

IPSS Master's Level Assessment Criteria

Thank you for submitting your stage 3 work to the IPSS for membership assessment. Candidates whose work is allocated a mark of 50% or above will successfully complete stage 3, providing there are no significant concerns prompting deferral (for example, a concern regarding ethical practice). The assessment criteria set out below is used to judge the quality of all IPSS Stage 3 candidacy submissions: namely, the case study and clinical vignettes. We expect you to scrupulously adhere to the principles of confidentiality in the material you present for assessment. We also expect to see the highest standards of ethical practice. We use standardized criteria to ensure that assessment decisions are consistent, fair, and transparent to both assessors and applicants. All assessment decisions are final. If needed, resubmission may be invited if it is thought likely the applicant can bring the work up to the required standard. The feedback you receive will clearly identify strengths of the work, and any shortcomings if such exist. Additional feedback beyond this will not be provided. Resubmitted work will necessitate payment of a further £150 fee to the IPSS.

Level 7**An exceptional submission that reflects outstanding psychoanalytic understanding of case material alongside the highest practice standards ~ Distinction ≥ 70**

Understanding	Depth of knowledge	Structure	General
<p>Advanced, in-depth, authoritative, comprehensive understanding of key psychoanalytic issues with demonstrable evidence of engaging and managing complexity</p>	<p>Complex and sophisticated account of clinical work. Key issues analyzed. Wide range of judiciously selected sources to support understanding of presented material. Compelling evidence of insightful and reflective approach to key issues. Robust critical engagement with a wide range of key psychoanalytic thinkers and theorists, including those who focus on social cultural issues from a psychoanalytic perspective. Cogent and captivating understanding of key Freudian ideas selectively and appropriately applied to the case study material.</p>	<p>Coherent and compelling case study. Logically presented</p>	<p>(90-100) Insightful work displaying in-depth knowledge. Publishable quality, originality and/or independent thought. Outstanding ability to comment insightfully on the complexities of psychoanalytic work and support this using appropriate theoretical insights and clinical illustrations. Flawless standards of presentation and referencing.</p> <p>(80-89) Insightful work displaying in-depth knowledge. Excellent ability to comment insightfully on the complexities of psychoanalytic work and support this using appropriate theoretical insights and clinical illustrations. Near flawless standards of presentation and referencing.</p> <p>(70-79) Thoughtful work displaying in-depth knowledge. Significantly above average ability to comment insightfully on the complexities of psychoanalytic work and support this using appropriate theoretical insights and clinical illustrations. Excellent standards of presentation and referencing.</p>

A coherent submission that reflects good or better psychoanalytic understanding of case material alongside high practice standards ~ Merit 60-69

Understanding	Depth of knowledge	Structure	General
<p>In-depth and wide-ranging understanding of key psychoanalytic issues with demonstrable evidence of engaging and managing the complications and challenges of the work</p>	<p>Competent work. Several key issues analyzed. A range of judiciously selected sources employed to support understanding of presented material. Some examples of insightful and reflective approach to key issues. Critical engagement with several key psychoanalytic thinkers and theorists, including those who focus on the social-cultural issues from psychoanalytic perspectives. Demonstrable understanding of key Freudian ideas selectively and appropriately applied to the clinical material.</p>	<p>Coherent work logically presented</p>	<p>(65-69) Thoughtful work displaying in-depth knowledge. Above average ability to comment insightfully on the complexities of psychoanalytic work and support this using appropriate theoretical insights and clinical illustrations. High standards of presentation and referencing.</p> <p>(60-64) Thoughtful work displaying depth of knowledge at times. Evident ability to periodically comment insightfully on the complexities of psychoanalytic work and support this using appropriate theoretical insights and clinical illustrations. Good standards of presentation and referencing.</p>

A largely coherent submission that reflects a satisfactory psychoanalytic understanding of case material alongside satisfactory practice standards ~ Pass 50 - 59

Understanding	Depth of knowledge	Structure	General
<p>Some understanding of key psychoanalytic issues with some evidence of engaging and managing some of the complications and challenges of the work</p>	<p>Largely competent work with some key issues analyzed Some sources used selectively to support presentation of clinical work. Some examples of insightful and reflective approach to key issues. Limited engagement with key psychoanalytic thinkers and theorists, including those who focus on the social-cultural issues from psychoanalytic perspectives. Some understanding of key Freudian ideas selectively and appropriately applied to the clinical material.</p>	<p>Competent work in places but lacks fluency/coherence</p>	<p>(55-59). Thoughtful work at times, displaying inconsistent ability to demonstrate depth of knowledge. Inconsistent ability to comment insightfully on the complexities of psychoanalytic work and support this using appropriate theoretical insights and clinical illustrations. Satisfactory standards of presentation.</p> <p>(50-54) Some, but infrequent evidence of thoughtful approaches to clinical work, occasionally but not frequently displaying depth of knowledge. Some inconsistent ability evident to periodically comment insightfully on the complexities of psychoanalytic work and support this using appropriate theoretical insights and clinical illustrations. Adequate standards of presentation.</p>

A largely superficial submission that reflects an inadequate psychoanalytic understanding of case material alongside unsatisfactory practice standards ~ Fail 40 – 49

Understanding	Depth of knowledge	Structure	General
<p>Superficial and unsubstantiated understanding of key psychoanalytic issues with little evidence of engaging and managing the complications and challenges of the work.</p>	<p>Largely superficial work. Rare or absent use of sources selectively employed to support presentation of clinical material. Rare or absent examples of insightful and reflective approach to key issues. Rare or absent engagement with key psychoanalytic thinkers and theorists, including those who focus on social-cultural issues from psychoanalytic perspectives. Rare or absent understanding of key Freudian ideas.</p>	<p>Significant Weaknesses in structure, fluency and/or coherence</p>	<p>(40-49) Largely absent evidence of thoughtful approaches to clinical work. Rare or absent depth of knowledge. Rare or absent ability to periodically comment insightfully on the complexities of psychoanalytic work and support this using appropriate theoretical insights and clinical illustrations. Inadequate standards of presentation. Questionable understanding of ethical practice requiring further reflection and possible support.</p>

An answer almost entirely lacking in evidence of knowledge and understanding. Candidates' ability to practice safely and ethically is suspect ~ Fail 0-39

Understanding	Depth of knowledge	Structure	General
<p>Superficial and unsubstantiated understanding of key psychoanalytic issues with no evidence of engaging and managing the complications and challenges of the work.</p>	<p>Superficial work. No or inappropriate use of sources selectively employed to support presentation of clinical material. No or inappropriate/invalid examples of insightful and reflective approach to key issues. No engagement with key psychoanalytic thinkers and theorists, including those who focus on social-cultural issues from psychoanalytic perspectives. No understanding of key Freudian ideas.</p>	<p>Pervasive and persistent weaknesses in structure, fluency and/or coherence, rendering the work largely incomprehensible</p>	<p>(33-39) Substantial absence of thoughtful approaches to clinical work. Rare or absent depth of knowledge. Rare or wholly absent ability to comment insightfully on the complexities of psychoanalytic work and support this using appropriate theoretical insights and clinical illustrations. Inadequate standards of presentation. Apparent and probable shortcomings in ethical practice, requiring further reflection and support.</p> <p>(20-32) Some attempt to write something relevant but with many flaws; work contains nothing of substance and is poorly presented. Significant concerns regarding ethical practice requiring immediate attention.</p> <p>(0-19) Egregious errors, substantially irrelevant material and/or unacceptably brief. Broadly incomprehensible. Exigent concerns regarding ethical practice rendering the candidate unsuitable for psychoanalytic work without further training.</p>