

British Caving Association

MODULE 3 CIC ASSESSMENT COACHING MODULE SCORING RATIONALE SURFACE CHECK

1. Fail. A poor performance
2. Defer. Unsatisfactory – below required level but should be able to remedy
3. Developing. At the standard in most elements but areas can improve
4. Good. Mature client centred approach
5. Excellent. Exceptional performance - aspirational

- 1 An indication of a poor or very poor performance. A candidate whose presence may be at best unhelpful to the clients and at worst detrimental to them. The score of 1 is likely to be extremely rare. The reasons behind these scores must be carefully scrutinised as it may also reflect a failure in training and mentoring as well as in candidate competence. This level of candidate weakness should have been identified before assessment. It should be carefully considered whether the candidate should continue in the scheme.
- 2 A weak or unsatisfactory performance below that required of a CIC holder. Depending on the issues identified and the ongoing support available, it should generally be possible for the candidate to remedy faults and omissions so as to be able to represent for assessment.
- 3 A satisfactory performance at or above the standard required in most elements.
However, the candidate is likely to have significant areas which they can develop and improve and will probably be keen to do so.
- 4 A good or very good performance demonstrating a mature, knowledgeable and client centred approach. Whilst the candidate should still have room for development these areas may be more difficult for the assessor to identify.
- 5 An excellent or exceptional performance. These are likely to be very rare indeed, the score of 5 being a level of perfection we would all aspire too. Candidates at this level will have prodigious talent and knowledge as

British Caving Association

coaches and be working in such a sophisticated manner as to make the assessor's job challenging.

Notes

Whilst it is frequently tempting to score candidates highly, a marking scheme works most effectively if it pivots around its centre point. There should be no shame in achieving a straightforward pass at 3, indeed, against the CIC scheme, this is a noteworthy and commendable achievement.

Using this approach allows for a normal distribution of scores with the bulk in the middle and equal room at either side to differentiate between individuals. It prevents the 'floor' or 'ceiling' effect whereby the outcomes are skewed towards one end of the scale. Should this happen the marking criteria need to be re-examined or it becomes impossible to effectively differentiate between candidates. In particular, those who are genuinely working at a higher standard are inadequately rewarded for their competence.

A scheme which differentiates its candidates well also permits weaknesses and inadequacies in that scheme to be recognised and remedied thereby making it better for everyone.

Surface Check Scoring Rationale

Logbook Experience in coaching

1. The candidate's logbook showed very little coaching experience
2. The candidate's logbook showed some coaching experience but mainly teaching novices introductory SRT
3. The candidate's logbook showed a variety of coaching but mainly with peers
4. The candidate's logbook showed a wide variety of coaching including some advanced techniques
5. The candidate's logbook showed a very broad variety of coaching including recreational and professional coaching, novice and more advanced techniques.

Preprogramming/Prior assessment of clients

1. No prior assessment done. Candidate may arrive with a preset agenda. Candidate needs have no impact on the day. This is likely to lead to a poor venue choice and coaching which does not meet the requirements of the clients.
2. Limited prior assessment which does not impact on learner activity or venue or which has little impact. Candidate delivers their own agenda which may be partially adaptable to learner / client needs. Resulting venue choice may not maximise clients' development.
3. Candidate gains information on clients' prior experience and wants for the day. This significantly influences the venue choice and learner activity.
4. Good assessment of clients' prior experience, needs and wants which the candidate uses to structure the session and choose the venues appropriately.
5. Excellent questioning of clients which swiftly elicits quality, quantity and currency of prior experience. Candidate discovers the standard of their clients' caving, what their caving aspirations are and why they are not currently achieving these. Questioning focused on all aspects of clients' caving skills (tactical, psychological, physical and technical), as opposed to a tightly defined technique only approach. Excellent venue selection and activity should follow.

Surface Venue

1. The venue was not suitable and had no welfare facilities.
2. The venue had limited areas to work in
3. The venue was appropriate for the vertical work
4. The venue was appropriate for the vertical work and had toilet facilities
5. The venue was appropriate for the vertical work, had toilets and classroom facilities.

Leader/Venue Provided Equipment

1. The equipment was unsafe.
2. The equipment was safe but not in a professional state.
3. The equipment was safe and appropriate to the skills being taught.
4. The equipment was safe and appropriate to the skills being taught. It was inspected and maintained in accordance with PPE legislation.

British Caving Association

5. The equipment was safe and appropriate to the skills being taught. The candidate had provided a variety of equipment to give options and knew why each piece suited different people/locations. The equipment was inspected and maintained in accordance with PPE legislation.

Client Provided Equipment

1. The equipment was unsafe.
2. The equipment was safe but not in a professional state.
3. The equipment was safe and appropriate to the skills being taught.
4. The equipment was safe and appropriate to the skills being taught. It was inspected and maintained in accordance with PPE legislation.
5. The equipment was safe and appropriate to the skills being taught. The student had provided a variety of equipment to give options and knew why each piece suited different people/locations. The equipment was inspected and maintained in accordance with PPE legislation.

Group and individual safety and management

Style / rapport/sensitivity / Group management / supervision / control and safety / Use of assistant / Conservation and vulnerability assessment / guidance to achieve exemplary standards

1. The candidate did not engage with the clients, did not spot unsafe practice and did not make clients aware of conservation issues. CLAP never used, inappropriate positioning and unsafe practice regularly occurred as a result
2. The candidate did engage with clients but this was mainly a one way conversation, did stop unsafe practice but not explain what the issue was and similarly with conservation issues. . CLAP rarely used to allow safe learning and appropriate input - safety therefore at issue several times.
3. The candidate did engage with clients and listened to their questions to allow two way conversation. CLAP used but opportunities missed to use positioning use to best advantage at times for client learning.
4. The candidate used the information from clients to progress their needs and wants. The candidate told clients why practice was unsafe and why conservation was important. CLAP was used most of the time to allow safe learning with appropriate input.
5. The candidate used information from clients to progress them with a variety of options. CLAP was used to allow safe learning with appropriate input. Conservation was discussed with experience in conservation projects.

Appropriate Emergency Equipment

1. The equipment was unsafe.
2. The equipment was safe but not in a professional state.
3. The equipment was safe and appropriate to the venue and skills being taught.
4. The equipment was safe and appropriate to the venue and skills being taught. It was inspected and maintained in accordance with legislation.
5. The equipment was safe and appropriate to the venue and skills being taught. The candidate had provided a variety of equipment to give options and knew why each piece suited different people/locations. The equipment was inspected and maintained in accordance with legislation.

Advanced knowledge of caving techniques and equipment

Theory input / delivery (including education re: cave environment, conservation, access, weather etc.)

1. The candidate did not engage with the clients and had no meaningful knowledge of advanced techniques such as wider equipment/hardware beyond standard SRT kit, rescue, hauling and problem solving
2. The candidate did engage with clients but this was mainly a one way conversation, telling clients information but did not offer explanation of topics Candidate had a limited knowledge of advanced techniques such as wider equipment/hardware beyond standard SRT kit, rescue, hauling and problem solving
3. The candidate did engage with clients and listened to their questions and imparted knowledge appropriately Candidate had acceptable knowledge of advanced techniques such as wider equipment/hardware beyond standard SRT kit, rescue, hauling and problem solving but missed opportunities to bring this into the training.
4. The candidate used a variety of questions to discover what clients knew and helped build on the knowledge. Candidate had good knowledge of advanced techniques such as wider equipment/hardware beyond standard SRT kit, rescue, hauling and problem solving but and took opportunities to bring this into the training. They provided some extra equipment for clients to try
5. The candidate used a variety of questions to discover what clients knew and helped build on the knowledge. The candidate had experience of being involved in some sort of access, conservation or resource project. The candidate may be a provider for other NGBs showing advanced knowledge in an area such as weather. . Candidate had exceptional knowledge of advanced techniques such as wider equipment/hardware beyond standard

British Caving Association

SRT kit, rescue, hauling and problem solving. They took every opportunity to bring this into the training, including providing a wide range of equipment to try.

Analytical ability

1. The candidate makes frequent errors of analysis leading to incorrect or inaccurate information and advice being given to clients. The priorities for improvement are not identified leading to the candidate working on elements of client practice which are of a lesser importance or, indeed, inappropriate. Analysis is likely to be hampered by weak prior assessment or by poor comparison of that information with clients' actual practice. No, or very little, differentiation is made between clients.
2. Some accurate analysis may be made though it is incomplete. The analysis may focus mainly on technical aspects thereby missing other critical elements. This is likely to make task setting, prioritisation and differentiation difficult. The candidate tends to be drawn to issues which they quickly recognise rather than standing back and identifying individual developmental needs.
3. Analysis is satisfactory. The candidate observes and correctly identifies individual client strengths and areas for development and is able to prioritise appropriately. The evaluation will extend beyond the technical and the candidate will be aware of the need to assess clients' physical, tactical and psychological competence and to factor this into their decision making. There is evidence of differentiation.
4. The candidate's analysis is of a very good standard. They are able to swiftly identify individual learner needs and to cross-match their practical evaluation with information gleaned in the prior assessment. Analysis is ongoing throughout the day and the candidate is able to adapt their approach and activity as a result of this. Differentiation between clients is clear.
5. Excellent holistic analytical ability will be seen whereby the candidate is able to constantly re-evaluate all learner/client needs and seamlessly adjust practice and activity as a result of this. The clients are likely to be unaware of this going on such is the subtlety and skill of the candidate. Such analysis will lead to highly appropriate and beneficial client activity at all times.

Quality of coaching

1. Candidate adopts an inflexible approach (e.g., constantly directive), blind to the clients' needs and the learning environment. The clients are not required to process their own experiences and they are not encouraged to challenge and question. This may also be unsafe. This is likely to have a low activity to talk ratio. Learners may be unhappy or disappointed with their experience. Very limited and / or inappropriate learning. Very little

British Caving Association

evidence of questioning.

2. Candidate operates safely though does not engage or stimulate learners with appropriate tasks nor utilise appropriate coaching approaches given the learners' needs and environment. Activity to talk ratio is poor. Candidate tends to interfere with and interrupt learner practice unnecessarily. Learner success tends to be despite the candidate.
3. Candidate operates safely throughout. Learners are provided with appropriate tasks and challenges. Candidate is able to use a reasonable range of coaching approaches in a variety of situations. The candidate is aware of the need to allow the clients to practice without interruption. There is evidence of questioning, appropriate goal setting and good activity levels. On balance, the candidate's presence is beneficial to the clients.
4. Candidate operates safely throughout. Candidate is able to analyse learner needs in an ongoing fashion and deploy a very good range of appropriate coaching approaches to meet the clients' personal needs. The use of questioning and agreed tasks / goal setting is of a very good standard. The level of practice and activity is high and clients are encouraged to process their own experience and problem solve. The learners improve as a result of this approach.
5. The candidate has a high level of coaching and learning knowledge and is able to deploy this in a caving context. Learners are kept highly active and are fully engaged in their own learning process. They are constantly challenged to think and problem solve. Learners are encouraged to become independent and adaptable cavers so that they can work without the coach in a range of environments. The candidate encourages the learners to deploy appropriate skills given their circumstances rather than rote repeat a rigid set of techniques.

Feedback to Clients

1. Feedback tends to be directive and poorly timed e.g., talking over practice. It will take no or very little account of the clients' own thoughts on their performance. Feedback may not identify the critical issues nor be related to the tasks being tackled by the clients. It may be inaccurate and misleading – even unsafe. Candidates are likely to talk too much, providing more information than can be dealt with by the learners, this will have a negative impact on client activity time.
2. Candidate feedback will tend to be generally accurate though will take little or only sporadic account of clients' thoughts on their own performance. This will lead to client dependence on the candidate for information. Feedback tends to be undifferentiated and is likely to significantly impact on client activity time. The timing, quantity and quality of feedback could all be improved to the benefit of the clients.
3. Feedback is both accurate and appropriate to observed client practice. It relates to tasks set and factors-in information gleaned from clients on their

own performance. Talk to activity time is satisfactory. There is evidence of differentiated feedback throughout the day. Feedback is prioritized and limited to that which can be worked on by the clients in any one practice session. The candidate tends to avoid talking over practice. The clients benefit from feedback sessions with the candidate.

4. A very good standard of accurate feedback is seen which is clearly taking account of all facets of client performance – not just the technical. Clients' activity levels are high as the candidate is able to deal with individuals and differentiate feedback whilst keeping others active. Clients are appropriately questioned after each bout of practice so that they are encouraged to process their own experience supported by observations and input from the candidate. The candidate has multiple methods of providing feedback which are deployed appropriately e.g., verbal, visual and manual. Clients are encouraged to spend sufficient time practising rather than having a single or limited attempt at the task.
5. As above plus feedback is based on extremely good analysis of clients' practice. The standard of questioning is very high leading to excellent levels of client problem solving and self-coaching – clients may think that they are personally dealing with many of their own difficulties and not realise that they are being subtly supported and directed by the candidate. The candidate will foster an independent learning approach that is highly adaptable and transferable to a wide range of venues.

Reviewing

1. No review of client performance at the end of the session or day is provided or is so perfunctory so as to be pointless. Information which is provided may be inaccurate, misleading or contradictory. The review does not elicit information from the clients on their progress and any information is provided by the candidate. Client sensitivities may not be heeded and inappropriate comments may be made by the candidate.
2. A review is organised though poorly structured with most information coming from the candidate rather than from the clients. When clients do contribute, they may not be encouraged to extend their thoughts and they may be interrupted whilst speaking. The candidate may demonstrate poor listening skills. This type of review is unlikely to be beneficial to the clients.
3. The candidate runs a structured review in which information is shared between them and the clients. The clients will be asked for their views on their own performance and will be invited to consider priorities for improvement. The candidate will be able to provide accurate, evidence based information and action plans which are beneficial to the clients' ongoing development. The candidate is generally sensitive to their clients throughout the review.
4. An ability to competently run a very good review is apparent. The clients are questioned on their progress across the session/course/day and the candidate confirms or questions them to ensure understanding before augmenting, reinforcing or redirecting them. The candidate questions the clients accurately and pertinently to ensure they are clear on priorities for

British Caving Association

improvement and offers encouragement and support to aid this process. The candidate will exhibit very good listening skills and will not interrupt the clients whilst they are speaking; they will have the ability to extract further information from clients via effective questioning. The candidate is able to clearly differentiate between the clients throughout the review and remains constantly sensitive when discussing areas for development and individual differences.

5. An excellent review is observed which the candidate so organises so that it is run in the main by the candidates with subtle direction, encouragement, support and questioning from the candidate. This is likely to follow on from a coaching approach in which the clients have been encouraged to self analyse and to become independent learners. The candidate will be able to effortlessly manage the discussion to ensure it remains relevant at all times. Clients will depart with an in-depth understanding of their current competence, their potential and individualised action plans to realise this. To effectively use this approach to reviewing requires no little skill and is likely to be extremely uncommon – even though candidates may try.