and non-authoritative. Referencing conventions largely ignored.	Poor evidence of reading and/or of reliance on inappropriate sources, and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Referencing conventions used inconsistently.	References to a limited range of mostly relevant sources. Some omissions and minor errors. Referencing conventions evident though not always applied consistently.	Inclusion of a range of research informed literature, including sources retrieved independently. Referencing conventions mostly consistently applied.	Inclusion of a wide range of research informed literature, including sources retrieved independently. Selection of relevant and credible sources. Very good use of referencing conventions, consistently applied.	A comprehensive range of research informed literature embedded in the work. Excellent selection of relevant and credible sources. High-level referencing skills, consistently applied.	Outstanding knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in the work. Outstanding selection of relevant and credible sources. High-level referencing skills consistently and professionally applied.
2. Knowledge and Understanding of Subject Extent of knowledge and understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the discipline.	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of material at this level. Substantial inaccuracies.	Gaps in knowledge, with only superficial understanding. Some significant inaccuracies.	Evidence of basic knowledge and understanding of the relevant concepts and underlying principles.	Knowledge is accurate with a good understanding of the field of study.	Knowledge is extensive. Exhibits understanding of the breadth and depth of established views.	Excellent knowledge and understanding of the main concepts and key theories. Clear awareness of challenges to established views and the limitations of the knowledge base.	Highly detailed knowledge and understanding of the main theories/concepts, and a critical awareness of the ambiguities and limitations of knowledge.
3. Analysis Analysis, evaluation and synthesis; logic, argument and judgement; analytical reflection; organisation of ideas and evidence	Unsubstantiated generalisations, made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of logic, leading to unsupportable/missing conclusions. Lack of any attempt to analyse, synthesise or evaluate.	Some evidence of analytical intellectual skills, but for the most part descriptive. Ideas/findings sometimes illogical and contradictory. Generalised statements made with scant evidence. Conclusions lack relevance.	Evidence of some logical, analytical thinking and some attempts to synthesise, albeit with some weaknesses. Some evidence to support findings/ views, but evidence not consistently interpreted. Some relevant conclusions and recommendations, where relevant	Evidence of some logical, analytical thinking and synthesis. Can analyse new and/or abstract data and situations without guidance. An emerging awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence to support the argument. Valid conclusions and recommendations, where relevant	Sound, logical, analytical thinking; synthesis and evaluation. Ability to devise and sustain persuasive arguments, and to review the reliability, validity & significance of evidence. Ability to communicate ideas and evidence accurately and convincingly. Sound, convincing conclusions / recommendations.	Thoroughly logical work, supported by evaluated evidence. High quality analysis, developed independently or through effective collaboration. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions. Strong, persuasive, conclusions, justifiable recommendations.	Exceptional work; judiciously selected and evaluated evidence. Very high quality analysis, developed independently or through effective collaboration. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions. Highly persuasive conclusions

4. Practical Application and Deployment Effective deployment of appropriate methods, materials, tools and techniques; extent of skill demonstrated in the application of concepts to a variety of processes and/or contexts; formulation of innovative and creative solutions to solve problems.	Limited or no use of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Little or no appreciation of the context of the application.	Rudimentary application of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques but without consideration and competence. Flawed appreciation of the context of the application.	An adequate awareness and mostly appropriate application of well-established methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Basic appreciation of the context of the application.	A good and appropriate application of standard methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Good appreciation of the context of the application, with some use of examples, where relevant.	A very good application of a range of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Very good consideration of the context of the application, with perceptive use of examples, where relevant. Evidence of some innovation and creativity.	An advanced application of a range of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. The context of the application is well considered, with extensive use of relevant examples. Application and deployment extend beyond established conventions. Innovation and creativity evident throughout.	Outstanding levels of application and deployment skills. Assimilation and development of cutting-edge processes and techniques.
5. Skills for Professional Practice Demonstrates attributes expected in professional practice including: individual initiative and collaborative working; deployment of appropriate media to communicate (including written and oral); clarity and effectiveness in presentation and organisation.	Communication media is inappropriate or misapplied. Little or no evidence of autonomy in the completion of tasks. Work is poorly structured and/or largely incoherent.	Media is poorly designed and/or not suitable for the audience. Poor independent or collaborative initiative. Work lacks structure, organisation, and/or coherence	Can communicate in a suitable format but with some room for improvement. Can work as part of a team, but with limited involvement in group activities. Work lacks coherence in places and could be better structured.	Can communicate effectively in a suitable format, but may have minor errors. Can work effectively as part of a team, with clear contribution to group activities. Mostly coherent work and is in a suitable structure.	Can communicate well, confidently and consistently in a suitable format. Can work very well as part of a team, with very good contribution to group activities. Work is coherent and fluent and is well structured and organised.	Can communicate professionally and, confidently in a suitable format. Can work professionally within a team, showing leadership skills as appropriate, managing conflict and meeting obligations. Work is coherent, very fluent and is presented professionally.	Can communicate with an exceptionally high level of professionalism. Can work exceptionally well and professionally within a team, showing advanced leadership skills. Work is exceptionally coherent, very fluent and is presented professionally.

