

Year 3 MB ChB
Medical Humanities Student Selected Component Option:

Alternative Projects
ME33A1
(15 credits)

ME33A2
(30 credits)

October- 2024

Course Co-ordinator: Dr LEEANNE BODKIN

Contents

Introduction to the Course	2
Aim	2
Learning Outcomes	2
Course Co-ordinator and course information	3
Approval process.....	3
Ethical considerations	4
Teaching Methods.....	4
Assessment.....	4
Submission and Marking Criteria.....	5
Absences, extensions and academic misconduct	5
Other opportunities.....	6
Student Evaluation.....	6
Appendix 1: Assessment cover sheet	7
Appendix 2: Mark Schemes.....	8

Introduction to the Course

This course enables individual students to identify an area of study of personal interest or that is not offered currently within the Medical Humanities options to undertake an alternative project on. Students will need to be motivated and able to work independently.

All students on this course will have had to undergo a project approval process to ensure the project is appropriate for the Medical Humanities SSC and is achievable.

Following the successful approval of your project proposal you should list your alternative project when selecting courses through MyCurriculum in September. If you are putting this as your first choice you will still be required to submit alternatives in the system but you are guaranteed your project.

You need to get permission to conduct your project outwith Aberdeen and you may be required to attend other year 3 timetabled teaching.

Aim

Give you the opportunity to consider Medicine, Healthcare, Illness and Disability from an alternative perspective of your own choosing.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this course you will have demonstrated;

- the ability to work on your own initiative on a project of particular personal interest

As projects and assessments vary you will not all achieve all the following outcomes. However you may have opportunity to develop and demonstrate the following skills;

- An ability to participate in the creation of new knowledge and understanding through research and inquiry
- An intellectual curiosity and a willingness to question accepted wisdom and to be open to new ideas
- A capacity for independent, conceptual and creative thinking
- A capacity for problem identification, the collection of evidence, synthesis and dispassionate analysis
- An openness to, and an interest in, life-long learning through directed and self-directed study
- A capacity for self reflection, self discovery and personal development
- An ability to communicate effectively for different purposes and in different contexts; including academic writing skills, presentation skills or visual communication

Course Co-ordinator and course information

Dr Leeanne Bodkin

Suttie Centre for Teaching & Learning in Healthcare
Aberdeen
AB25 2ZD
Tel 01224 437723
leeannebodkin@abdn.ac.uk

I am usually in work on Monday-Thursday. Please contact me by email in the first instance.

If you are having any difficulties academic or pastoral during your medical humanities please inform the course coordinator as soon as possible so they are aware and if necessary can liaise with your supervisor.

Approval process

Alternative projects are your ideas; this is your opportunity to identify a topic of your own choosing to study in depth that considers Medicine and Healthcare from an alternative perspective. Purely Scientific/ Medical projects will not be approved, otherwise there is no limit to the possibilities.

Where possible you should try to find a suitable person with appropriate expertise to supervise you and to assess your work academically. The Medical Humanities team may be able to help you find a suitable supervisor over the summer. Please see the Guide for Supervisors on <https://www.abdn.ac.uk/medical/humanities/course/view.php?id=31> which you might find useful to share with potential supervisors. It is not necessary to have this confirmed when submitting proposal however final approval is dependant on confirmed supervisor before making course choices in Sept.

It is not necessary to do primary data collection and you should consider if this is necessary and alternative s should this not be possible.

You should contact the SSC coordinator by email in the first instance with an outline of your proposal and then you will be asked to complete a proposal form (see below). You will need to have submitted your initial proposal by **in May** by email to leeannebodkin@abdn.ac.uk There are also opportunities to do projects with identified supervisors and these are listed on website.

You will be invited to discuss your initial proposal at a meeting with the medical humanities team after submission and to revise proposal if necessary during the summer. We consider your proposal with you and if the project is feasible in terms of time involved, supervision and eventual outputs. The more preparatory research into the project you do the better chance it has of approval. Students may only undertake an 'alternative' project in Medical Humanities, with the approval of the Medical Humanities team. We will decide with you if it is to be worth 15 credits and agree equitable assessment.

Timeline

May - Proposal submission
June - Approval Panel
July - Follow up Actions from panel
Aug - Confirm supervisor and approval
Sept - Submit as first choice in course selection

Ethical considerations

You should consider if your plans might need ethical approval, usually we advise against projects that do and you would need appropriate support to undertake ethical approval from your supervisor and this will need to be undertaken in advance. As part of the approval process you will need to discuss if there are any ethical considerations for your project such as;

Does the research involve the NHS and/or any type of clinical contact?

- including on NHS premises

Does the research involve human participants?

- including accessing data (even if anon) or questionnaires, consider data protection and safeguarding

Does the research involve existing data from humans?

- including on social media

If you do still want to pursue this you will be required to have a backup plan should your application be unsuccessful.

Teaching Methods

You will be supervised by your nominated supervisor and should expect to be in contact with them weekly. For the most part there will be no structured teaching. Guidance is provided on a bespoke basis and, a schedule of work should be agreed between the student and supervisor.

A 30 credit course entails 300 notional hours of effort and likewise a 15 credit course entails 150 hours (this must be completed by the end of the six weeks). The Medical Humanities Alternative Project may be a 15 credit or 30 credit course depending on the time the project will require to complete.

You will be contacted by course coordinator to check on progress as required. A mid-point progress session will bring all students together to give informal presentation (with or without slides) of your project.

Midpoint progress presentations: Tues 12th Nov 1-4pm Blackboard collaborate ME33A2

Supervisors may be willing to read a plan or draft of a section of your written assessment but are NOT expected to read a complete draft, proof read or provide feedback prior to submission of assessed work.

Assessment

Each project will have individualised assessment agreed during the approval process but is likely to be either 1 or 2 components;

For 30 credit project;

- 5000 word written submission (format dependant on discipline essay/report) (100%)
- OR 3500 word written submission (80%) **AND** 1500 word reflective essay or Oral Presentation (20%)

For 15 credit project;

- 3500 word written submission (essay/report format dependant on discipline essay/report) (100%)

OR 2500 word written submission (format dependant on discipline essay/report) (80%) **AND** Oral Presentation (20%)

Or for art projects

Reflective portfolio (50%) and final outcome for exhibition (50%)

Your individualised assessment requirements including components their weight and length of submission and the relevant marking schemes will be sent to both you and your supervisor prior to the start of the SSC. Copies of the marking scheme for each type of component are available in the appendices.

There will be an alternative projects presentation session on final Tuesday of the SSC

Presentation session (assessed): Tues 3rd Dec 1-5pm in Suttie Centre and on teams.

although you may be asked to also present for an audience arranged by your supervisor.

Your supervisor will be your first marker and all assessment components will be double marked, this will be arranged by the course coordinator.

Submission and Marking Criteria

You will be required to submit any written assessment components electronically through MyAberdeen and by email to your supervisor with the covering sheet (see appendix 1) by the last day of the SSC - **5pm Friday 6th December 2024**

You can log in to MyAberdeen by going to: www.abdn.ac.uk/myaberdeen and entering your University username and password. Further information on MyAberdeen including Quick Guides and video tutorials, can be found at after log in on the Help Tab.

Absences, extensions and academic misconduct

Absence

Attendance is monitored and unaccounted absence can lead to class certificate being refused. Inform your project supervisor, course coordinator and MBChB office of absences ideally in advance.

STUDENTS should be

- Reading information providing in the course guide with regard to required attendance and absence reporting
- Seeking approval for planned absence prior to the ME33 course by contacting MBChB Office in advance
- Reporting absences through local reporting processes outlined in their course guide
- Responding to **C6** email notification by following the relevant School procedure for your medical humanities course(s).

Extension

The late submission of work without prior approval from the SSC coordinator will incur late submission penalties. You should submit your request for approval to Dr Leeanne Bodkin leeannebodkin@abdn.ac.uk and copy in Year 3 administrator MBChB office. Your supervisor cannot give you approval.

STUDENTS should be

- Reading information providing in the course guide with regard to requesting extensions and penalties for unapproved late submissions
- Seeking approval for a short (one week) extension to an assessment submission deadline from Course coordinator through local School procedures
- Providing if required evidence of exceptional circumstances to support request e.g. medical certification.
- Responding to email correspondence from course coordinator, MBChB office and SSC coordinator with regard to request.
- Aware late submission of work without prior approval from course coordinator or SSC coordinator will incur late submission penalties.
- Aware candidates who wish to establish that their academic performance has been adversely affected due to exceptional circumstances should follow medical school policies and procedures. A Student Guide to Exceptional Circumstances Policy can be found in the Assessment section of MyMBChB

Academic Misconduct

The work you submit must be your own and meet academic writing standards for referencing. You will be asked to submit a plagiarism declaration and if plagiarism is suspected this will be investigated as academic misconduct.

STUDENTS should be

- Reading information providing in the course guide with regard to plagiarism, use of text matching plagiarism detection software and GenAI.
- Submitting work for assessment through the software as instructed
- Responding to email notifications regarding plagiarism investigation

Other opportunities

Prizes

There will be a internal prize awarded for the best alternative project. In addition there is an overall Medical Humanities SSC for which the top students can also be considered.

There are other external prizes that you may be circulated information about that we encourage students to submit their work for consideration.

Conferences

We encourage students to consider submitting their work to appropriate conferences e.g. the Association of Medical Humanities and there may be funding available for successful submission to allow attendance at the conference.

Student Evaluation

We place great importance on interaction with, and feedback from students. To facilitate this, each course participates in the Course Evaluation Form exercise. As part of the exercise, the results are discussed at Year 3 Team Meetings and SSLC and course co-ordinators provide an overall report for the Academic Standards Committee.

Appendix 1: Assessment cover sheet

Medical Humanities

ALTERNATIVE PROJECT

ME33A1 or ME33A2

ASSESSMENT COVERSHEET

(please complete this and submit with your written work)

STUDENT NAME	_____
STUDENT ID	_____
COURSE CODE/NAME:	ME33A ALTERNATIVE PROJECT
COURSE TUTOR:	Dr Leeanne Bodkin
PROJECT SUPERVISOR:	_____
TYPE OF ASSESSMENT:	_____
PROJECT TITLE:	_____ _____

HAS AN EXTENSION BEEN GRANTED?

☐

The late submission of work without prior approval from the SSC coordinator will incur late submission penalties. You should submit your request for approval to Dr Leeanne Bodkin leeannebodkin@abdn.ac.uk and copy in Year 3 administrator MBChB office. Your supervisor cannot give you approval.

PLAGIARISM STATEMENT

“Plagiarism means using someone else’s work or ideas (whether that is a written source, image, table or graph) and giving the impression that they are your own. Plagiarism also includes the use of generative artificial intelligence tools to generate content without appropriate acknowledgment of the source.”

<https://www.abdn.ac.uk/students/academic-life/academic-integrity.php>

I hereby acknowledge that I have read and understood the above definition of plagiarism. I declare that all material from other sources used in this piece of assessed work, whether directly quoted or paraphrased, has been clearly identified and attributed to the source from which it came.

SIGNATURE: _____

|

Appendix 2: Mark Schemes

- Project
- Essay
- Report
- Reflective Essay
- Presentation
- Art Portfolio
- Art Final Outcomes and Exhibition

Alternative Medical Humanities Project –PROJECT ASSESSMENT

Marking criteria using Common Grading Scale (CGS)

Band	Grade	Description
Excellent	A1 - 22 A2 - 21 A3 – 20 A4 - 19 A5 - 18	Exceptionally good project in all aspects of design and execution Exceptionally well presented content demonstrating a very broad and integrated knowledge and understanding of topic Clinical or other content accurate demonstrating wide knowledge and understanding ,where appropriate, of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms Highly relevant to the stated audience and demonstrating wide knowledge and understanding of current debates Meets full criteria set for project
Very Good	B1 – 17 B2 – 16 B3 - 15	Above average design and execution Clearly presented content demonstrating broad and integrated knowledge and understanding of topic Clinical or other content accurate demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding ,where appropriate, of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms Minor inaccuracies only Relevant to stated audience and demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding of current debates Generally matches criteria set for project
Good	C1 – 14 C2 – 13 C3 - 12	An acceptable project in design and execution Content mainly relevant and presented in an appropriate way demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of topic Clinical or other content accurate demonstrating some knowledge and understanding ,where appropriate, of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms Some inaccuracies Relevant to stated audience and demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of current debates Some mismatch with project criteria
Pass	D1 – 11 D2 – 10 D3 - 9	Borderline project design or execution Inappropriate selection or poor presentation of content, but still understandable. Demonstrating little knowledge and understanding of topic Insufficient accurate content, demonstrating little knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms May include some minor and one or two major inaccuracies Little relevance to stated audience, demonstrating little knowledge and understanding of current debates Limited attempts to meet project criteria
Fail	E1 – 8 E2 – 7 E3 - 6	Unsatisfactory design or execution Poor selection of content demonstrating no knowledge and understanding of topic Poor presentation of content, which is irrelevant or incomplete, demonstrating no knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms No relevance to stated audience and demonstrating no knowledge and understanding of current debates Major inaccuracies Failed to meet project criteria
Clear Fail	F - <5	No evidence that an appropriate project has been carried out (i.e. token or no submission)

Alternative Medical Humanities Project –ESSAY ASSESSMENT

Marking criteria for Project Essay using Common Grading Scale (CGS)

Band	Grade	Description
Excellent	A1 - 22	Well written: clear, fluent, accurate usage, with correct spelling and grammar
	A2 - 21	Sharp focus on set question / topic
	A3 – 20	Well, logically structured demonstrating a very broad and integrated knowledge and understanding of topic
	A4 - 19	Accurate and appropriately selected content
	A5 - 18	Clear, coherent, sophisticated, nuanced, argument and analysis demonstrating wide knowledge and understanding ,where appropriate, of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology. Evidence of extensive reading and research demonstrating wide knowledge and understanding of current debates Accurate and properly formatted bibliography/references Meets full criteria set for assessment
Very Good	B1 – 17	Above average in quality of writing
	B2 – 16	Good focus on set question / topic
	B3 - 15	Appropriately structured demonstrating broad and integrated knowledge and understanding of topic Well selected content Clear, coherent argument and analysis demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding ,where appropriate, of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology. Evidence of reading and research and demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding of current debates Accurate and properly formatted bibliography/references Generally matches criteria set for assessment
Good	C1 – 14	Acceptable writing quality
	C2 – 13	Lack of clear focus on set question / topic
	C3 - 12	Adequately structured and demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of topic Content lacking relevance at times Adequate argument and analysis demonstrating some knowledge and understanding ,where appropriate, of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms Evidence of reading and research demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of current debates Appropriately formatted bibliography/references with minor lapses only Some mismatch with assessment criteria
Pass	D1 – 11	Poor quality of writing and presentation
	D2 – 10	Limited attempt to address question or topic
	D3 - 9	Poorly structured and demonstrating little knowledge and understanding of topic Some inaccuracies Poorly developed argument with minimal analysis demonstrating little knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms Limited evidence of reading, narrow range of sources demonstrating little knowledge and understanding of current debates Appropriately formatted bibliography/references but with some inaccuracies or lapses Limited attempts to meet assessment criteria
Fail	E1 – 8	Very poorly written and presented
	E2 – 7	Badly structured, demonstrating no knowledge and understanding of topic
	E3 - 6	Frequent inaccuracies Very poor or no argument Very poor or no analysis demonstrating no knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms Inadequate reading demonstrating no knowledge and understanding of current debates Very poorly referenced Failed to meet assessment criteria

Clear Fail	F - <5	No evidence that a project has been carried out (i.e. token or no submission)
-----------------------	------------------	---

Alternative Medical Humanities Project –REPORT ASSESSMENT

Marking criteria using Common Grading Scale (CGS)

Band	Grade	Description
Excellent	A1 - 22 A2 - 21 A3 – 20 A4 - 19 A5 - 18	Appropriate structure and logical flow demonstrating a very broad and integrated knowledge and understanding of topic Clear and concise introduction Extensive literature review (if relevant) demonstrating wide knowledge and understanding of current debates Approach and method clearly explained demonstrating wide knowledge and understanding ,where appropriate, of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms Results accurately and appropriately reported (if relevant) Demonstrates good understanding of problems encountered and how they were resolved (if relevant) Accurate and properly formatted bibliography/references Meets full criteria set for assessment
Very Good	B1 – 17 B2 – 16 B3 - 15	Appropriate structure demonstrating broad and integrated knowledge and understanding of topic Clear introduction Good literature review (if relevant) demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding of current debates Approach and method clearly explained demonstrating sound knowledge and understanding ,where appropriate, of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms Results accurately and appropriately reported (if relevant) Demonstrates understanding of problems encountered and how they were resolved (if relevant) Accurate and properly formatted bibliography/references Generally matches criteria set for assessment
Good	C1 – 14 C2 – 13 C3 - 12	Mostly appropriate structure demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of topic Reasonable introduction with some flaws Adequate literature review (if relevant) demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of current debates Approach and method adequately explained demonstrating some knowledge and understanding ,where appropriate, of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms Results reported (if relevant) Demonstrates some understanding of problems encountered and how they were resolved (if relevant) Appropriately formatted bibliography/references with minor lapses only Some mismatch with assessment criteria
Pass	D1 – 11 D2 – 10 D3 - 9	Poor structure and content, but still understandable. Demonstrating little knowledge and understanding of topic Limited introduction Limited literature review with little evidence of appropriate reading (if relevant); demonstrating little knowledge and understanding of current debates Approach and method poorly explained demonstrating little knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms Results reported in a limited or inappropriate manner (if relevant) Limited understanding of problems encountered (if relevant) Mostly appropriately formatted bibliography/references but with some lapses Limited attempts to meet assessment criteria

Fail	E1 – 8 E2 – 7 E3 - 6	<p>Very poor or no structure demonstrating no knowledge and understanding of topic</p> <p>Inadequate introduction</p> <p>Very limited or no literature review with little evidence of appropriate reading (if relevant); demonstrating no knowledge and understanding of current debates</p> <p>Approach and method very poorly or not explained and demonstrating no knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles, concepts, terminology, specialisms</p> <p>Results reported in an inaccurate or inappropriate manner (if relevant)</p> <p>Very limited or no understanding of problems encountered (if relevant)</p> <p>Major inaccuracies or lapses in referencing</p> <p>Failed to meet assessment criteria</p>
Clear Fail	F - <5	No evidence that a project has been carried out (i.e. token or no submission)

Alternative Medical Humanities Project –REFLECTIVE ESSAY ASSESSMENT
Marking criteria using Common Grading Scale (CGS)

Band	Grade	Description
Excellent	A1 - 22 A2 - 21 A3 – 20 A4 - 19 A5 - 18	Exceptionally well written. Description is minimal, covering the issues for reflection and noting their context. Clear evidence of standing back from an event, “mulling over” and internal dialogue. Recognition that the frame of reference from which an event is viewed can change. Critical awareness of own thought processes. The view and motives of others are taken into account. Recognition that prior experience and thoughts can interact to produce current behaviour. Points for learning are noted. Deep understanding of technical issues involved in project. Meets full criteria set for assessment
Very Good	B1 – 17 B2 – 16 B3 - 15	Above average in quality of writing. Description is focused with particular aspects accentuated for reflective comment. Material is being “mulled around”. Evidence of external ideas or information and where this occurs, the material is subjected to reflection. Some analysis, particularly exploring motives or reasons for behaviour. Where relevant, there is willingness to be self-critical. Recognition that things might look different from other perspectives, and that views can change with time or the emotional state. Good understanding of technical issues involved in project. Generally matches criteria set for assessment
Good	C1 – 14 C2 – 13 C3 - 12	Acceptable writing quality. Description is focused with particular aspects accentuated for reflective comment. Material is being “mulled around”. Evidence of external ideas or information and where this occurs, the material is subjected to reflection. Understanding of technical issues involved in project. Some mismatch with assessment criteria
Pass	D1 – 11 D2 – 10 D3 - 9	Poor quality of writing The basic account is descriptive however, the account is more than just a story. It is focused on the event as if there are questions to be asked and answered. Points where reflection could occur are signalled. There is recognition of the benefits of further exploration, but it does not go very far. Limited understanding of technical issues involved in project. Limited attempts to meet assessment criteria
Fail	E1 – 8 E2 – 7 E3 - 6	Little evidence that a project has been carried out/no reflection on project or challenges involved Failed to meet assessment criteria
Clear Fail	F - <5	No evidence that a project has been carried out (i.e. token or no submission)

Alternative Medical Humanities Project –PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT

Marking criteria using Common Grading Scale (CGS)

Mark		Description
18-22	Outstanding	<p>Exceptionally engaging presentation with complete clarity and excellent pace of delivery.</p> <p>Excellent use of AV aids - powerpoint slides or selection of effective images which enhance the presentation.</p> <p>Very well structured and well-rehearsed presentation of definite and convincing argument; analysis; message; original narrative.</p> <p>Exceptionally well presented content demonstrating extensive background research, a very broad and integrated knowledge and understanding of topic.</p> <p>Extremely effective and accurate deployment of primary sources and linkages to secondary literature / 'theory'</p> <p>Highly relevant to the stated audience and demonstrating wide knowledge and understanding of current debates. Evidenced by superb handling of questions.</p>
15-17	Very Good	<p>Above average engaging presentation with clarity of delivery and well-paced.</p> <p>Very good use of AV aids - powerpoint slides or well-chosen effective images which enhance the presentation.</p> <p>Very well structured and rehearsed presentation of definite and convincing argument; analysis; message; original narrative</p> <p>Clearly presented content demonstrating thorough background research, a broad and integrated knowledge and understanding of topic.</p> <p>Effective accurate deployment of primary sources and links to secondary literature / 'theory'</p> <p>Relevant to the stated audience and demonstrating wide knowledge and understanding of current debates. Evidenced by handling of questions very well.</p>
12-14	Good	<p>Average presentation with some clarity of delivery and pacing</p> <p>Acceptable use of AV aids - powerpoint slides or images which in the main enhance the presentation.</p> <p>Well-structured and prepared presentation of definite and convincing argument; analysis; message; narrative</p> <p>Clearly presented content demonstrating sufficient background research, a some knowledge and understanding of topic.</p> <p>Attempted deployment of primary sources and links to secondary literature / 'theory' with some minor inaccuracies.</p> <p>Relevant to the stated audience and demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of current debates. Evidenced by handling of questions well.</p>
9-11	Pass	<p>Borderline presentation with lack of clarity of delivery and poor pacing.</p> <p>Poor use of AV aids - powerpoint slides or images which detract at times from the presentation.</p> <p>Poorly structured and prepared presentation of unconvincing argument; analysis; message; unoriginal narrative.</p> <p>Presented content demonstrating lack of sufficient background research, and limited knowledge and understanding of topic.</p> <p>Ineffective deployment of primary sources and limited links to secondary literature / 'theory', significant inaccuracies.</p> <p>Relevance to the stated audience and demonstrating limited knowledge and understanding of current debates. Evidenced by uncertain handling of questions.</p>
6-8	Fail	<p>Unsatisfactory presentation with lack of clarity of delivery and pacing.</p> <p>Ineffective use of AV aids – powerpoint slides or inappropriate selection of images which detract from the presentation.</p> <p>Poorly structured and prepared presentation of ill-defined and unconvincing argument; analysis; message; unoriginal narrative.</p> <p>Poorly presented content demonstrating little or no background research, and very limited knowledge and understanding of topic.</p> <p>Ineffective deployment of primary sources and irrelevant or no links to secondary literature / 'theory'.</p> <p>Lacks relevance to the stated audience and demonstrating little or no knowledge of current debates. Evidenced by inability to handle questions.</p>

<5	Clear Fail	<p>Presentation not completed or unsatisfactory delivery and pace.</p> <p>No or limited ineffective use of AV aids – powerpoint slides or failure to choose or inappropriate images chosen</p> <p>No preparation of argument; analysis; message; narrative.</p> <p>No evidence of background research</p> <p>Lack of any deployment of primary sources and no links to secondary literature / 'theory'.</p> <p>Irrelevant to the stated audience and demonstrating no knowledge of current debates. Unable to deal with any questions.</p>
----	-------------------	--

Alternative Medical Humanities Project –ART PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT
Marking criteria using Common Grading Scale (CGS)

Mark		Description
18-22	Outstanding	<p>Evidence of extensive experimentation and exploration using a wide variety of media or techniques</p> <p>Extensive research and exceptionally well documented influences, sources and references</p> <p>Critical awareness of own thought processes and exceptionally well documented process of decision making and development of ideas</p> <p>Recognition that the frame of reference can change and sensitivity to this. For example considering the viewer or patient.</p> <p>Clear evidence of standing back, “mulling over” and internal dialogue, being appropriately self-critical and displaying personal engagement with the project.</p> <p>Evidence of deeply reflective response to feedback, external ideas or information</p> <p>Points for learning are noted and impact on future artwork evident within project and beyond to impact on future career as a healthcare practitioner</p> <p>Deep understanding of technical issues involved in project and execution including excellent time management</p>
15-17	Very Good	<p>Evidence of experimentation and exploration using different media or techniques</p> <p>Wide research and well documented influences, sources and references</p> <p>Critical awareness of own thought processes and well documented process of decision making and development of ideas</p> <p>Recognition that and the frame of reference can change and sensitivity to this. For example considering the viewer or patient.</p> <p>Evidence of standing back, “mulling over” and internal dialogue, being appropriately self-critical at times and displaying personal engagement with the project.</p> <p>Evidence of reflective response to feedback, external ideas or information</p> <p>Points for learning are noted and impact on future artwork evident within project and beyond to impact on future career as a healthcare practitioner</p> <p>Understanding of technical issues involved in project and execution including good time management</p>

12-14	Good	<p>Evidence of experimentation and exploration using different of media or techniques</p> <p>Researched and documented influences, sources and references</p> <p>Evidence of standing back, “mulling over” and internal dialogue,</p> <p>Recognition that the frame of reference can change.</p> <p>Awareness of own thought processes and documentation of process of decision making and development of ideas</p> <p>Evidence of some reflective response to feedback, external ideas or information</p> <p>Points for learning are noted and some attention given to impact on future artwork evident within project and some attention given to impact on future career as a healthcare practitioner</p> <p>Understanding of technical issues involved in project and execution including reasonable time management</p>
9-11	Pass	<p>Limited evidence of experimentation and exploration using different of media or techniques</p> <p>Researched and documented limited range of influences, sources and references</p> <p>Descriptive with little evidence of standing back, “mulling over” and internal dialogue</p> <p>Some awareness of own thought processes and adequate documentation of process of decision making and development of ideas</p> <p>Evidence of some superficial reflective responses to feedback, external ideas or information</p> <p>Minimal attempt made to consider points for learning and future impact</p> <p>Some understanding of technical issues involved in project and execution including adequate time management</p>
6-8	Fail	<p>Little evidence that a project has been carried out</p> <p>Lack of reflection and self-awareness</p> <p>Failure to learn or consider future impact</p> <p>Lack of understanding of technical issues and poor time management</p>
<5	Clear Fail	<p>No evidence that a project has been carried out (i.e. token or no submission)</p>

- **Alternative Medical Humanities Project –FINAL OUTCOMES AND EXHIBITION**

Marking criteria using Common Grading Scale (CGS)

Mark		Description
18-22	Outstanding	<p>Exceptionally good project in all aspects of design and execution</p> <p>Presents evidence that demonstrates ability to generate highly original ideas in response to topic of project and development of these to final outcome(s).</p> <p>Exceptionally effective final outcome(s)</p> <p>Demonstrates excellence in observation, visualisation and technical execution in chosen medium.</p> <p>Highly relevant to the stated audience and demonstrating excellent presentation and exhibition skills, in collaboration with others.</p> <p>Exceeds criteria set for project</p>
15-17	Very Good	<p>Above average design and execution</p> <p>Presents evidence that demonstrates ability to generate original ideas in response to topic of project and development of these to final outcome(s).</p> <p>Very effective final outcome(s)</p> <p>Demonstrates above average skills in observation, visualisation and technical execution in chosen medium.</p> <p>Relevant to the stated audience and demonstrating good presentation and exhibition skills, in collaboration with others.</p> <p>Meets full criteria set for project</p>
12-14	Good	<p>Good design and execution</p> <p>Presents evidence that demonstrates ability to generate ideas in response to topic of project and attempts development of these to final outcome(s).</p> <p>Effective final outcome(s)</p> <p>Demonstrates skills in observation, visualisation and technical execution in chosen medium.</p> <p>Relevant to the stated audience and demonstrating presentation and exhibition skills, in collaboration with others.</p> <p>Meets most of project criteria</p>
9-11	Pass	<p>Adequate project design or execution</p> <p>Presents limited evidence that demonstrates ability to generate own ideas response to topic of project and shows partial development of these to final outcome(s).</p> <p>Limited effectiveness of final outcome(s)</p> <p>Demonstrates some skills in observation, visualisation and technical execution in chosen medium.</p> <p>Little relevance to stated audience, demonstrating few presentation and exhibition skills, failure to work in collaboration with others.</p> <p>Some mismatch with project criteria</p>

6-8	Fail	<p>Unsatisfactory design or execution</p> <p>No evidence of generation of own ideas in response to topic or development of these to effective final outcomes.</p> <p>Poor skills in observation, visualisation and technical execution in chosen medium.</p> <p>No relevance to stated audience, demonstrating poor presentation and exhibition skills, failure to work in collaboration with others.</p> <p>Failed to meet project criteria</p>
<5	Clear Fail	No evidence that an appropriate project has been carried out (i.e. token or no submission)