



VIVA- Summative

Students are asked to offer a live, online, verbal presentation of a family you are working with to a panel of two markers. You will need to:

- Make a clear statement at the start of your viva that you have anonymised this family
- Present a systemic genogram
- Give a clear description of risk and the context of the work including the relationship that the family has with you/the organisation
- Present two written systemic hypotheses
- Cite and reference your use of systemic theory
- Give a verbal description of what systemic interventions you used to test out in relation to just **one of your hypotheses**
- Describe what your reflections and learning have been

Your viva will last a maximum of 15 minutes. **When you are preparing, keep in mind the timings allocated for each section and make sure you practice it out loud to yourself to ensure the timings work.** At the end of your presentation, there will be questions from the panel to allow you to expand on some of the ideas you offered. The intention with these questions is to allow you to gain additional marks, particularly if the panel feel you have missed things out or not had time to explain ideas fully.

24 hours in advance of your viva, you will need to submit to liz@collectivespace.org.uk, a three-generational systemic genogram of the family you will present. Annotate with social graces, relevant life-cycle events, quality of relationship lines, trans-generational patterns, household lines and map on relevant professionals who are also part of the system.

You will also need to submit 24 hours in advance of your viva, your two systemic hypotheses in written format.

During the viva you can refer to notes to support you in presenting the case. This should be no more than one sheet of A4 paper and should be notes to help you, rather than be read out as a script.

Section	Timing
Genogram (20%)	3 mins
Risk and context setting (20%)	3 mins
Systemic formulation (30%)	6 mins
Reflection on learning and development (20%)	3 mins
Presentation (10%)	Marked but not timed

The first part of the viva is where we will ask you to present your genogram, this should take no longer than **three minutes**.

- In this section you will orient the panel to the information in your genogram; tell us briefly about the relevant members of this family, how they are connected, the quality of the relationships and how social graces are influencing the system

This next section is 'risk and context setting' and will also last **three minutes**

The questions we would like you to consider in this section are:

- What was the purpose of your involvement?
- Describe how different people within the system are understanding risk and need for these children
- Have the family had previous involvement with social care and how does this influence their relationship to help?

The section on 'systemic formulation' is given the heaviest weighting for marks and for this reason, you will have **six minutes**. This is where we want you to show us that you have developed a relational understanding of family interactions by providing two systemic hypotheses which offer ideas about what might be contributing to the problems that have been presented. Make sure that the ideas that you offer have some link to the risk that you have described in the previous section. We will ask you to describe an intervention you might consider using – or indeed an intervention you actually tried – in relation to just **one** of the hypotheses.

The questions we would like you to consider in this section are:

- What systemic theory have you drawn upon that influence the ideas you have offered in your hypotheses and/or your intervention?
- How did you turn your hypothesis into an intervention, in other words what did you do with the family to test the hypothesis out?
- What did you notice about how the family responded and what sense do you make of this?

In the final section on 'reflection on learning and development' you are asked to reflect on the hypotheses you have chosen and explain how your systemic training has influenced your practice. You will have **3 minutes** in this section.

The questions we ask you to consider in this section are:

- Which hypothesis were you most drawn to and why?
- Which of yours and the family's social graces might have influenced your work with them and why do you think this was?
- Now that you have had systemic training or having prepared for this presentation, what other ideas might you have considered?

Grading Matrix

Genogram: / 20

High Distinction 80-100	Distinction 70-79	Merit 60-69	Pass (50-59)	Fail (<50)
In addition to criteria in 'distinction'... The genogram is of an extremely high standard. Very well ordered presentation making it easy for the reader to follow. Key aspects of the 'story' of the family can be	In addition to criteria in 'merit'.... There is a clear indication of patterns and events across time and through the generations. Wider social/cultural influences are	In addition to criteria in 'pass'... Annotations made to genogram offer enough detail that a visual representation of the written formulation can start to be	Genogram is largely drawn correctly and family structure is depicted accurately. Genogram shows several of these things; three generations, households, dates and some	Genogram is incorrectly drawn. Signs and symbols do not correctly depict the family structure. Genogram fails because several of the following issues are evident; does not include 3 generations, dates are not shown,

understood without needing to refer to the body of the assignment. Large amounts of relevant and detailed information are efficiently included. The supra-system around the family is indicated and issues of power, difference and diversity between the family and the professionals are clearly noted.	noted as well as professional networks. A wide variety of social graces are represented through the genogram. Genogram has sufficiently rich information in it that it allows the reader to begin to hypothesise about some aspects of the family function.	seen. Clearly depicted image, with helpful key for understanding lines and symbols. Social graces are also included. Life cycle transitions outside of normative ideas of family, are noted and offered if applicable.	relational annotations. Presentation is acceptable but the genogram offered is considered to be a basic map of the family rather than offering a systemic representation of the family.	households are not depicted, quality of family relationship lines are not shown, social graces are missing. Difficult to read or messy in presentation.
--	--	---	--	--

Risk and context setting: /20

80-100	Distinction 70-79	Merit 60-69	Pass (50-59)	Fail (<50)
In addition to criteria in 'distinction'..... Demonstrates an understanding of how risk may be influenced by contextual factors such as poverty, class, race etc. The family's relationship to help is explored in order to try and make sense of what barriers might influence engagement. Ideas are expressed confidently and in sophisticated ways during the presentation.	In addition to criteria in 'merit'.... Attention is paid to organisational and wider societal views about risk that may be shaping social care's risk thresholds and approach to intervention. Locates 'self' in relation to these wider discourses around risk and describes family/professional relationships using systemic language and ideas. The notion of power is addressed in the presentation, and ideas about difference and diversity are offered in order to understand some of the challenges that might be presented in the case work.	In addition to criteria in 'pass'....Different views about risk are offered (family, organisation, practitioner's own view). Reference is made to historical and/or current relationship between family and social care. Social graces are talked about in the presentation with a connection to the risk issue described.	A brief statement made about risk but only one view on this is offered. The overall purpose of social care intervention is mentioned. Student states what their role is but does not expand on how their role might impact on the relationship the family has to the agency. No comment made on the family's history to the organisation.	Risk information is unclear or vague in the presentation. eg., 'neglect' or 'abuse' are referred to without further detail of description of impact on child. Purpose of social work involvement not stated. Organisational context or the role of the practitioner is not clear.

Systemic Social Work Formulation: / 30

High Distinction 80-100	Distinction 70-79	Merit 60-69	Pass (50-59)	Fail (<50)
In addition to the criteria in 'distinction'.... Hypotheses are formulated and articulated in sophisticated ways. Attempts are made to understand the complexity of the system which includes the wider social and political influences. Ability to identify possible feedback loops that impact on risk is evidenced. Reflexivity is evident; student shows ability to re-evaluate ideas based on feedback from the family in response to the intervention and this then shapes their views on what might be happening rather than them concluding that the family were 'resistant' to change. Interventions are carefully and ethically considered	In addition to the criteria in 'merit'.... The concepts of circularity, neutrality, curiosity are all clearly evidenced in examples being offered. Hypotheses are multi-generational and include wider influences impacting the family system. Student is able to show curiosity about the meanings of behaviours. There is reference to the contribution of	In addition to the criteria in 'pass'.... presented. There is an attempt to understand the logic of what might contribute to the beliefs, behaviours, and relationships of the family members. Curiosity is demonstrated in the language used and ideas are offered tentatively. Attempts are made to test out the hypotheses using appropriate systemic interventions and systemic theory is described when offering	Two hypotheses are offered about parent-child and other family interactions. At least one of the hypotheses offered is relational in that it makes links and connections between at least two people in the family, rather than focuses on an individual. Intervention suggested has some connection the hypothesis formulated. At least one systemic theory appropriately named and cited.	There is either a lack of any hypothesis, or only <i>one</i> hypothesis is offered. Hypotheses are intrapsychic and do not consider any relational issues. Only one member of the family is talked about within a hypothesis. Hypotheses that are presented read as linear statements or as linear questions,

and demonstrate excellent capacity of the practitioner to translate theory to practice. Practice described is of a very high standard and consistent with the way in which someone might work in a systemic practitioner role.	professionals to the problem that is being described, and attention is given to how imbalances of power limit the choices of family members to act differently. More than one systemic theory is referenced and is clearly explained and understood. Intervention is strongly linked to systemic theory and to the ideas in the hypothesis, and takes into account fit with family. Resistance from the family to respond to	these. Interventions are coherent with ideas presented in the hypothesis. Examples of actual interventions are given. For example, rather than just stating "I used circular questions to test out my hypothesis", the student states what model/authors circular questions originate from, and gives actual examples of some of the circular questions that were used to test out the hypothesis they were referring to.		rather than tentative ideas or hunches that are based on circular assumptions. No links made in the hypotheses between beliefs, behaviours and relationships. No interventions identified, or interventions that are offered do not link to the ideas embedded in the hypothesis. No reference to systemic theory, or systemic theory
--	--	---	--	---

	the intervention is explored through a systemic lens and understood relationally, rather than locating it within the family.			that is referenced , is done so incorrectly .
--	--	--	--	---

Reflection on own learning and development: / 20

High distinction 80-100	Distinction 70-79	Merit 60-69	Pass (50-59)	Fail (<50)
In addition to the criteria in 'distinction'.... Shows an excellent ability to be self-reflexive. Has great awareness of how this learning will impact on self and families in the future. Able to describe what they will do in order to recalibrate their own practice in light of learning. Able to critique and reflect on past practice and hypothesise about how this may have influenced family	In addition to the criteria in 'merit'....Offers suggestions about what might lie outside their own awareness and how they may challenge themselves going forward to maintain curiosity. Explains how this new understanding may change their practice and how this will impact on families they work with, evidencing self-reflexivity. Ideas are expressed clearly and systemic theory brought in and referenced	In addition to the criteria in 'pass'....Offers an account of why they were drawn to the particular hypotheses they formulated. Includes in this, some aspect of themselves and their preferences and makes some reference to personal social graces. Shows some ability to self-reflect. Identifies how using systemic formulation may assist in work with family or how this process may help	Offers a basic description of own learning and how understanding of risk has developed through the exercise. Able to give at least one example to the panel of how the training has impacted on thinking or practice. Shares something about themselves that they can link to their learning.	No evidence that the student's thinking about risk has evolved through the process of systemic formulation. Does not explain how the training has expanded ideas or impacted on thinking or practice. Offers nothing about themselves that tells the panel what influenced their ideas.

responses to professional intervention. Ideas all expressed in fluent and articulate ways to the panel and all systemic theory clearly understood to a high level.	appropriately. Issues of power and social graces are explored very well.	with other cases going forward. Offers some explanation about how the course is changing their thinking and practice.		
--	--	---	--	--

Presentation: /10

High distinction 80-100	Distinction 70-79	Merit 60-69	Pass (50-59)	Fail (<50)
Exceptional style of presentation Sophisticated use of systemic ideas and language that appear fluent and eloquent. Clear evidence that theoretical understanding	In addition to the criteria in 'merit'.... Presentation is of a very high standard and ideas presented articulately. Detailed and coherent descriptions	In addition to the criteria in 'pass'.... Clearly presented and very easy to follow. Succinctly presented ideas, well evidenced and good use of	The presenter stays on task and addresses key learning points in the presentation Answers are consistent with the question being asked Ideas are expressed clearly enough	Reads entirely from notes Presentation has not been adequately prepared Does not answer the questions that are posed by the panel Difficult to follow, goes too off track, unstructured,

also translates to high quality practice. Questions asked by the panel allow student to showcase fully their extended learning and offer ideas above and beyond just meeting the key learning points.	of systemic theories and good evidence of a wide range of reading Clear to see how the learning journey of the student is progressing Use of accessible language to convey complex systemic ideas	systemic theory. Structured well, uses the time to offer relevant ideas and address key learning points and full responses to questions asked by the panel Some evidence of the student's learning journey is demonstrated	for the panel to follow.	unclear with presentation of ideas Theory is used incorrectly
---	--	---	---------------------------------	---