



ASSESSMENT 2 BRIEF	
Subject Code and Title	GRL610 Group Leadership
Assessment	Group counselling session/program proposal
Individual/Group	Individual
Length	1,500 words (\pm 10%)
Learning Outcomes	The Subject Learning Outcomes demonstrated by successful completion of the task below include: a) Apply the theoretical foundations of group work in a therapeutic context. b) Critically reflect on the process of participating in and leading or co-leading a group. c) Evaluate principles of group leadership in a group mental health or psycho-education setting.
Submission	Due by 11:55 pm AEST/AEDT Sunday end of Module 7.
Weighting	40%
Total Marks	100 marks

Assessment Task

This assessment requires you to write a proposal addressing the requirements of the organisation indicated in the case-study brief. You may choose to focus on a session plan or a program proposal designed to achieve a particular outcome.

Please refer to the Task Instructions for details on how to complete this task.

Context

This assessment mirrors a real-world experience and encourages you to develop your communication skills in addressing the requirements of organisations for group counselling sessions or programs.

The proposal will prepare you to contribute to improving the wellbeing of a particular group of people (as described in the case-study brief – available in the Assessment 2 folder) by working professionally and effectively to achieve outcomes relevant to the clients described in the case-study brief. This assessment requires and enables higher-order thinking and problem-based learning by advancing your academic skills and your ability to source, organise, summarise, integrate and identify reliable and credible references, which you will embed into your written work using the approved APA referencing system.

Instructions

Prepare a 1,500-word ($\pm 10\%$) proposal based on the requirements specified in the case study brief. The brief can be downloaded from the Assessment 2 folder for this subject.

The proposal must provide clear and easy-to-read information about the proposed group counselling sessions or program to address the organisation's requirements. The information must be presented in a concise and informative, professional style. You must write in a manner that is accessible to a lay audience, using an engaging tone. Be mindful of using terminology that a non-health professional/layperson would not understand without some explanation.

The proposal must include:

- An introduction (the aim of the proposal/strategy);
- An analysis of the issues indicated in the case-study brief;
- A detailed description of the mental health interventions available, which must include information about therapeutic approaches and strategies, with a particular focus on group therapy;
- A procedure for working collaboratively with the organisation and other health professionals if required; and
- References to relevant research to justify the proposed solution.

Referencing

It is essential to use appropriate APA style for citing and referencing research. Please see more information on referencing in the [Academic Skills webpage](#).

Submission Instructions

Submit this task via the **Assessment** link in the main navigation menu in *GRL610 Group Leadership*. The Learning Facilitator will provide feedback via the Grade Centre in the LMS portal. Feedback can be viewed in My Grades.

Academic Integrity Declaration

All students are responsible for ensuring that all work submitted is their own and is appropriately referenced and academically written according to the [Academic Writing Guide](#). Students also need to have read and be aware of Torrens University Australia Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure and subsequent penalties for academic misconduct. These are [viewable online](#).

Students also must keep a copy of all submitted material and any assessment drafts.

Special Consideration

To apply for special consideration for a modification to an assessment or exam due to unexpected or extenuating circumstances, please consult the [Assessment Policy for Higher Education Coursework and ELICOS](#) and, if applicable to your circumstance, submit a completed [Application for Assessment Special Consideration Form](#) to your Learning Facilitator.

Assessment Rubric

Assessment Attributes	Fail (Yet to achieve minimum standard) 0–49%	Pass (Functional) 50–64%	Credit (Proficient) 65–74%	Distinction (Advanced) 75–84%	High Distinction (Exceptional) 85–100%
<p>Introduction</p> <p>Percentage for this criterion = 10%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underdeveloped explanation of the proposal and comprehension of the issues and proposed solution. Fails to present relevant research <i>or</i> the research is weak or inaccurate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is adequately introduced. Demonstrates a good understanding of the importance of the issues and the proposed solution that is supported by relevant research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper presents a detailed description of the proposal. The discussion of the importance of the issues and the proposed solution is well-developed and is supported by relevant research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper provides a clear, focused description of the proposal. Demonstrates an excellent grasp of the issues and the proposed solution while including relevant research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper provides a very clear, focused description of the proposal. Demonstrates an excellent grasp of the issues and the proposed solution while including relevant high-quality research.
<p>Analysis of issues and identification of appropriate counselling strategies</p> <p>Percentage for this criterion = 40%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to display adequate knowledge of the issue/s indicated in the case-study brief. Information not presented in a way that is generally understandable to non-health professionals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good discussion of the issues in a way that is generally understandable to non-health professionals. Based on a relatively good understanding of the proposed counselling strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good level of analysis of the issues in a way that is quite understandable to non-health professionals. Thoroughly yet succinctly discusses the proposed counselling strategies while making references to relevant research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thoroughly developed level of analysis of the issues in a way that is quite understandable to non-health professionals. Thoroughly yet succinctly discusses the proposed counselling strategies that are justified by research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent level of analysis of the issues in a way that is thoroughly understandable to non-health professionals. Presents a suitably in-depth, integrative yet succinct description of the proposed counselling strategies that are justified by high-quality research.

Assessment Attributes	Fail (Yet to achieve minimum standard) 0–49%	Pass (Functional) 50–64%	Credit (Proficient) 65–74%	Distinction (Advanced) 75–84%	High Distinction (Exceptional) 85–100%
<p>Critical analysis/knowledge of integrative/ collaborative approaches relevant to the organisation’s ethos</p> <p>Percentage for this criterion = 40%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No or very little evaluation of the issues or current evidence-based, conventional interventions; no or little evidentiary support. Major gaps in knowledge of group counselling strategies. Shows inadequate knowledge of the match between the organisation’s ethos and the intervention. Poor use of research to support discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some evaluation of the issues, but sometimes the choice, evaluation and analysis in the presentation of the research evidence for the proposed counselling strategies are inadequate. Basic understanding, explanation and critical analysis of the proposed counselling strategies. A basic understanding of the organisation’s ethos in relation to the intervention is displayed. Research provides some support for discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A good evaluation of the issues; satisfactory choice, evaluation and analysis of the research evidence for the proposed counselling strategies. Good understanding and explanation and critical analysis of the proposed counselling strategies. Displays a good understanding of the organisation and its ethos in relation to the interventions it promotes and very clear analyses the value of group counselling to the organisation. The discussion is adequately supported by research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good evaluation of the issues; good choice, evaluation and analysis of the research evidence for the proposed counselling strategies. Good understanding, explanation and critical analysis of the proposed counselling strategies. Demonstrates a thorough understanding and good comprehension of the organisation’s ethos in relation to group counselling as an intervention. The discussion is quite well supported by research and is persuasive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-quality evaluation of the issues; excellent choice and analysis of the research evidence for the proposed counselling strategies. Excellent understanding, explanation and critical analysis of the proposed counselling strategies. Displays a thorough understanding of the organisation and its ethos in relation to group counselling as an intervention, and the analysis of the value of group counselling to the relevant organisation is very clear. The discussion is strongly supported by research.
<p>Use of appropriate referencing and academic skills</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of referencing <i>or</i> contains referencing errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing style used correctly and consistently for both the in-text citations and the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing style used correctly and consistently for both the in-text citations and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing style used correctly and consistently for both the in-text citations and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent, consistent and accurate use of the referencing guidelines for both the in-text

Assessment Attributes	Fail (Yet to achieve minimum standard) 0–49%	Pass (Functional) 50–64%	Credit (Proficient) 65–74%	Distinction (Advanced) 75–84%	High Distinction (Exceptional) 85–100%
Percentage for this criterion = 10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References are irrelevant or highly questionable. The paper includes multiple grammatical errors and does not use language or terminology that would be easily understood by a layperson. 	<p>reference list, with some errors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are minor grammatical errors. Some technical language (jargon) used without explanation in layperson’s terms. 	<p>the reference list, with some errors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good level of appropriate language for the layperson, including punctuation, style, tone and grammar. There may be a few errors, but these are minor in nature. 	<p>the reference list, with only minor errors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good level of appropriate language for the layperson, including punctuation, style, tone and grammar. There may be a few errors but, these are minor in nature. 	<p>citations and the reference list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High level of professional and appropriate language for the layperson, including punctuation, style, tone and grammar.