

PHRM7203 Video reflection assessment rubric

| Assessment criteria | 7 (≥85%) High Distinction | 6 (75-84%) Distinction | 5 (65-74%) Credit | 4 (50-64%) Pass | 3 (47-49%) Marginal Fail | 2 (30-46%) Fail | 1 (0-29%) Low Fail |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Criteria 1: Using reflective practice to enhance knowledge and critical thinking. Evidence of the ability to <i>critically reflect</i> on your own practice to inform your video journal on medication safety (50%) | The response demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the topic: The video journal reports, reflects, and responds in a very effective way to key events and issues. Excellent judgement is shown in presenting only relevant information. Reflection relates constructively to developing practice and recognises the broader context within the fields of clinical therapeutics, pharmacology and medication safety. Expert critical thinking used to present high-level justification of reflection supported by pertinent consideration and quality literature. | The response demonstrates an advanced understanding of the topic: The video journal reports, reflects, and responds in a very effective way to key events and issues, relating this to the student's developing practice and recognises the broader context within the fields of clinical therapeutics, pharmacology and medication safety. Critical thinking is used to present a high-level justification of the reflection supported by mostly pertinent consideration and quality literature. | The response demonstrates a proficient understanding of the topic: The video journal reports, reflects, and responds to key events and issues, relating this to the student's developing practice and the broader context within the fields of clinical therapeutics, pharmacology and medication safety. Critical thinking used to present a very good justification of the reflection supported by some focused consideration and quality literature. | The response demonstrates a functional understanding of the topic: The video journal reports, reflects, what happened and/or identifies what the key issues are and provides personal responses to these issues and the context within the fields of clinical therapeutics, pharmacology and medication safety. Critical thinking is used at times to present a sound justification of the reflection supported by appropriate consideration and good literature. | The response demonstrates a developing understanding of the topic: The video journal reports, reflects, what happened and/or identifies what some of the key issues are and provides personal responses to these issues with minimal relation to the context within the fields of clinical therapeutics, pharmacology and medication safety. Evidence of critical thinking is limited in high-level justification of reflection with limited consideration and some literature. | The response demonstrates a minimal understanding of the topic: The video journal does not report or reflect, all of what happened and does not identify what the key issues are or the relationship to the context within the fields of clinical therapeutics, pharmacology and medication safety. Absence of critical thinking and limited justification of the reflection which is poorly supported with poor literature | The response demonstrates insufficient understanding of the topic: The video journal does not report or reflect on any of what happened and/does not identify what the key issues are or consider any of the within the fields of clinical therapeutics, pharmacology and medication safety. Absence of justification and/or reflection |
| C1 Weighted Score | (42.5-50) | (37.5-42.4) | (32.5-37.4) | (25-32.4) | (23.5-24.9) | (15-23.4) | (0.0-14.9) |

PHRM7203 Video reflection assessment rubric

| Assessment criteria | 7 (≥85%) High Distinction | 6 (75-84%) Distinction | 5 (65-74%) Credit | 4 (50-64%) Pass | 3 (47-49%) Marginal Fail | 2 (30-46%) Fail | 1 (0-29%) Low Fail |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| Criteria 2: Application of disciplinary knowledge to critical thinking. Evidence of ability to <i>source and engage</i> with appropriate evidence, and professional practice frameworks to inform medication safety (40%) | Demonstrates the ability to generate a comprehensive academic argument through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of strong academic and professional literature to persuasively and comprehensively justify statements - Sourcing, appraising and expertly balancing the views of articles from wide-ranging and contemporary sources - A background which presents a well-articulated argument | Demonstrates the ability to generate a comprehensive academic argument through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of strong academic and professional literature to convincingly justify statements - Sourcing, appraising and presenting a predominately balanced view of articles from wide-ranging and contemporary sources - A background which presents a clear and focused argument | Demonstrates the ability to generate a strong academic argument through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of mostly strong academic and professional literature to suitably justify statements - Sourcing, appraising and presenting a mostly balanced view of articles from predominately wide-ranging and contemporary sources - A background which presents a predominately focused argument | Demonstrates the ability to generate a sound academic argument through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of some strong academic and professional literature to provide emerging justification for statements - Sourcing, appraising and presenting a balanced view of articles from predominantly contemporary sources - A background which presents a sufficient academic argument | Demonstrates a limited ability to generate an academic argument through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of some or inappropriate literature in attempting to justify statements - Poorly sourcing, appraising literature with a limited balance in views - A background which lacks an academic argument with limited or no focus | Demonstrates scant ability to generate an academic argument through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of limited/no/inappropriate literature to poorly justify statements - Presenting insufficient literature to demonstrate any meaningful academic view - A background which lacks focus and fails to present any sufficient argument | Demonstrates no ability to generate any academic argument through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of any literature use and no justifications supporting statements - Failing to source literature (or sourcing scant literature) with an absence of any academic view - A background lacking both focus and argument - The use of AI or similar tool is not appropriately acknowledged or inappropriate. |
| C2 Weighted Score | (34.0-40.0) | (30.0-33.9) | (26.0-29.9) | (20.0-25.9) | (18.8-19.9) | (12.0-18.7) | (0.0-11.9) |
| Criteria 3: Presentation. Assessment is <i>presented</i> in alignment with academic expectations (10%) | This VJ always uses appropriate professional and non-discriminatory language. Correctly cites all sources within the reference list, application of references is highly consistent, with correct use of a consistent referencing style without errors. Expressed ideas are consistently very clear, concise, and discussed fluently. | This VJ consistently uses appropriate professional and non-discriminatory language. Correctly cites almost all sources within the reference list, application of references is very consistent, with correct use of the chosen referencing style with very minimal errors. Expressed ideas are very clear, concise, and discussed fluently. | This VJ predominantly uses appropriate professional and non-discriminatory language. Correctly cites most sources within the reference list, application of references is consistent, correctly uses a consistent referencing style with some minor errors. Expressed ideas are clear, concise, and discussed fluently. | This VJ mostly uses appropriate professional and non-discriminatory language. Cites some relevant sources within the reference list, application of references is generally consistent, uses a consistent referencing style with some errors. Expressed ideas are adequately clear, concise, and discussed well. | This VJ occasionally uses appropriate professional and non-discriminatory language. There is inconsistent citing of sources within the reference list. Application of references is generally inconsistent, with the chosen referencing style and there are some major errors. Expressed ideas are somewhat unclear, are not concise or are not clearly discussed. | In this VJ there is inappropriate use of professional and non-discriminatory language, inaccurate and inconsistent citing of sources on the reference list. Application of references is mostly inconsistent with the chosen referencing and has many major errors. Expressed ideas are unclear, are not concise and not discussed in any meaningful manner. | In this VJ there is frequent use of inappropriate unprofessional and discriminatory language. There is, absent or inaccurate citing of sources within the reference list. Application of references is inconsistent, and the chosen referencing is used mostly incorrectly. Interpretation of expressed ideas is hindered by unclear communication. |
| C3 Weighted Score | (8.5-10) | (7.5-8.4) | (6.5-7.4) | (5.0-6.4) | (4.7-4.9) | (3.0-4.6) | (0-2.9) |